

SECRET



Copy

9 December 1958

MEMORANDUM FOR : Special Assistant to the Director
for Planning and Development

THROUGH : Director of Development and Procurement, HPS

SUBJECT : Report of Trip to ITEK

Reference : Memo for Addressee, Subject: Exploitation
of Equipment for CORONA Photography
(dtd 1 Dec.1958).

1. During the period 2 - 3 December, [redacted] and the undersigned visited ITEK. The primary purpose of the visit was to resolve the differences in opinion regarding the relative merits of the processors and printers produced by ITEK and those manufactured by [redacted]. During our stay we talked with Mr. W. Levison and [redacted] the latter two were project officers for the ITEK processor and printer.

2. Basically, Mr. Levison's concern was twofold:

a. The processors and printers produced by [redacted] would not retain the resolution obtained by the camera.

b. [redacted] in the person of [redacted] was not giving the ITEK equipments a fair trial and was not cooperating with ITEK personnel.

3. During our two day stay, we undertook to resolve each of the two major points brought to our attention by Mr. Levison.

a.1. In answer to par. 2A -- We indicated to Walt Levison all of the [redacted] are capable of producing material in excess of calculated resolution of the Hyc cameras using either the IIA lenses or the IIB lenses. The majority of the cameras (14) will have the IIA lenses. Only 4 cameras will have the IIB lenses. The IIA lens produces 110 1/mm on axis; at 1° off axis 90 1/mm; at 2° = 75 1/mm and; at 2 1/2° = 60 1/mm. ITEK believes the IIB lens will produce 100 1/mm across the slit. It must be remembered these figures are based on bench tests using high resolution targets.

2. We indicated to Mr. Levison that [redacted] considered the ITEK printer an excellent machine but it would need certain modifications before it could be utilized on CORONA. We assured Mr. Levison all of the printers [redacted] and ITEK) could duplicate material without appreciable loss of detail.

Declassified and Released by the N R O

In Accordance with E. O. 12958

NOV 26 1997

00

3. Mr. Levison stated he has not seen [redacted] evaluation of either the ITEK printer or processor. We assured him this was an oversight on our part as we thought the undersigned had given his copy to an ITEK representative at the 3 November meeting at [redacted]. I promised to send him a copy as soon as I could locate one. This was done on 9 December.

b.1. In answer to par. 2B.- This point seemed to be a figment of Mr. Levison's imagination for both [redacted] and [redacted] indicated to us they had no problems with [redacted] in the checkout or evaluation of ITEK equipment. I asked [redacted] about the rumor that [redacted] kept him out of the [redacted] facility for 3 days for reasons unknown. [redacted] was surprised to hear this rumor had come to our attention. The true story he stated was as follows:

[redacted] and he were instructed by ITEK to spend a week at [redacted] to run tests on the printer and processor. They arrived at [redacted] on a Monday morning. [redacted] was denied entrance to our [redacted] facilities because his clearance had not arrived. [redacted] understanding the situation, returned to his hotel room. As [redacted] had clearance, he proceeded to go to work. The same afternoon, [redacted] clearance arrived and he too spent the remainder of the week working on ITEK equipment.

2. We stated [redacted] told us he had been instructed by ITEK not to attempt any repairs or cleanup of the electronic unit of the ITEK processor. Neither Walt Levison nor [redacted] was aware of these instructions. However, when we talked to [redacted] he stated [redacted] was given these instructions when [redacted] informed him of the first breakdown. [redacted] indicated he intended these instructions to hold only for that one occasion. He admitted he did not tell [redacted] this; consequently, [redacted] assumed the ITEK instructions were currently applicable. [redacted] during the week of 8 December, went to [redacted] and removed the electronic unit for repair and cleanup.

4. Mr. Levison admitted the following:

a. He felt he was most to blame for the misunderstanding between [redacted] and ITEK. (NOTE: This statement was unsolicited.)

b. The ITEK processor and printer could not be used for CORONA without considerable modification. A test program would have to be instituted to insure the modified equipments would operate effectively.

c. [redacted] is held accountable by the Project for processing and printing and therefore should have the responsibility for producing the equipments and techniques necessary to obtain the best available results.

5. We suggested to Mr. Levison he establish closer liaison with [redacted] and frankly and openly discuss any problems with [redacted] and his people. If, after discussion and study, the problem still exists, the facts should be presented to us and we would then attempt to resolve the differences.

6. CONCLUSIONS:

A. We believe we have succeeded in bringing [redacted] and ITEK a little closer together and giving each a better understanding of the other's interests. I am sure [redacted] as a consequence of some of ITEK's accusations, has taken a closer look at his equipment and their results.

B. The undersigned is of the opinion, however, that ITEK and [redacted] will not work effectively as a team. I believe enough ill will has been engendered to preclude any hope of a good relationship. Our task of arbitration will be continuous.

C. Our recommendation is still to utilize [redacted] processors and printers for CORONA.

[redacted]
Lt. Col., USAF
R&D Officer

CONCUR:

/s/ [redacted]
Major, USAF

DPS/DCI [redacted]
Distribution:

Orig - [redacted]