

PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE 9 Jul 61		2. LOCATION Humboldt, Sask., Canada		12. CONCLUSIONS ☐ Was Balloon ☐ Probably Balloon ☐ Possibly Balloon ☐ Was Aircraft ☐ Probably Aircraft ☐ Possibly Aircraft ☐ Was Astronomical ☐ Probably Astronomical ☐ Possibly Astronomical ☐ Other ☒ Insufficient Data for Evaluation ☐ Unknown	
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local 2330 GMT 100530Z		4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION ☐ Ground-Visual ☐ Ground-Radar ☐ Air-Visual ☐ Air-Intercept Radar			
5. PHOTOS ☐ Yes ☐ No		6. SOURCE Civilian			
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 45 sec		8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS 1		9. COURSE Irregular	
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING Circular, size of pea, whitish-blue. Very irregular flight path. Disappeared behind horizon.				11. COMMENTS Report was submitted by a young man who had apparently set up a UFO club, makes his investigation, then sends his reports to the USAF. He copies format of AFR 200-2; however he left out some important evidence in this report. Report was not made until a month after alleged sighting therefore it would be a waste of time to pursue it further. Due to lack of pertinent info, it is evaluated as Insufficient Data.	

DESCRIPTION OF THE OBJECT(S)

Shape circles

Size compared to a known object (Use one of the following terms: Head of a pin, pea, dime, nickel, quarter, half dollar, silver dollar, base ball, grapefruit, or basketball) held in the at about arm's length. pea

Color White - blue Number one (1)

Formation, if more than one no formation

Any discernable features or details None

Tail, trail, or exhaust, including size of same compared to size of the object(s) None

Sound, if heard describe sound No sound

Other pertinent or unusual features None

DESCRIPTION OF COURSE OF THE OBJECT(S)

What first called the attention of observer(s) to the object(s) Do just happened to see it
666

Approximate angle of elevation of object(s) when first observed 75° vertical

Approximate angle of elevation of object(s) upon disappearance 0°

Description of flight path and maneuvers of the object(s) very irregular path

How did the object(s) disappear? (Instantaneously to the north etc.) disappeared behind horizon

How long was the Object(s) visible? (Be specific, 5 minutes, 1 hour etc.) 45 minutes

INVESTIGATION

Investigation made on August 5, 1966 at Laurelwood 922 9th St. W. Humboldt

Investigator's name and address Penner, Susan 531 3th St. W. Humboldt

MANNER OF OBSERVATION

Use one or many combination of the following terms: Ground visual, ground-electronic, or air electronic (If electronic, specify type of radar) Ground-visual

Statement as to optical aids (Telescopes, binoculars etc.) no aid

LOCATION OF OBSERVATION

Exact latitude and longitude of each observer, and/or geographical position. A position with reference to a known landmark should also be given, such as "2 Miles N of Deerville;"

" 3 Miles SW of Blue Lake " (example 89 45 N, 192 71 W) 105° 7' Longitude.

52° 13' Latitude (Humboldt Substation)

TIME AND DATE OF SIGHTING

Time and date of sighting 11:30 P.M. July 2, 1961

Light conditions at time of sighting (Use one of the following terms: night, day, dawn, dusk)

light

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION ON OBSERVER(S)

Name(s)

[REDACTED]

Age(s)

15

Mailing address(es)

Box [REDACTED] - Humboldt Substation

Occupation

Student (Humboldt Substation Institute)

WEATHER CONDITIONS AT TIME OF SIGHTING

Observer(s) account of weather conditions

Light Breeze

Ceiling

Unlimited

Visibility

Excellent

Amount of cloud cover

None

Thunderstorms in area and where

they were located

None

Temperature rise

Unobtainable

Any other unusual activity or conditions, meteorological, astronomical, or otherwise which might account for the sighting

none other known

Existence of physical evidence, such as materials or photographs

None

Please collect as many as possible and have them give their addresses

Mrs

Person who is giving the report will sign below and will give his or her address

Hamulobolus - Sack

INVESTIGATOR'S REMARKS

at the time B had the system. B was flying out of town and I
supposed to find up the sky as he called he mother she was
a witness. (signature above) suggestion: After No witness don't
travel across path we do they but only by B. No. No. B. No.
don't travel the fact. Only possible explanation of F. 6 66
Reliability of witnesses good

Report sent in on August 7/41