Re: Serious camera question − what it boils down to?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2005−10/msg00817.html

- *From*: RS <russ@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Mon, 10 Oct 2005 14:19:33 GMT

Regarding DSO imaging (as opposed to planetary), you don't need a steady, rock−solid, non−periodic−error mount *IF* you image as I do. I take very short exposures (less than 10 seconds each) and then combine them for a virtual total exposer time of anywhere between 5 and 20 minutes. This way, I avoid image rotation and the need for guiding as well. I dont even polar align! I do all my imaging int alt−az mode. As far as planetary imaging, the total exposures are short enough that the mout requirements are even LESS demanding.

I am not a "great" imager, but I have managed to avoid the usuall imaging pitfalls by using this method. If anyine is interested in seeing examples, my non−guided alt−az images are located here: http://epcinternet.com/astron/

Again, they're not great, but I dont have any guiding or mount isuues either.

On Sun, 09 Oct 2005 18:55:47 GMT, "David Nakamoto" <res07oeg@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

>Hi everyone !
>
>In my opinion, it boils down to three things. The first thing is that at the
>current time one still needs a steady, rock−solid mount with minimum periodic
>error that's visible in the telescope/camera setup you're using, learning to
>accurately align everything, and a lot of patience. Learning image processing
>is a must also, but since this can be done in the "safety" of one's heated
>office in a comfortable chair, I don't count this part of the business (haha!)
>but it is necessary.
>
>The second thing it boils down to is that you need to learn, through this
>newsgroup, web sits, and books, how to do imaging. It's more than just the
>equipment, although that's important, because as far as planets are concerned
>you still need reasonably good tracking coupled with high magnifications, and as
>far as deep sky is concerned you need rock−steady tracking and lots of
>sensitivity on your pixels, among other things. But learning how to process

>images is just as important, so you learn what you need to do when you take the
>original images, and learn what you can and can't get away with. among other
>things.
>
>The third thing it boils down to is that right now there seems (to me) to be
>three things developing; (1) webcams for planets, and high resolution images of
>the Moon and Sun, (2) dedicated cooled CCD cameras for deep sky, and (3) DSLRs
>that act as good introduction to imaging, takes great wide field images, and
>prove good on the brighter DSOs.
>
>Part of the DSI technology might make things easier in the future, especially
>that feature that gets rid of tracking errors. I'm certainly keeping my fingers
>crossed ! I think the DSI is certainly worth checking into; it should generate
>great webcam type images, and good images of most DSOs amateurs think about.
>I'm not sure about the Pro; those expose filters make me cringe. Didn't Meade
>do their research, or were they simply "going their own way for its own sake?"
>
> Sincerely,
> −−− Dave

.

- ***Follow−Ups***:
  - ♦ ***Re: Serious camera question − what it boils down to?***
    - ◊ *From:* David Nakamoto
  - ♦ ***Re: Serious camera question − what it boils down to?***
    - ◊ *From:* Doink

- ***References***:
  - ♦ ***Serious camera question***
    - ◊ *From:* Doink
  - ♦ ***Re: Serious camera question***
    - ◊ *From:* David Nakamoto
  - ♦ ***Re: Serious camera question***
    - ◊ *From:* Doink
  - ♦ ***Re: Serious camera question***
    - ◊ *From:* Stephen Paul
  - ♦ ***Re: Serious camera question − what it boils down to?***
    - ◊ *From:* David Nakamoto

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Dissambling the EQ6 Dec Axis***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Christian Astronomers NG?***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Serious camera question − what it boils down to?***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Serious camera question − what it boils down to?***
- Index(es):
  - ♦ ***Date***
  - ♦ ***Thread***