PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE

7 November 1957

2. LOCATION

Harlingen AFB, Texas

3. DATE-TIME GROUP

Local _____

GMT 07/1538Z

4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION

☐ Ground-Visual X☒ Ground-Radar

☐ Air-Visual ☐ Air-Intercept Radar

5. PHOTOS

☐ Yes

☒ No

6. SOURCE

Military

7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION

2 to 3 minutes

8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS

one

9. COURSE

E to N then W

12. CONCLUSIONS

☐ Was Balloon
☐ Probably Balloon
☐ Possibly Balloon

☐ Was Aircraft
☐ Probably Aircraft
☐ Possibly Aircraft

☐ Was Astronomical
☐ Probably Astronomical
☐ Possibly Astronomical

☒ Other Malfunction
☐ Insufficient Data for Evaluation
☐ Unknown

10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING

Faint radar target similar to T-29 a/c. Target appeared 10 mi NE going W to about 14 mi and disappeared 14 mi NW. Reappeared 10 mi SW going E for 10 mi then turned N for 10 mi then turned W and disappeared at 15 mi. Speed of target est an excess of 1000 mph.

11. COMMENTS

Obj not substantiated by any other evidence and was a faint target which appeared while the operator was working an a/c in traffic pattern. There is a possibility of radar malfunction.

ATIC FORM 329 (REV 26 SEP 52)

7/15382

20

Nhodi

SUBJECT: Request - Analysis and Comments, Electronic UFO Reports

TO: AFCIN-4E4 FROM: AFCIN-4E1 DATE: 3 Feb 59 COMMENT NR. 2

AFCIN-4E1a/W. Picklesimer/jc
74201/Bldg 828/Rm 241

1. Reference is made to your request for review and analysis of eleven (11) UFO reports.

2. Comments follow in order of inclosure numbers.

a. Inclosure #1: This UFO was not substantiated by any other evidence and was a faint target which appeared while the operator was working an aircraft in a traffic pattern. Assistant Wing Operations Officer indicated a possibility of a radar malfunction. This office concurs that a radar malfunction was possible.

1

Signed: _____

PAGE TWO RJWFHG 55

Incl # 1 [redacted]

IN EXCESS OF 1000 MPH (E) FADED FROM SCOPE (F) 2 TO 3 MINUTES (3)(A)

AN/MPN 1-C (B) NONE (C) N/A (4)(A) 1538Z 7 NOV 57 (B) DAY (5) 26

DEGREES 15N--97 DEGREES 50W (6)(A) N/A (B) [redacted] A/1C [redacted]

Location of radar UFO

8

AACS DETACHMENT AIRCRAFT LANDING CONTROL OPERATOR, REASONABLY

RELIABLE. [redacted]L A/2C [redacted] AACS DETACHMENT RADAR REPAIRMAN

REASONABLY RELIABLE (7)(A) N/A (B) SURFACE--3/22/- 36K; 6M-180/40K;

10M-230/25K; 16M-240/30K; 20M-250/40K; 30M-250/40K. (C) SCATTERED-2M:

BROKEN 10M. (D) 6 MILES IN DZ (E) 7/10 (F) NO RW OR TSM ACTIVITY IN

VICINITY:

SOME TSM 100 NM NORTH (8) NEGATIVE (9) N/A (10) NEGATIVE; ONLY AIRCRAFT

IN AREA WSSSSSSSSSSSS ONSCOPE AT TIME OF INCIDENT (11) ASSISTANT WING OPER

OPERATIONS OFFICER: POSSIBILITY EXISTS UNKNOWN TARGET WAS DUE TO RADAR

MALFUNCTION; HOWEVER REPORTED PATTERN OF FLIGHT UNEXPLAINABLE. EXIST-

ENCE OF A UFOB NOT CONFIRMED DUE TO NO OTHER SUBSTANTIATION (12) NONE

BT

C LINE 11 GP 3 THRU 7 SHUD READ 1" WAS ON SCOPE AT TIME

C LINE 11 ZBK-2 GP IS SAME AS 1 ON LINE 12

7 0310Z NOV RJWFHG

Radar

A WPA019 YIB014 WYB011 WDA012HGA081

R RJEDDN RJEDKF RJEDWP RJEPHQ

DE RJVFHG 55

R 072158Z

FM COMDR HARLINGEN AFB

TO RJEDDN/COMDR ADC ENT AFB

RJEDKF/COMDR CADF RICHARDS-GEBAUR AFB

RJEDWP/COMDR AIR TECH INTELLIGENCE CENTER WPAFB

RJEPHQ/DIRECTOR INTELLIGENCE HQ USAF

BT

UNCLAS FROM 03131.

UFOB REPORT AS FOLLOWS: (1) (A) UNDETERMINED. (B) TARGET SIMILAR TO A T-29 AIRCRAFT AT 4000 FEET (C) UNDETERMINED (D) ONE FAINT RADAR TARGET (E) N/A (F) NONE (G) NONE (H) NONE (I) NONE (2)(A) UNKNOWN TARGET APPEARED ON RADAR SCOPE WHILE OPERATOR WAS WORKING T-29 ACFT NBR 53476 IN TRAFFIC PATTERN (B) AZIMUTH 229 DEGREES (C) AZIMUTH 273 DEGREES (D) TARGET APPEARED TEN MILES NORTHEAST GOING WEST TO ABOUT 14 MILES AND DISAPPEARED 14 MILES NORTHWEST. REAPPEARED AGAIN TEN MILES SOUTHWEST GOING EAST FOR TEN MILES THEN TURNED NORTH FOR TEN MILES THEN TURNED WEST AND DISAPPEARED AT 15 MILES. OBJECT WAS ESTIMATED AT SPEED

