[redacted]

PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE
August 1961

2. LOCATION
Fontana, California

3. DATE-TIME GROUP
Local _____
GMT _____

4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION
☐ Ground-Visual ☐ Ground-Radar
☐ Air-Visual ☐ Air-Intercept Radar

5. PHOTOS
☒ Yes
☐ No

6. SOURCE
Civilian

7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION

8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS
One

9. COURSE

10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING
3 photos received at ATIC of supposed flying saucer.

11. COMMENTS
Pictures sent to photo analysis. The object was small and photographed at close range. They were the result of long exposure outdoors or indoor exposures with the light from radically different angles, either of which would preclude the object being a flying saucer. Photo was a deliberate attempt to mislead the true identity of the object.

12. CONCLUSIONS
☐ Was Balloon
☐ Probably Balloon
☐ Possibly Balloon
☐ Was Aircraft
☐ Probably Aircraft
☐ Possibly Aircraft
☐ Was Astronomical
☐ Probably Astronomical
☐ Possibly Astronomical
☒ Other Hoax
☐ Insufficient Data for Evaluation
☐ Unknown

ATIC FORM 329 (REV 26 SEP 52)

OFFICIAL FILE COPY
TD-E

TD-E/Major Friend/vw/69216
Analysis of Photographs ([redacted], Jr.) 5 OCT 1961

Hq USAF (SAFOI-3c - Major Coleman)

1. The attached photographs have been examined by the FTD photo-analysis division who were unable to identify the object pictured.

2. The analysts concluded, however, that the object was small, being photographed at close range. They further concluded that the photographs resulted from either a long outdoor exposure or were indoor exposures due to the fact that the light apparently came from radically different angles.

3. It is the analysts opinion that the photographs are a deliberate attempt to perpetuate a hoax.

EDWARD H. WYNN
Colonel, USAF
Deputy for Science
and Components

2 Atchs
1. Ltr fr [redacted]
2. Envelope containing 3 photographs

COORDINATION: TD-E Robert J. Friend Maj DATE 4 Oct 61

RETURN TO
AFCIN-3D1
Maxwell AFB, Alabama
APR 13, 60121
1-9 Aug 1961

100358

AO
17

gentlemen
one picture tells
a thousand words so
three picture should
tell a lot.
if interested Notify
at this address.

[redacted]

3 Incl

Fontana Calif

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM

28 August 61

Major Friend:

Request an evaluation of the photographs enclosed herewith.

Let us know your conclusions so I may reply. Looks like another set of 'you know what.'

Wm. T. Coleman, Jr.
Major USAF
SAFOI-3
4C-922

HEADQUARTERS
FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY DIVISION
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: TD-E/Major Friend/vw/69216

SUBJECT: Request for Photo Analysis

1 Sept 61

TO: TD-D4a

1. It is requested that an analysis be made of the attached photographic prints to determine the nature of the images.

2. It is requested that the prints be forwarded to TD-E upon completion of the analysis in order that they may be returned to the witness.

3. There is a suspense of 11 Sept 61 on this request.

EDWARD H. WYNN
Colonel, USAF
Deputy for Science
and Components

1 Atch
Ltr (thermo-fax cy) fm Mr. [redacted], w/3
photos.

1st Ind (TD-D4a) 2 Oct 61

TO: TD-E

1. The subject photography has been examined but no conclusion can be reached as to the identity of the object. However it appears to be a small object photographed at close range.

2. On two of the photographs the light source was apparently the same, while on the third image the light came from a radically different angle. This indicates either a large passage of time out of doors, or indoor photography, either of which would preclude a chance encounter with a flying saucer.

3. It is our opinion that this is a deliberate effort to mislead us.

WILBER PRICE, JR.
Chief, Photo Exploitation Div.
Deputy for Surv Support

1 Atch
no change

HEADQUARTERS
FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY DIVISION
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: TD-E/Major Friend

SUBJECT: Analysis of Photographs ([redacted])

5 OCT 1961

TO: Hq USAF (SAFOI-3c - Major Coleman)

1. The attached photographs have been examined by the FTD photo-analysis division who were unable to identify the object pictured.

2. The analysts concluded, however, that the object was small, being photographed at close range. They further concluded that the photographs resulted from either a long outdoor exposure or were indoor exposures due to the fact that the light apparently came from radically different angles.

3. It is the analysts opinion that the photographs are a deliberate attempt to perpetuate a hoax.

EDWARD H. WYNN
Colonel, USAF
Deputy for Science
and Components

2 Atchs
1. Ltr fm [redacted]
2. Envelope containing 3 photographs.

TD-E/Major Friend

Analysis of Photographs ([redacted])

5 OCT 1951

Hq USAF (SAFOI-3c - Major Coleman)

1. The attached photographs have been examined by the FTD photo-analysis division who were unable to identify the object pictured.

2. The analysts concluded, however, that the object was small, being photographed at close range. They further concluded that the photographs resulted from either a long outdoor exposure or were indoor exposures due to the fact that the light apparently came from radically different angles.

3. It is the analysts opinion that the photographs are a deliberate attempt to perpetuate a hoax.

EDWARD H. WYNN
Colonel, USAF
Deputy for Science
and Components

2 Atchs
1. Ltr fm [redacted]
2. Envelope containing 3 photographs.

9 October 1961

Dear [redacted]:

I am returning the photographs which you sent to us recently.

The only conclusion reached was that the object photographed was small in size and photographed at close range. Focus was not fine and details are consequently missing.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM T. COLEMAN, JR.
Major, USAF
UFO Project Officer
Public Information Division
Office of Information

Mr. [redacted]
Fontana, California