

Tribal Fusion



[Search](#) [Members](#) [Calendar](#) [Help](#) [Home](#)


Search by username

Not logged in - [Login](#) | [Register](#)

[Steves Forums](#) > [Misc Forums](#) > [Digiscoping](#) > William Optics 24mm DCL-28 eyepiece

**William Optics 24mm DCL-28 eyepiece**

Moderated by: **Lin Evans**[New Topic](#) [Reply](#) [Print](#)

Author	Post
<p><b>mashjax</b> Member</p> <p>Joined: Wed Mar 12th, 2003 Location: Panama City, Florida Posts: 10</p>	<p>Posted: Sat Mar 29th, 2003 08:28 pm <a href="#">Quote</a> <a href="#">Reply</a></p> <p>I would like to get some more advice on eyepieces please. I have a Swarovski ST-80 HD connected to a Nikon Coolpix 990 using the Swarovski 20 - 60x zoom eyepiece. Comparing my current zoom eyepiece at 20x setting to a fixed one such as the Williams Optics 24mm will I notice a big difference in the field of view. With the Williams could I reduce the zoom on the camera more than with the Swarovski 20-60x and is the optical quality of the Williams 24mm comparable to Swarovski. I shoot larger mammals more so than birds. Also any comments on the Swarovski fixed eyepieces such as the 30mm.</p> <p>Thanks for any advice. This has been very helpful to receive answers to my questions on this and on Andy's forum.</p> <p>Mike</p>
<p><b>PaulyOly</b> Member</p> <p>Joined: Fri Oct 25th, 2002 Location: Interlachen, FL Posts: 26</p>	<p>Posted: Sun Mar 30th, 2003 03:22 am <a href="#">Quote</a> <a href="#">Reply</a></p> <p>Hey up there in panama city, you got a nice and expensive spotting scope, why buy a cheap eyepiece for it, i seriously doubt the dcl28 will be comparable to a swarovski fixed eyepiece, someone did a comparison of it to a pentax xl28 and that same person tried to sell me the william optics eyepiece, i decided on the xl28. I would think the field of view would be much greater than with your zoom, but you should be able to look up the specs on the eyepieces on the net. I use the pentax pf-80ed-a, i actually just got it yesterday and here's some of my first shots taken today with a 1/15th shutter speed and hand holding to the eyepiece, no cropping, taken in macro mode on the 990, so half zoom.</p> <p><a href="http://www.pbase.com/paulyoly/digiscoping_with_s602">http://www.pbase.com/paulyoly/digiscoping_with_s602</a></p>
<p><b>Lin Evans</b> Member</p> <p>Joined: Thu Jun 6th, 2002 Location: Berthoud, Colorado Posts: 1063</p>	<p>Posted: Wed Apr 9th, 2003 02:44 pm <a href="#">Quote</a> <a href="#">Reply</a></p> <p>Quite the contrary, the William Optics DCL-28 is an incredibly sharp and clean eyepiece, equal in every way to Swarovski's best. I highly recommend it, especially for mid-range (up to 3000mm) with the HD-80.</p> <p>I have the ST80-HD and I use it variously with Swarovski, William Optics 24mm and ScopeTronix eyepieces - all excellent.</p> <p>You will get MUCH more zoom back range with the William Optics. With my CP4500, I have over 80% vignette free zoom.</p> <p>Lin</p> <p>Here's a shot with the William Optics DCC-28:</p> 
<p><b>StanV</b> Member</p> <p>Joined: Tue Feb 25th, 2003</p>	<p>Posted: Thu Apr 10th, 2003 03:58 pm <a href="#">Quote</a> <a href="#">Reply</a></p>

Location: **Ambler,  
Pennsylvania USA**

Posts: 9

"why buy a cheap eyepiece for it"

Where does this idea come from? I have read it in more than one place now. I just ordered one. It's about \$90. I will be using it in place of a Celestron 25mm Plossl. The Celestron goes for about \$60 and is, I believe, considered in many circles to be a quality piece. I would venture a guess that the William eyepiece optics is at least as good as the typical digicam optics. After all, if the camera is \$400, how expensive can the lens optics really be?