Nov 8 Nov 8 57 413 '5707

4E4

4x2a

atic

Note

(Target definitely maneuvered)

7E-1 Comments/Conclusions: —

UFOB INDEX CARD

ATSS-UFOB-520-57

1. DATE 7 Nov-57 ~~2 Jan 58~~	2. LOCATION Harlingen AFB, Texas	12. CONCLUSIONS ☐ Was Balloon ☐ Probably Balloon ☐ Possibly Balloon ☐ Was Aircraft ☐ Probably Aircraft ☐ Possibly Aircraft ☐ Was Astronomical ☐ Probably Astronomical ☐ Possibly Astronomical ☐ Other ~~Poss Radar Mal~~ ☒ Insufficient Data for Evaluation ☐ Unknown
3. DATE-TIME GROUP 07/1538Z Nov 57	4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION ~~☐ Ground-Visual~~ ☒ Ground-Radar ☐ Air-Visual ☐ Air-Intercept Radar	
5. PHOTOS ☐ Yes ☒ No	6. SOURCE Military	
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION Two to three minutes	8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS One	9. COURSE See below

10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING

One faint radar target similar to a T-29. Object appeared in NE going W, then SW, then E then N then W. Object was going estimated 1900MPH. Object was in sight for two to three minutes.

11. COMMENTS

Concur with Reporting Officer that this sighting was possibly caused by radar malfunction.

AISOP Form 5 (15 Oct 54)

SUBJECT: Request - Analysis and Comments, Electronic UFO Reports

TO: AFCIN-4E4 FROM: AFCIN-4E1 DATE: 3 Feb 59 COMMENT NR. 2
AFCIN-4E1a/W. Picklesimer/jc
74201/Bldg 828/Rm 241

1. Reference is made to your request for review and analysis of eleven (11) UFO reports.

2. Comments follow in order of inclosure numbers.

a. Inclosure #1: This UFO was not substantiated by any other evidence and was a faint target which appeared while the operator was working an aircraft in a traffic pattern. Assistant Wing Operations Officer indicated a possibility of a radar malfunction. This office concurs that a radar malfunction was possible.

b. Inclosure #2: This radar paint was probably due to unidentified aircraft passing through the area.

c. Inclosure #3: From the rather meager information in this report, it is likely that the radar sighting was due to unidentified aircraft.

d. Inclosure #4: The evidence presented in this report indicates a good possibility of a small flock of large birds.

e. Inclosure #5: There are several unusual things about this reported UFOB sighting. First, the equipment was evidently under control of maintenance personnel at the time of sighting. This could mean that the radar equipment was not in perfect adjustment, or some sort of target simulator or other special equipment was being used in connection with the maintenance operation. (There is no mention of this in the report, however.) Also, the report gives no indication of any attempt to rotate the antenna to a new bearing to determine whether the signal originated inside the equipment. (This question arises since the azimuth of the target was reported to be exactly the same throughout the time of interception and, therefore, appears to indicate that the antenna was not rotating.) Further, regular operating personnel are generally more familiar with the appearance of a particular radar scope and could possibly be more reliable observers than maintenance personnel. Hence, it is concluded that possibly a false target due to equipment malfunction rather than an actual target caused the reported radar paint.

f. Inclosure #6: The evidence presented in this report indicates the possibility that radar reflections from clouds or rain storms caused the unexplained blips. Equipments which operate at S-band usually are more susceptible to weather phenomena than L-band equipments. It is assumed that the search equipment which did not pick up the reported blips was operating in the L-band.

g. Inclosure #7: It is difficult to understand how 3600 mph targets would stay on a 40-mile scope for 41 minutes. There is a possibility that weather or anomolous propagation caused the reported radar blips.

h. Inclosure #8: Same sighting as Inclosure #7.

DISPOSITION FORM

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (If any)

FILE NO.

SUBJECT Request - Analysis and Comments, Electronic UFO Reports

TO AFCIN-4E1
Colonel Hoffman

FROM AFCIN-4E4

DATE 15 April 1958

COMMENT NO. 1

AFCIN-4E4g/Capt Gregory/ko
Ext 6-9216/Bldg. 263

1. Attached are eleven (11) official UFO reports received from various Air Force radar units for your review and analysis.

2. These represent only that number which this division has found a little difficult to evaluate or conclude.

3. It should be pointed out that radar UFO reports have increased noticeably the last six (6) months; and it appears that this trend will continue in the future.

4. This matter was discussed with your staff earlier this year, in the possibility that your office may consider obtaining the services of either an electronics UFO specialist or consultant. Reference your DF, Comment Nr. 2, dated 13 Jan 58, copy attached.

2 Incls:
1. Folder containing 11 UFO Radar Reports
2. Comment #2, DF, dtd 13 Jan 58

Henry A. Miley
HENRY A. MILEY
Chief, Air Sciences Division
AFCIN-4E4

SUBJECT: Request - Analysis and Comments, Electronic UFO Reports

i. Inclosure #9: Since no confirming evidence was presented, it is assumed that anomolous propagation of some sort caused the reported track.

j. Inclosure #10: Radar range of the reported target is not given. Thus, a possible important clue is missing. The possibility of a balloon or an unidentified aircraft cannot be ruled out completely.

k. Inclosure #11: This reported UFOB possibly could have been one object or two objects one at a time. Both sightings were of such a nature as to indicate unidentified aircraft. High rate of speed was mentioned in the report, but no attempt was made to estimate the speed. The object seemed to reverse direction at times, but so can an aircraft, especially a light aircraft of a helicopter. Suggestion is made that the radar station should have made every possible attempt to identify the object at the time of sighting.

1 Incl
Incl Nr. 2 w/d

GORDON C. HOFFMAN
Colonel, USAF
AFCIN-4E1