

Carl -

This regards your question on whether to use OPS scans > 46900 to make a new set of PSFs.

I looked at the spatial variation in K - W1 and K - W2 for scan 46940a in *OPS*. To remind you - this used cryo PSFs and provisional (non-optimal) pixel calibrations. W1 shows no significant spatial variation (consistent with pops), however, the W2 spatial pattern goes the opposite way!

Attached are the K - W2 maps from OPS and POPS.

Also attached are the W2 pixel-to-pixel responsivity maps (flats) used in OPS and POPS, in this order, same stretch. They are qualitatively similar.

The 2D variation for OPS could be explained by a bad flat if it were wrong (i.e., signal on the right side of the array is amplified relative to the left after division by an erroneously low response). However, the pops result cannot be explained this way.

Can anyone shed any light? Some other calibration is conspiring against us.

Back to the original question of whether to remake PSFs. I suggest yes (I think Tim agreed too), in case we see something totally new. I'm going to continue to evaluate ical and all calibrations.

Regards, Frank

On May 1, 2014, at 3:48 PM, Frank Masci <<u>fmasci@ipac.caltech.edu</u>> wrote: On May 1, 2014, at 3:44 PM, Carl Grillmair <<u>carl@ipac.caltech.edu</u>> wrote: I could get started and see how far I get between other stuff. Using scans > 46900 would put me in the better-calibrated regime?

Better calibrated? Not really. Provisional calibrations from late Dec'13 are still being applied in fops and I see nasty residuals. Let me explore. Stay tuned.