If you can refer us to a review of the eyepiece, I would appreciate it. Otherwise, I am going to trust that I am not taking a step backwards in spite of your post.

**Lin Evans**

Member

Posted: Thu Apr 10th, 2003 05:56 pm

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

*Where does this idea come from?*

Joined: Thu Jun 6th, 2002  
Location: Berthoud, Colorado  
Posts: 1063

Obviously not from anyone who has ever used one! The DCS-28 is among the sharpest, if not THE sharpest eyepiece I have ever used.

I have no clue where people get this idea, but I purchased one of the first ones at \$100 and found it to be superior to everything else I had. Of course to use it with a Swarovski, one must buy the Swarovski adapter to adapt a 1.25" bayonette type eyepiece made for celestial scopes, but it works "perfectly."

Both the Swarovski and ScopeTronix eyepieces are equal in every way to the best which Leica, Pentax, Swarovski, Meade, Celestron and Kowa make.

Lin

**Dj-Hoffman**

Member

Posted: Fri Apr 11th, 2003 03:05 am

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

Joined: Tue Dec 3rd, 2002  
Location:  
Posts: 9

I slightly disagree. I've had the W/O DCL-28 and Scopetronix STWA-18PX. Both of these seemed a step below my pentax eyepiece. The main deficient area wasn't sharpness, it was color. The W/O and Scopetronix both seemed to generate pale photos compared to the Pentax eyepiece. I made this conclusion after a series of test photos (test photos were taken on the same day of the same targets while switching eyepieces back and forth).

I am by no means trying to imply anything negative about these eyepieces. They are a bargain for 2x the price. Replacing my Pentax (zoom) eyepiece would cost me \$379 retail.

I should note that I use a Pentax scope, so maybe this has something to do with it. Maybe the two just get along better together while other scopes might not be the same.

Either way, you have to love the "adapter-less" design. How else could you get any closer? I'm currently working on converting my Meade 26mm Super Plossl into the same design on my lathe. I have some info on this on my site.

**[http://www.pbbase.com/dj\\_hoffman/  
converting\\_the\\_meade\\_26mm\\_super\\_plossl\\_into\\_a\\_threaded\\_eyepiece](http://www.pbbase.com/dj_hoffman/converting_the_meade_26mm_super_plossl_into_a_threaded_eyepiece)**

Nikon cp990/cp995 -- Pentax PF-80ED -- Pentax SMC zoom [http://www.pbbase.com/dj\\_hoffman/root](http://www.pbbase.com/dj_hoffman/root)

**Lin Evans**

Member

Posted: Fri Apr 11th, 2003 04:56 am

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

*The main deficient area wasn't sharpness, it was color*

Joined: Thu Jun 6th, 2002  
Location: Berthoud, Colorado  
Posts: 1063

Quite probably it has to do with coatings. The William Optics and ScopeTronix eyepieces are neutral, as designed for maximum compatibility with a broad range of optics. The Pentax 80 coating may intensify color with the Pentax eyepiece, but intensity is something which is easily dealt with post capture.

I use both the ScopeTronix and William Optics DCL-28 with the Meade ETX-90, Swarovski ST-80 HD and Zeiss Diascope 85T FL. With each of these there is zero color shift and no perceptible difference in chroma saturation. I haven't used these eyepieces with the Pentax 80, but I do know that each of these eyepieces are neutral and that there is nothing about the eyepiece which would reduce saturation, so I could only conclude that the Pentax eyepiece increases saturation a bit because of coatings.

There are ample statistics available on each of these fine optics which show that they rank at the very top of the heap for sharpness and optical properties.

Best regards,

Lin

### **mashjax**

Member

Joined: Wed Mar 12th, 2003  
Location: Panama City, Florida  
Posts: 10

Posted: Fri Apr 11th, 2003 11:55 pm

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

Hi Lin - I think that I will be purchasing the Williams DCL-28 and the Swarovski adapter. I wanted to know if you compare the Swarovski 20-60x zoom set at 20x to the DCL-28 will I have a greater zoom back range with the Williams? With the Swarovski I have to keep the Nikon 990 at almost full zoom and it would be nice to back off of the zoom a little.

