

TOP SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001700110006-6

HANDLE VIA TALENT-KEYHOLE CONTROLS ONLY



WARNING

"This document contains information affecting the National Defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, Title 18, USC, Secs. 793 and 794, the transmission or revelation of which in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law".

It is to be seen only by U. S. PERSONNEL especially indoctrinated and authorized to receive TALENT-KEYHOLE information: Its security must be maintained in accordance with the KEYHOLE CONTROL INSTRUCTIONS.

DECLASS REVIEW BY NIMA / DoD

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP78B04747A001700110006-6

TOP SECRET

TCS-11570-62-KH
19 March 1962

Copy 2

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Joint Services Meeting at NPIC

25X1A 1. On 14 March 1962 at 1000 hours, at the request of the JCS,
25X1A a meeting was held at NPIC to discuss some current problems related
to the duplicate (Keyhole) film materials produced by the contractor
at the processing center. The senior JCS representative [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] acted as monitor for the meeting. This Memo for Record
was compiled at the request of Mr. James Reber, CIA.

25X1A

CIA

Mr. James Reber

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

2. A letter from [REDACTED] JCS, stated that the duplicate positives and duplicate negatives produced by _____ for the Services were not of uniform quality and that there were some physical defects noted on the copies delivered to SAC. These defects are listed on the following page.

TCS-11570-62-KH
19 March 1962

- (a) Light Leaks
- (b) Creasing
- (c) Opaque patches
- (d) Lack of exposure control
- (e) Lack of processing control
- (f) Local unsharp areas
- (g) Bromide streaks
- (h) T-shaped abrasions
- (i) Cinch marks
- (j) High base fog
- (k) Mottling
- (l) Abrasions and scratches
- (m) Dust spots
- (n) Pin holes
- (o) Air bells

25X1A

3. One problem mentioned by [REDACTED] was eliminated immediately when all present agreed that the materials received by all customers from the processing center were essentially of the same quality as those furnished NPIC. SAC representatives stated that they had never suggested that NPIC materials were superior in quality to those made available to SAC.

25X1A

4. The contractor's representative stated that all duplicate positives were made from the original negative, per directive, which was cleaned and waxed every third printing. Duplicate negatives were made from one of the first few duplicate positives. All of these positives and negatives were exposed on the same printer and all processed under controlled conditions and any differences between the copies of the same generation would be insignificant. All of the defects listed above, contained in [REDACTED] letter, were categorized as attributable to three distinct and separate phases of the total operation: (1) the camera system; (2) the printer for generating the duplicate positives and negatives; and (3) processing errors. It was further explained that errors due to processing were the least likely to occur since there was very strict quality control during this phase of the operation. Errors due to printing were more likely to occur due to the environment of the plant which was not in any sense of the word a "white gloves" operation. It was further stated that most of the errors as listed could be directly attributable to defects inherent in the camera system.

25X1A

5. At this point in the meeting, [REDACTED] CIA, stated that due to lack of operational-type clearances of some of the persons present, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to explain the defects which were directly due to the camera system and how they had been corrected for

TCS-11570-62-KH
19 March 1962

future missions. It was agreed by most of the members present that a valid means of determining those errors due to printing and processing as differentiated from those errors in the camera system might best be determined by comparison with the original negative on the same mission number. Several examples of duplicate positives and subsequent generation materials were on exhibit in the area.

25X1D

6. The general type of criticism was that on previous missions the duplicate positives and duplicate negatives were much too dense or of too high gamma. The contractor explained that some of this density and high gamma was due inherently to the high resolution thin coated type of materials used on this project. However, some of this density could be attributed to the lack of guidance from the interested parties and the fact that there was a very real, but unwritten, implication of a date line to meet which made it impossible to exercise more quality controls. It was explained further that on the last mission, [REDACTED] a reproduction positive was made without directive and that duplicate negatives generated from this positive were of much lower gamma and lower density. He hastened to explain that this type of positive was virtually worthless to the photo interpreter and was produced specifically for the preparation of duplicate negatives.

25X1A

7. At the request of [REDACTED] samples were placed on a light table of duplicate positives made from the original negative (which NPIC FIs use) and duplicate positives made at SAC by electronically dodging a duplicate negative (which SAC FIs use). It was generally agreed that there was considerably less detail on the electronically dodged positives since they were, in essence, fourth generation and, in addition, were generally considerably underexposed.

25X1A

8. At 1200 hours, it was agreed to terminate this meeting and to appoint a committee chaired by [REDACTED] of NPIC to meet at 1330 hours in the 5th floor conference room. The purpose and function of this committee was to carry on discussions of some of the points raised at the morning session and to make recommendations which would lead to an improvement in the photographic products in the KH system.

25X1A

25X1A

[REDACTED]
NPIC/TP&DS/TDB: [REDACTED] (3591)