

A

$1N = 02^{11}$

IDA CRD

Friday Sept 30th 1983
drove out to Thayer Rd.

Drove to Nassau Inn Dinner.

1000 x Cray I


(A) wheels & wheels & ruts

(B) VSLI trim branching algorithms

VofTen


Rock Hec.

Neo Zeele



forget arithmetic

long word pass by other word



putative

R 81 = 13721 CRAY

RCA - 25,600 CRAY for \$5m

Pipeline 160,000 CRAY for \$5m \$100 chip & 200 per

Lunch.

Dave Robbins

done in '78 diagnostic

Scamp Project: Welch (member of cmk)

Spread signal how do we detect & what to do w/ them

do on site processing to reduce data (bandwidth) in field

Carried + square wave + other signals or jump main f

Difficult to blank out Jam. Save input energy. Must

sync trans & receiver

L

Sept 30 1982

IDA - CRD

Welch: Spread Band signals

- ① Analysis of system. How cheap the system
some just no good.
apparently put codes into 2 systems

The idea is to
vary signal, bit
p. & signal on
signal -

- ② Signal Aggregation
- when one can record parameters

③

④

⑤ Misc.



1801 N. BEAUREGARD STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22311 • TELEPHONE (703) 845-2000

March 23, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR MEMBERS OF THE IDA BOARD OF TRUSTEES

On March 17, 1983, Al Flax, Lou Tordella, Reeves Hicks, our New Jersey attorney, and I met with General Faurer and members of his staff to try to resolve the CRD polygraph problem. It is my impression that the conference ended with General Faurer holding 3 Aces while the best we could do was "2 one-eyed Jacks and the King with the ax" (See Hoyle if that is obtuse).

The meeting started with my reviewing the situation as I described it at our last Board meeting. I pointed out that the decision as to whether or not CRD employees would take a polygraph was not to be resolved by Lee Neuwirth or by Al Flax. This is an important matter that should be decided by the Trustees. I also pointed out that we have not received a formal opinion from the Attorney General of the State of New Jersey. From that point, we are operating in the dark. I also recalled to General Faurer that at our last meeting we had agreed to hold off requiring the polygraph test until it was applied more generally to those who had access to NSA information. Thus, it would not appear to pick out CRD for special attention. I also said that it was my impression that General Faurer had agreed to delay until the general atmosphere was more tolerant toward such tests. General Faurer quickly pointed out that on this last point he meant when the atmosphere among Government employees was more conducive and not, as I had suggested, the atmosphere of the general public. On this point we did not argue.

I then pointed out the choices that remained: first, that NSA would insist on the polygraph test, or, second, that NSA would back off. Under this second choice, I admitted that some of us would have difficulty if NSA backed off and then one of our employees became a defector and we had prohibited the test that might have found him earlier.

However, if NSA should insist on the test being taken, we could, as a Board of Trustees, refuse, and then NSA would have the option of taking the contract elsewhere. This would not be without pain for IDA because we are committed to many employees and have responsibilities for buildings, and so forth. However, also under NSA's insistence, we could defer with the possibilities that:

1. We might lose support of some Trustees who felt this was the wrong path;
2. We might be defendants in law suits;
3. We might well lose some very good people;
4. We could be subject to adverse publicity;
5. We might arouse the ACLU, Science magazine, committees of Congress, and so forth.

General Faurer said he was quite cognizant of all this, and he admitted we might see things more clearly after getting a ruling by the legal people giving the position of the New Jersey Attorney General. (The grapevine says that the Attorney General of New Jersey will defer to Federal supremacy.) We also pointed out that we had to have a legal opinion concerning the Trustees' liability for civil suits.

The conclusion was that General Faurer insists that NSA go ahead. He will defer for one month and has agreed to meet with the Trustees if we so desire to explain his decisions.

Therefore, I am calling a meeting for this purpose on Wednesday, April 13, in the IDA Board Room at 9:15 a.m. I hope you can attend. If not, I would like to know what your opinion is. You could tell me that you wish to:

1. Abstain from voting;
2. Vote not to obstruct the NSA;

MEMORANDUM FOR MEMBERS OF THE IDA BOARD OF TRUSTEES

March 23, 1983

Page 3

3. Vote to deny NSA the right to require polygraphing; or,
4. Give the Chairman your proxy.

It is my feeling that we have played the game almost to the limit. We are behind 10 to 0. It is the bottom of the 9th, 2 men are out, the count on the batter is 3 and 2. Unless some new facts appear, I would vote not to obstruct, which means that NSA would go ahead, I suspect gingerly. If you cannot come to the meeting, would you either fill out the enclosed form or call me and give me your decision. My phone number in Hilton Head is: (803) 842-4373.

Eric A. Walker

Eric A. Walker
Chairman

Attachment