One other question. With the Swarovski adapter connected to a ST-80 HD how strong is the connection between the Williams and the scope? Once I hook the 990 with the Williams to the scope can this camera weight be supported by itself? I have the straight (ST-80 HD) version if this makes any difference.

Thanks in advance  
Mike

### **Lin Evans**

Member

Joined: Thu Jun 6th, 2002  
Location: Berthoud, Colorado  
Posts: 1063

Posted: Sat Apr 12th, 2003 01:31 am

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

Hi Mike,

Absolutely yes!! You have huge zoomback capabilities extending from about 46mm to 115mm. The focal length on the Swarovski is 462mm so with the William Optics DCL-28 you have a 19.25x magnification factor ( $462/24 = 19.25$ ). This then translates to an effective vignette free zoom range of from 885.5mm to 2213.75mm. Even at full wide angle, the vignetting is not extreme and you can easily crop out a large usable portion of the very sharp image. The purpose of the large exit pupil (ocular) on the William Optics eyepiece is to allow nearly a full range of zoom which is a tremendous improvement over trying to use the 20-60 Swarovski eyepiece. With the camera attached to the native zoom eyepiece, it's necessary to use a large rubber band or other friction device to prevent the weight of the camera from turning the eyepiece, thus changing the zoom while you are trying to shoot. Very annoying, at least for me. Of course the down side is that with the 950/990 you don't get the additional range you have with the 4x 995 or 4500 which go all the way out to almost 3000mm, but still you have an excellent range to over 2200mm and with crystal clear images.

The Swarovski adapter converts the receiver from Swarovski's own design to a standard 1.25" barrel receiver which accommodates a wide range of astro-telescope eyepieces. The adapter has a very convenient thumbscrew which securely holds the eyepiece to the telescope. The William Optics DCL-28 is threaded to mate to the CP series of Nikon camera's 28mm filter threads so that the entire package is quite secure and easily supports the camera.

Best regards,

Lin

### mashjax

Member

Joined: Wed Mar 12th, 2003

Location: Panama City, Florida

Posts: 10

Posted: Sat Apr 12th, 2003 05:16 am

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

Thanks Lin - That was just the information that I needed. I just purchased these online from Anacortes. I will let you know what I think after I try them out.

As far as the 4x zoom on the Nikon 995 that would be nice. I have been looking to buy another 990 as a backup camera and for my girlfriend to use. The only thing that makes me lean away from the 995 is I have a RX Flash bracket that I mount a Nikon SB-28 on. I don't think that it would clamp on the 995 because of the pop-up flash.

The other thing is the battery on the 995. I use NIMH AA's on my 990 and my flash. Of course the 995 uses 2CR5 lithium batteries. I have always wondered why Nikon changed the battery type.

Thanks again for all the good information.

Have a great weekend,  
Mike

### Dj-Hoffman

Member

Joined: Tue Dec 3rd, 2002

Location:

Posts: 9

Posted: Sun Apr 13th, 2003 08:45 pm

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

*"There are ample statistics available on each of these fine optics which show that they rank at the very top of the heap for sharpness and optical properties."*

I am not denying that it is great quality for a standard plossl. I'd be interested in any comparisons between these and eyepieces of significantly higher quality (TV Panoptics, Pentax XL's,...). My Meade conversion eyepiece shows the exact same traits as the DCL (possibly better edge sharpness) and it too is basically a high-quality standard plossl. I do realize that the Scopetronix versions are wide-angle versions based on the same basic plossl design.

I agree with the post-processing idea too. It's just that I waste enough time downsizing my photos, without trying to decide on how much r,g,or b I can add before it looks phony. I would just sooner have the eyepiece do a little more of my work. I'm only responding to this because I have owned each of the eyepieces I've commented on, and these are just my findings.

I think if you check any of PaulyOly's examples you'll see just how good these other eyepieces can be in the color/sharpness department. Most of his photos are amazing quality for someone relatively new to digiscoping.

