

15 January 1963

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT : Itek Situation

1. We regard the LANYARD and the MURAL 40" system to be competitive with MURAL 40" having an edge. Itek recommends nine LANYARDS, in addition to six LANYARDS already scheduled, be procured. The rationale of having LANYARDS in the first instance was to fill a gap until [redacted] become available. It is suggested that decisions concerning additional procurement of LANYARDS be deferred until a successful LANYARD recovery is in ~~advance~~ ^{hand} and properly evaluated.

2. There follows a brief summary of relative merits of LANYARD MURAL 40" and MURAL 40"/J (a new system concept):

Coverage	800,000 sq. mi.	4,500,000	9,000,000
THOR Boost	Required	Not required	Required
Focal Length	66"	40"	40"
T-Stop	6.7	4	4
*Total cost for 4	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Resolution	5-7'	5-7'	5-7'

*Costs are ROM and include Itek, LMSC, G.E., etc. (but not THOR or TAT).

NOTE:

a. Since MURAL 40" has a much faster lens the opportunity to use fine grain, slow emulsions such as SO-132 are much better over a wider range of sun angles. This effects on-off points and operational flexibility. In addition, MURAL 40" gives continuous stereo coverage with no significant aiming problem such as with LANYARD.

b. It is likely that MURAL 40" may require only a THOR ABLE while LANYARD, MURAL/J and MURAL 40"/J will require THOR/AD vehicles.

Declassified and Released by the NRC
In Accordance with E.O. 12958
on NOV 26 1987

3. Meanwhile it makes a lot of sense to endeavor to optimize performance of MURAL/J configuration in order to achieve the best resolution possible from the present camera and vehicle combination. In this area a more accelerated and integrated systems approach should be pursued than the present course being followed by the SETD. The present approach encourages contractors and the SETD to assess systems and submit TD's for CCB approval. A more determined effort should be made, possibly with the help of a specially established committee, as suggested by Mr. Kiefer, to evaluate the entire system, i.e., camera and vehicle, and recommend speedy courses of action to optimize the performance of the entire system. This approach would put pressure on both the contractors and SETD into more aggressive courses of action.

4. Regarding Itek's "readout" system and technical camera spotting system suggestions, you will recall that Dr. Charyk cancelled the RCA/Itek study on the former and accepted a proposal on the latter, submitted on Itek's initiative. Undoubtedly Itek heard of [REDACTED] difficulties and took advantage of the situation and submitted a proposal. Since we lack definitive information on the technical status of [REDACTED] and the Itek competitive proposal, no attempt will be made to assess the merits of considering the Itek recommendation concerning a spotting system. Itek will be requested to make available to us their proposals on readout and spotting systems.

5. Itek's informal comments about more plant space being required to support CORONA/LANYARD efforts have not been formalized into a request for Contracting Officer consideration. Itek should formalize such a request if, indeed, additional space is required.

6. Attached is a "launch schedule" extracted from a recent Dr. Charyk report for handy reference.

John Parangosky
RC
JOHN PARANGOSKY
C/DD/OSA

Attachment

