Count - Vote			Vote			
Company	Primary	Last	Yes with Comments	Yes	No Reply	Comments
4D Technology Corporation	Primary	Martinek		1		
APOMA	Primary	Czajkowski		1		
Brookhaven National Lab.	Primary	Takacs		1		
Davidson Optronics, Inc.	Primary	Gaugh		1		
	Alternate	Bailey			1	
FLIR Precision Optics	Primary	Mistry			1	
Gage-Line Technology, Inc	Primary	Dombrowski		1		
Harold Johnson Optical Lab	Primary	Johnson		1		
IEEE Photonics Society	Primary	Dowell		1		
Individual	Primary	Corridon			1	
		Royall		1		
JDSU	Primary	Boultbee		1		
	Alternate	Catching			1	
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab	Primary	Yashchuk			1	
	Alternate	McKinney			1	
NIST	Primary	Dowell		1		
Northrop Grumman Aerospace Systems	Alternate	Howland		1		
Optimax Systems, Inc.	Primary	DeGroote Nelson		1		
	Alternate	Mandina			1	
		Plympton			1	
OSA (NIST)	Primary	Griesmann			1	
Photon, Inc.	Primary	Guttman			1	
Ray Williamson Consulting	Primary	Williamson	1			
Research Electro-Optics, Inc.	Primary	Turner		1		
Savvy Optics Corp.	Primary	Aikens	1			
SPIE (Endelman Enterprises)	Primary	Endelman			1	
Triptar Lens Co., Inc.	Primary	Krisiloff		1		
Xyratex International Inc.	Primary	Brunfeld			1	
Zygo Corporation	Primary	Evans	1			A signed ballot not received
	Alternate	Gupta			1	
Total Result			**3**	**14**	**13**	

Company	Primary	Last	First	Vote	Comments
4D Technology Corporation	Primary	Martinek	Stephen	Yes	
APOMA	Primary	Czajkowski	Walter	Yes	
Brookhaven National Lab.	Primary	Takacs	Peter	Yes	1.) References are made in the ANS Notes to other ANSI/OEOSC OP documents. These documents should be listed with their full titles somewhere in this document, possibly in the Bibliography. ANSI/OEOSC OP1.002 has been added to the bibliography. 2.) In ANS Note 3, the symbol for the “lambda” character shows up as a blank box in my Adobe Reader document. There must be something non-standard about the font used for this symbol. Iam using a Mac with 05 10.5 with Adobe Reader 9.0.0. Lambda character has been corrected.
Davidson Optronics, Inc.	Primary	Gaugh	Charles	Yes	
Davidson Optronics, Inc.	Alternate	Bailey	Sam	No Reply	
FLIR Precision Optics	Primary	Mistry	Ashish	No Reply	
Gage-Line Technology, Inc	Primary	Dombrowski	Frank	Yes	
Harold Johnson Optical Lab	Primary	Johnson	Hal	Yes	
IEEE Photonics Society	Primary	Dowell	Marla	Yes	
Individual	Primary	Corridon	David	No Reply	
Individual	Primary	Royall	William	Yes	
JDSU	Primary	Boultbee	Gordon	Yes	
JDSU	Alternate	Catching	Benjamin	No Reply	
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab	Primary	Yashchuk	Valeriy	No Reply	
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab	Alternate	McKinney	Wayne	No Reply	
NIST	Primary	Dowell	Marla	Yes	
Northrop Grumman Aerospace Systems	Alternate	Howland	Donna	Yes	
Optimax Systems, Inc.	Primary	DeGroote Nelson	Jessica	Yes	On page two in note 3 the wavelength symbol printed out as a box. I am not sure if it is my computer or the document. Lambda character has been corrected.
Optimax Systems, Inc.	Alternate	Mandina	Mike	No Reply	
Optimax Systems, Inc.	Alternate	Plympton	Rick	No Reply	
OSA (NIST)	Primary	Griesmann	Ulf	No Reply	
Photon, Inc.	Primary	Guttman	Jeffrey	No Reply	

Ray Williamson Consulting	Primary	Williamson	Ray	Yes with Comments	Comments for ballot BSRIOEOSC OP1.11O-1 Page 7, line 2: Space needed between “Figure” and “9” done Page 14, 4.6.7, paragraph 2 gives an example of a penta prism and states that the perpendicularity of the penta’s respective sides to its base are “pyramidal angles.” Paragraph 4 states that an error in ray deviation perpendicular to the plane of the drawing is known as a “pyramidal deviation error;” and then refers to Figure 28 b. Issues: Neither of these paragraphs defines “pyramidal error” the way I understand it—as the deviation of one surface normal to a plane formed by two other surface normals (typically the two legs of a right-angle prism vs. its hypotenuse.) (added 10/15/2009)— Malacara, Optical Shop testing edition 1. p. 470-471 (italics mine): Pyramid error is usually specified on prisms that have three or more polished surfaces perpendicular to a common plane. In a three-surface prism pyramid error is defined as the angle between one face and the line of intersection of the other two faces. It can be measured with an autocollimator and a turntable with leveling screws. When the autocollimator is adjusted to be perpendicular to both the front and the back of a single- mirror surface rotated 180°, it is perpendicular also to the axis of rotation. The prism replaces the mirror on the turntable, and with the aid of the leveling screws two faces of the prism are brought to be parallel to the axis of rotation and thus perpendicular to the autocollimator. Then the line of intersection of these two faces is also perpendicular to the autocollimator. The angle of the normal of the third face from the axis of the autocollimator is the pyramid error, which is usually expressed in arc-minutes. For a multifaced polygon the pyramid error might be specified as follows: “All polished surfaces 90° ± 1° to a plane normal to axis of rotation. Pyramid error 0°5’ max.” This means that all surfaces must be within a total range of 5 arc-mm, but this range can be located any place within 1° of 90°. So Malacara flatly states the definition in the case of 3-sided prisms, and suggests the definition for polygonal prisms, both specified separately from the angle to the base. Figure 28 b shows parallelism to the base surface, datum A, which is not necessarily perpendicular to the “plane of the drawing.” In fact, in 28 b it’s parallel to the plane of that drawing — it is nominally perpendicular to the plane of 28 a. I think we need to help ISO in this regard with a better explanation. 3rd angle projection not per ANSI style fig 28 (at least) In the January 2010 meeting the committee agreed that this should be proposed to the ISO committee for revision.

Research Electro-Optics, Inc.	Primary	Turner	Trey	Yes	
Savvy Optics Corp.	Primary	Aikens	David	Yes with Comments	Page 2 ANS Note 3: The λ symbol appears as a □ Page 2 Footnote 1: Typo "22°;C", Delete ";"
SPIE (Endelman Enterprises)	Primary	Endelman	Lincoln	No Reply	
Triptar Lens Co., Inc.	Primary	Krisiloff	Allen	Yes	
Xyratex International Inc.	Primary	Brunfeld	Andrei	No Reply	
Zygo Corporation	Primary	Evans	Chris	Yes with Comments	It is regrettable that the US standard is diverging from the ISO standard. We understand that the US proposed standard represents an improvement, and assume that every effort will be made to bring ISO 10110 into line with the US standard. Vote received as an e-mail. Still need a signed copy dated by the ballot cut-off period in order to count it.
Zygo Corporation	Alternate	Gupta	Krishnakant	No Reply	