


PROJECT 10073 RECORD

1. DATE - TIME GROUP 14 Jun 67 14/1800Z	2. LOCATION Manders, California (1 Witness)
3. SOURCE Civilian	10. CONCLUSION Photo: Other: (PROCESSING DEFECT) sighting: (NOT OBSERVED)
4. NUMBER OF OBJECTS One	
5. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION N/A	11. BRIEF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS The observer at no time saw the object. The image was on the roll of film when he developed it.
6. TYPE OF OBSERVATION CHANGE N/A	
7. COURSE N/A	COMMENTS: Photo experts stated that the image could possible be the result of a film processing defect, such as a bubble in the developer or a light reflection.
8. PHOTOS ☒ Yes ☐ No	
9. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE ☐ Yes ☒ No	

FORM
FTD SEP 63 0-329 (TDE) Previous editions of this form may be used.



This case contains 3, 8"x10"
photos and 1, 4"x5" negative.

PHOTO ANALYSIS REPORT

NR 67-64

PAGE 1 OF 1 PAGES

DATE OF REPORT 30 August 1967

SUBJECT UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

INDERS, CALIFORNIA

DATE 14 June 1967

PHOTOGRAPHY

AF _____ IR _____ QUALITY _____

P NRS _____

1. PURPOSE: This report is written to fulfill a request, Work Order Number 67-113, submitted by Major H. Quintanilla, Jr. TDET/UFO, to determine the identity of the unidentified object in the attached photo.

2. ANALYSIS: The object cannot be definitely identified. There is the possibility that it could be a film processing defect, such as a bubble in the developer, or a light reflection. An analysis of the original negative could possibly reveal new information which cannot be gleaned from the paper prints that have been made available.

PHOTO ANALYSIS BY:

ROBERT D. MYERS
Intelligence Research Specialist

APPROVED BY:

WILLIAM L. TURNER
Major, USAF
Chief, Photo Analysis Branch

WILBER PRICE, JR.
Chief, Photo Exploitation Division

TRND 70
PHOTO ANALYSIS

[REDACTED]
Pomona, California 91767
June 26, 1967

Major Hector Quintinilla, Jr.
Director, U.S.A.F. "Project Blue Book"
Air Force Research and Development Command
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Dayton, Ohio

Dear Major Quintinilla:

The enclosed photograph, containing what appears to be an "unidentified flying object," is hereby submitted for comparison with other such photographs in your files.

It was taken shortly before 10 A.M., Wednesday, June 14, 1967, near Landers, California, while the camera was pointed in a northeasterly direction. The camera (a Rolleicord) was set at f16 with a shutter speed of 1/250th of a second. A K2 yellow filter was used to slightly darken the sky so that the white dome of the building being photographed would stand out more clearly. The film, Kodak Plus-X, was developed in a solution marketed commercially as X33C for 12½ minutes at a temperature of 70°F.

The building is reputed to be an "Integratron" or "Time Machine" constructed by Mr. [REDACTED] of nearby Giant Rock. I am of the opinion that Mr. [REDACTED] is an out-and-out fraud, and I had intended to use the photograph to illustrate a tongue-in-cheek magazine article about the "Time Machine" and the Giant Rock area. Three earlier visits to the site had resulted in unsatisfactory photographs due to the position of the sun or incorrect exposure. All of these earlier visits had been made late in the afternoon; therefore, I had decided to see if I couldn't get better results during the fourth visit by taking the photographs in the morning.

When the enclosed photograph was taken, the camera was mounted on a tripod. I focused it, made the settings noted above, and then stood in front of it and to one side so that my shadow would protect the lens from the direct glare of the sun. At the moment I tripped the shutter by pushing a cable release, I was looking at the lens, not at the object being photographed. At no time did I actually see the apparent "unidentified flying object" in the photograph.

As soon as I inspected the film after its development, I noticed a donut-shaped object in the sky above the building's dome. It appeared to be an undeveloped spot surrounded by a clear area. Naturally, the clear area appears as a black ring in the finished print.

My first reaction was to conclude that somehow the developer had failed to reach that spot and that the result was a flaw on the negative. Perhaps, I thought, that portion of the film had been touching another spot on the same roll as it lay coiled in the development tank. But no corresponding flaw appears anywhere else on that roll. The tank used, incidentally, is a 16 oz. Nikor, designed to hold one roll of 120 film.

