

[Redacted]

ILLEGIB

STAT

2 February 1966

[Redacted]

STAT

Dear George:

Subject: Contract [Redacted]  
Status Report  
Coherent Enlarger Evaluation Program, Support Activities

STAT

Our participation in the program began during the week of 8 November 1965. During this week, the enlarger was shipped [Redacted] assembled and put into operating order. The laser was cleaned and satisfactory output was measured. Enlargements of resolution targets were made in order to determine the proper position of the focal plane. Finally, operating procedures were briefly demonstrated to [Redacted] personnel.

STAT

STAT

In general, the above installation went very smoothly. [Redacted] Technicians began making the permanent service connections even before the enlarger was completely assembled.

STAT

STAT

On the 18th of November, a return visit [Redacted] was made [Redacted] [Redacted] During the week that had passed [Redacted] had not done any experiments but had completed the installation of services and had begun analytical computations.

STAT

STAT

STAT

The next visit [Redacted] was made on 19 January 1966 [Redacted] [Redacted] personnel displayed enlargements of three-bar targets which we made on the enlarger (on 12 November 1965) and which [Redacted] made. It was said that these enlargements showed that the optical system was not at optimum alignment. It was also said by [Redacted] personnel that the enlarger required adjustment as regards light leaks, 9 1/2" roll film feed, vapor removal and vacuum pump vibration. All of the above points were agreed upon by all present. We will make these adjustments before 11 February.

STAT

STAT

STAT

STAT

STAT

STAT

Apart from adjustments, the [Redacted] personnel commented that exposures could be shortened if a more powerful laser were employed (see enclosure). In addition, there were discussions of double-slit and edge gradient methods of determining the degree of coherence at the object plane; no other experimental results were shown, no other experimental or analytical work was discussed by [Redacted] personnel.

STAT

STAT

CONCLUSIONS: In general, the meeting of 19 January 1966 was not encouraging to us. We have a contract to participate in the evaluation program and have extensive capabilities in physical optics. Funds, personnel and facilities are available to make calculations, perform experiments or supply materials; thus, the evaluation program might be accelerated if [Redacted] would seek closer co-operation with us. We recommend that progress review meetings be scheduled at two week intervals so that all concerned may be most completely informed.

STAT

STAT

[Redacted]