Again, I agree that the DCL/STWA's are great for a standard plossl design! Here is a link to some samples from my "new" eyepiece-adapter mentioned above:

[http://www.pbase.com/dj\\_hoffman/](http://www.pbase.com/dj_hoffman/)

**converting\_the\_meade\_26mm\_super\_plossl\_into\_a\_threaded\_eyepiece**

Nikon cp990/cp995 -- Pentax PF-80ED -- Pentax SMC zoom [http://www.pbase.com/dj\\_hoffman/root](http://www.pbase.com/dj_hoffman/root)

**Lin Evans**

Member

Joined: Thu Jun 6th, 2002  
Location: Berthoud, Colorado  
Posts: 1063

Posted: Sun Apr 13th, 2003 09:39 pm

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

*I'd be interested in any comparrrisons between these and eyepieces of significantly higher quality (TV Panoptics, Pentax XL's,...).*

Though it's possible that even better quality images might be made with the more expensive eyepieces, the primary issue as I see it is that to get the image, one need to be able to frame the subject at varying distances. To do this requires a modicum of zoom range whether that be afforded by the camera or a zoom eyepiece. Perhaps why the Swarovski 20-60 zoom is so popular with digiscopers is that it offers one of the finest zoom eyepieces available and has a range amenable to many digiscoping uses.

The down side, as I've said in other posts, is twofold. First, it's necessary to use some friction device like a rubber band to prevent zoom "creep" from wrecking the frame. Second, it's necessary to have the camera at nearly full zoom, which is usually not the very best focal length for distortion free images, and also puts the Nikons into the worst light gathering of their range.

With the ScopeTronix and William Optics eyepieces, there is ample zoom range so that great images may be usually made in the mid-range of the camera's zoom as well as at the extremes. If a suitable eyepiece of the highest quality glass were available which could afford the photographer this zoom leeway, then I would be the first in line to purchase it. But to my knowledge, there is no TV Panoptics or other eyepiece of similar design made with a large exit pupil ocular like the WO or ST eyepieces. This then limits the user to a single focal length or tiny zoom range which is most inconvenient unless by pure chance the subject happens to be at just the proper distance.

I find the William Optics and ScopeTronix eyepieces to do the job in fine fashion and render tack sharp images to the limits of my various scopes native focal length ranges. Would I welcome "better and sharper images?" Sure. But I'm sure not willing to give up the zoom range and mid-focal length advantage of the camera's native lens to facilitate the outside chance that I might get superior performance in the small percentage of cases when I might be able to use these eyepieces.

As far as edge sharpness is concerned. I would welcome perfect edge sharpness, but for digiscoping purposes it's of limited importance since the background of the vast majority of shots will be out of focus and edges of of less importance than central lens sharpness because that's usually close to where the subject will be found.

Here's a 6000mm (5989mm exactly) shot with the William Optics DCS-28 and my Meade ETX-90. The eyepiece, for me, is a non-issue. It works very well and gets me results I can live with while providing great zoom versatility.

Best regards,

Lin

**Dj-Hoffman**

Member

Joined: Tue Dec 3rd, 2002

Location:

Posts: 9

Posted: Mon Apr 14th, 2003 05:17 am

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

Your info on the Swaro zoom was news to me. I had no idea of the downsides it has. I just assumed it was similar to mine. Zoom creep is non-existent for me. Changing zoom almost requires two hands, and I only have to be at 1/2 camera zoom (990) even at 60x eyepiece zoom. I was really unaware of other zoom's abilities. Basically my post was about fixed focus eyepieces, I just mentioned my zoom because I've been spending so much time on making an adapter for it.

*Both the Swarovski and ScopeTronix eyepieces are equal in every way to the best which Leica, Pentax, Swarovski, Meade, Celestron and Kowa make.*

*If a suitable eyepiece of the highest quality glass were available which could afford the photographer this zoom leeway, then I would be the first in line to purchase it. But to my knowledge, there is no TV Panoptics or other eyepiece of similar design made with a large exit pupil ocular like the WO or ST eyepieces.*

This was the sole reason of my mention of the Pentax XL's, as comparing them to a standard plossl seemed odd to me. Also, it is possible to purchase an eyepiece with substantially higher grade glass and still maintain or exceed the large exit pupil ocular/exit pupil diameter needed for digiscoping. As a side benefit, you gain 4mm of additional eye relief and 3 Degrees (XL-28 ) or 13 degrees (XL-21) of AFOV (these values are in comparison to the DCL-28 ).