(more)

Here are some other factors about the situation that seem strange to me:

(1) If the white spot is the result of lack of development, what is the explanation for the clear ring (clear on the negative, that is) surrounding it?

(2) Instead of being clearly defined around the edges, as might be expected of a spot caused by chemicals, this spot is fuzzy around the edges, as might be expected in the photograph of an object in motion.

(3) I have taken and developed thousands of pictures, and this is the first time I have seen anything like this on any of them. It is certainly an astounding coincidence that the one picture in which it does appear was taken in an area in which flying saucer sightings have been so often reported and that it appears, not superimposed on the building or on the ground, but in the sky, where one would expect to see a flying saucer.

I still think the "object" shown in this picture is the result of some accident during development, but because of the factors listed above I am submitting this print for your opinion and for insertion in your files. If you would like to see the negative as well, please let me know and I'll send it to you.

Sincerely,



SEND TO
PHOTO ANALYSIS

Pomona, California 91767
June 26, 1967

Major Hector Quintinilla, Jr.
Director, U.S.A.F. "Project Blue Book"
Air Force Research and Development Command
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Dayton, Ohio

Dear Major Quintinilla:

The enclosed photograph, containing what appears to be an "unidentified flying object," is hereby submitted for comparison with other such photographs in your files.

It was taken shortly before 10 A.M., Wednesday, June 14, 1967, near Landers, California, while the camera was pointed in a northeasterly direction. The camera (a Rolleicord) was set at f16 with a shutter speed of 1/250th of a second. A K2 yellow filter was used to slightly darken the sky so that the white dome of the building being photographed would stand out more clearly. The film, Kodak Plus-X, was developed in a solution marketed commercially as X33C for 12½ minutes at a temperature of 70°F.

The building is reputed to be an "Integratron" or "Time Machine" constructed by [redacted] of nearby Giant Rock. I am of the opinion that [redacted] is an [redacted] and I had intended to use the photograph to illustrate a tongue-in-cheek magazine article about the "Time Machine" and the Giant Rock area. Three earlier visits to the site had resulted in unsatisfactory photographs due to the position of the sun or incorrect exposure. All of these earlier visits had been made late in the afternoon; therefore, I had decided to see if I couldn't get better results during the fourth visit by taking the photographs in the morning.

When the enclosed photograph was taken, the camera was mounted on a tripod. I focused it, made the settings noted above, and then stood in front of it and to one side so that my shadow would protect the lens from the direct glare of the sun. At the moment I tripped the shutter by pushing a cable release, I was looking at the lens, not at the object being photographed. At no time did I actually see the apparent "unidentified flying object" in the photograph.

As soon as I inspected the film after its development, I noticed a donut-shaped object in the sky above the building's dome. It appeared to be an undeveloped spot surrounded by a clear area. Naturally, the clear area appears as a black ring in the finished print.

My first reaction was to conclude that somehow the developer had failed to reach that spot and that the result was a flaw on the negative. Perhaps, I thought, that portion of the film had been touching another spot on the same roll as it lay coiled in the development tank. But no corresponding flaw appears anywhere else on that roll. The tank used, incidentally, is a 16 oz. Nikor, designed to hold one roll of 120 film.

(more)

Here are some other factors about the situation that seem strange to me:

(1) If the white spot is the result of lack of development, what is the explanation for the clear ring (clear on the negative, that is) surrounding it?


(2) Instead of being clearly defined around the edges, as might be expected of a spot caused by chemicals, this spot is fuzzy around the edges, as might be expected in the photograph of an object in motion.

(3) I have taken and developed thousands of pictures, and this is the first time I have seen anything like this on any of them. It is certainly an astounding coincidence that the one picture in which it does appear was taken in an area in which flying saucer sightings have been so often reported and that it appears, not superimposed on the building or on the ground, but in the sky, where one would expect to see a flying saucer.

I still think the "object" shown in this picture is the result of some accident during development, but because of the factors listed above I am submitting this print for your opinion and for insertion in your files. If you would like to see the negative as well, please let me know and I'll send it to you.

Sincerely,





~~to~~
~~to~~

Pomona, California 91767

14 June 67

(5)

~~to~~

Va. Tech. ^{Solo Point}

