

PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE August 1961		2. LOCATION Fontana, California		12. CONCLUSIONS ☐ Was Balloon ☐ Probably Balloon ☐ Possibly Balloon ☐ Was Aircraft ☐ Probably Aircraft ☐ Possibly Aircraft ☐ Was Astronomical ☐ Probably Astronomical ☐ Possibly Astronomical ☐ Other <u>Hoax</u> ☐ Insufficient Data for Evaluation ☐ Unknown	
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.	

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.

E. H. Winn
EDWARD H. WINN
Colonel, USAF
Deputy for Science
and Components

2 Atchs
1. Ltr to ~~REDACTED~~
2. Envelope containing 3
photographs.

COORDINATION: TD-E

Robert Friend

DATE 4 Oct 61
RETURN TO
Mr. William A. B. Alaband

1003588

PO
17

gentlemen
one picture tells
a thousand words so
three picture should
tell a lot.

if interested Notify
at this address.

3 Feb

[REDACTED]

Fontana Calif

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM

23 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.'

WTC
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.

Ed H. Wynn
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.
WILBER PRICE, JR.
Chief, Photo Exploitation Div.
Deputy for Engr 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 (W [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]
[REDACTED]
Fontana, California