Your Starling picture is beautiful for such a long focal distance. But my comments are all in reference to spotting scopes, as you well know that what is an amazing eyepiece in an f/12 telescope, often looks quite opposite in a fast f/6 scope and vice-versa (although I am not implying this to be the exact case with the W/O).

Despite all of my rambling on, I do not agree to the whole Idea that simply more money=better quality. Therefore, an eyepiece that immediately comes to mind is the Vixen Lanthanum (LV) 25mm. You still gain 4mm more eye relief and have the added benefit of one of your elements being made of Lanthanum (a possible chromatic aberration reducer). Exit pupil diameter/exit pupil ocular size again meeting or exceeding the W/O. It is also known to work great in fast scopes. Cost is in the \$120 range.

Many of my figures were taken from:

<http://www.excelsis.com/1.0/section.php?sectionid=22>

I guess we could go on and on! Although, it sure is an interesting debate. 😊

Dennis

Nikon cp990/cp995 -- Pentax PF-80ED -- Pentax SMC zoom [http://www.pbase.com/dj\\_hoffman/root](http://www.pbase.com/dj_hoffman/root)

**eric s**

Member

Posted: Mon Apr 14th, 2003 02:21 pm

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

Joined: Sat Dec 7th, 2002  
Location: **Near Boston, Massachusetts USA**  
Posts: 5384

Dj-Hoffman

As a person who is reading all of this, don't let me stop you two from continuing. I'm learning a lot about eye pieces and digiscoping from this back-and-forth. I've found it very educational.

Lin

The color rendition on the breast of that starling seems a little... artificial? Grainy? I'm not sure the word. Something doesn't seem natural to me. I don't know, maybe it's just because of the shiny subject combined with the *\*huge\** distance....

Which of your many cameras did you use to capture it?

The huge reach and quality of the pictures to be had with this setup continues to amaze me. I keep thinking that I might have to try going that route some day. That bird wouldn't be more than a smudge with a 500 or 600mm lens on the 10D I'm purchasing. Oh the toys I'd get if I was filthy rich.

**Lin Evans**

Member

Joined: Thu Jun 6th, 2002  
Location: Berthoud, Colorado  
Posts: 1063

Posted: Mon Apr 14th, 2003 03:09 pm

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

*The color rendition on the breast of that starling seems a little... artificial? Grainy?*

Hi Eric,

Actually, it's pretty natural for the Starling which shows strong iridescent greens and violets in sunlight. I used the Nikon CP990 with the Meade ETX-90 and William Optics DCL-28 24mm eyepiece for that shot.

With your 10D you can also use the Meade ETX-90 with Meade's "T" adapter and a standard "T" connect to get a fixed "2000mm" equivalency. There is a port on the Meade which allows access to the 1250mm fixed focal length (1250mmx1.6x=2000mm) at F13.8. Here are a couple shots made with my D30 at 2000mm with the Meade. The first shot of the fox kits is at a distance of a couple hundred feet and the butterfly is about 10 feet.

The great thing about the Meade is that it will focus down to 7 feet so you can actually shoot macros of insects with it (a little hard to use the finder scope, at that focal length and close focus distance) if you set up on a flower or similar attractive base and wait for a butterfly, etc.

Lin



**eric s**

Member

Joined: Sat Dec 7th, 2002  
Location: **Near Boston, Massachusetts USA**  
Posts: 5384

Posted: Mon Apr 14th, 2003 04:11 pm

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

Wow, those two pictures are quite amazing. A 7-foot minimum focus is a lot better than I expected. Now I'm really starting to look forward to getting something like this when my wallet recovers from the 10D and 100-400L.

My comment on the starling's breast wasn't about the colors as much as the texture. Like a moire pattern is just starting to show or something. Maybe it's just a trick of my eyes/brain. I do agree that the color and gloss is normal... I haven't seen one since last year, but it fits what I recall.

