

Engineering Committees

New Release Print Leader

In July, we prematurely announced the availability of a newly proposed release print leader. Contrary to expectations, the first prints were found unsatisfactory after trial at a few of the New York television stations; consequently, another version was made up and prints were distributed to all of the television networks in New York. On Friday, September 8, Charles Townsend's subcommittee met and approved this version for limited trial distribution. After consultation with Dr. Garman, Chairman of the parent committee, and Fred Bowditch, Engineering Vice-President, it was agreed to make up a fairly substantial quantity of both negatives and prints. All of those requesting samples as a result of the July announcement, as well as others known to have an interest in this project, have now been supplied.

There has been some concern among those responsible for this work that rather general distribution at this time may cause difficulties. It has been the hope from the start that one leader can be developed, which will serve the theater, television and the 16-mm fields equally as well. If the trial leaders now being distributed should get into general use, it would certainly mean the existence of two leaders and the possibility of considerable confusion; therefore, a letter was sent with each sample, requesting the recipients to use the leaders only for experimental purposes and to withhold any wider use until the committee has had an opportunity to review all comments.

Committee Ballots

During the last six months, members of Engineering Committees have been extremely lax about returning their ballots on proposed standards, recommendations or committee reports. Often when members feel that they have no comments or critical interest in a particular subject, they fail to take any action to notify Society headquarters to that effect. Consequently, the balloting is not closed because of the belief that the missing votes represent objections to a proposal. It is realized that in some cases committee members need time to make a thorough investigation before casting a formal ballot. In those cases, however, it would be most helpful if such were reported so as to save the time and money spent sending out repeated follow-ups.

At the present time, six engineering ballots are in process. One, "16-mm Review Room Characteristics," was mailed on May 29, 1950. The ballot was sent to 72 committee members and to date just half have been returned. This is a very poor response for a project that two years ago was considered important enough to warrant considerable activity. Listening tests and meetings were held in Astoria, New York City, Washington and Chicago. Equipment was shipped around and committee members spent time and money traveling to those sessions. After all of that time and effort, it is most unfortunate that the project should be held up merely because members neglect to vote.

Possibly, there is some fault in our method of operation which is causing the delays. If this is true, we would greatly appreciate your suggestions.