I've seen the T suggestion before, but that was ages ago. Humm... I assume going with a CP4500 would be more flexible because of the zoom range it would give, whereas the 10D in raw mode might generate better pictures (all things being equal.) But it would save some money over buying another camera.

## Lin Evans

Member

Joined: Thu Jun 6th, 2002  
Location: Berthoud, Colorado  
Posts: 1063

Posted: Tue Apr 15th, 2003 04:16 pm

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

*My comment on the starling's breast wasn't about the colors as much as the texture. Like a moire pattern is just starting to show or something.*

I think what you are seeing is jpg compression artifacts. I compressed the image tightly then applied a gaussian blur to the sky to blur the compression artifacts there, but there was no convenient way to minimize them on the highlights of the feathers. I'll see if I can find the original and post it with less compression.

Lin

## eric s

Member

Joined: Sat Dec 7th, 2002  
Location: **Near Boston,  
Massachusetts  
USA**  
Posts: 5384

Posted: Tue Apr 15th, 2003 08:53 pm

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

Lin,

I'd be interested in seeing it. I'm on a cable modem, so the size won't be too much of a problem.

At this point I'm still in the learning on the digital size of all this (and not that far along with the photo side) so I wasn't sure if my eyes were tricking me or not.

## PaulyOly

Member

Joined: Fri Oct 25th, 2002  
Location: Interlachen, FL  
Posts: 26

Posted: Wed May 7th, 2003 02:55 am

[Quote](#) [Reply](#)

Sorry, i do not check this forum often. I had no idea i started so much controversy. The examples i could find to compare the two eyepieces ( pentax xl-28 and williams dcl-28 😊) made me decide on the pentax. I retract my comment about the dcl-28 being cheap, i've never owned this eyepiece, i'm no expert on eyepieces or scopes.

As Mr. hoffman stated i am new to digiscoping and spotting scope, but not new to digital photography. I dare say that the pentax xl-28 can produce better images than the williams optics dcl-28, atleast when used with the cp990 and pentax pf80ed-a scope, as i have not seen any images taken with the dcl-28 that can make me say otherwise. Here are a few examples, i did nothing but sharpen the images using Olympus camera 2.5, no color changes or contrast was done, i sharpened 3 on a scale from 1-9 using the olympus software and cropped the image at 100%, NO resizing, these are 100% crops. If someone can show me a 100% crop taken with the dcl-28 and cp990 on any telescope spotting scope that delivers better results then i'm willing to try it wholeheartedly. Otherwise my next eyepiece purchase will be the pentax xl-21. All pics were taken in macro mode at half zoom from 15-20 feet. Well pics won't work so here's the links.

<http://www.pbase.com/image/16375887>

<http://www.pbase.com/image/16375883>

<http://www.pbase.com/image/16375885>

And here's a resized pic

<http://www.pbase.com/image/16376784>

<http://www.pbase.com/image/16411344>

**Lin Evans wrote:**

*Would I welcome "better and sharper images?" Sure. But I'm sure not willing to give up the zoom range and mid-focal length advantage of the camera's native lens to facilitate the outside chance that I might get superior performance in the small percentage of cases when I might be able to use these eyepieces.*

*Zoom range isn't an issue with the pentax xl-28, even at full wide the vignetting is almost nill. The exit pupil is 4.4mm with the pentax eyepiece, what is the dcl-28's exit pupil?*

*If anyone wants to see more examples click here.*

**[http://www.pbase.com/paulyoly/digiscoping\\_with\\_pentax\\_80ed](http://www.pbase.com/paulyoly/digiscoping_with_pentax_80ed)**

*every pic in this gallery was taken using the pentax scope/xl-28 eyepiece and cp990*

*If you see a red X, try refreshing or right click on the X and click show pic. If anyone doesn't understand what a 100% crop means please ask and hopefully someone else can explain because i don't fully understand it myself.*

*I'm in no way affiliated with pentax, nor am i trying to hurt william optics sales of their dcl-28. I was not trying to offend anyone that owns the dcl-28 eyepiece. I simply thought the swarovski fixed eyepiece would produce better pics, perhaps it will not.*

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Current time is 08:02 am