

PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE 30 November 1957		2. LOCATION 17 Mi S of Minot, North Dakota		12. CONCLUSIONS ☐ Was Balloon ☐ Probably Balloon ☐ Possibly Balloon ☐ Was Aircraft ☐ Probably Aircraft ☐ Possibly Aircraft ☐ Was Astronomical ☐ Probably Astronomical ☐ Possibly Astronomical	
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local _____ GMT 30/1020Z		4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION ☐ Ground-Visual ☒ Ground-Radar ☐ Air-Visual ☐ Air-Intercept Radar		☒ Other Poss false target ☐ Insufficient Data for Evaluation ☐ Unknown	
5. PHOTOS ☐ Yes ☒ No		6. SOURCE Military			
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 20 seconds		8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS one		9. COURSE	
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING Visual one inch blip on HRI, climbed from 5,000 ft to 25,000 ft in 20 seconds. Traveled 100 miles in 20 seconds when it faded from HRI.				11. COMMENTS It is concluded that possibility object is a false target due to equipment malfunction rather than an actual target caused the rptd radar paint.	

30 NOV 57 14 51 Z

1 } 4E4
2 }
3 }

44X20

(WB)

Area C
cf

RB067

SQF095 YDA099 XYA173 XDD071EGUA036

PP RJEDDN RJEDWP RJEPHQ

DE RJWPGU 3H

P 301210Z

FM COMDR 786TH ACWRON

TO RJWPGU/ COMDR 29TH ADIV

RJEDWP/COMDR AIR TECHNICAL INTELL CENTER

RJEPHQ/DIRECTOR OF INTELL HDQ USAF

RJEDDNXCOMDR AIR DEFENSE COMMAND ENT AFB

BT

UNCLASSIFIED/FROM 786TH OPERATIONS

UFOB

1. (A) VISUAL PRESENTATION ON HRI FPS-6

(B) N/A

(C) N/A

(D) ONE

(E) N/A

(F) ONE INCH BLIP ON HRI

30 NOV 57 11 03

(G) N/A

(H) N/A

1166
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.

PAGE TWO RJWPGU 3H

(I) CLIMBED FROM 5,000 FEET TO 25,000 FEET IN TWENTY (20)

SECOND, TRAVELED 100 MILES IN TWENTY (20) SECOND.

2. (A) APPEARED ON HRI- FPS-6.

(B) 5,000 FEET 207 DEGREES AT 80 MILES

(C) 25,000 FEET 207 DEGREES AT 180 MILES

(D) STRAIGHT LINE

(E) FADE FROM HRI

(F) TWENTY SECONDS

3. (A) GROUND ELECTRONIC HRI (FPS-6

(B) N/A

(C) N/A

4. (A) TIME AND DATE OF SIGHTING

(A) 1020Z 30 NOV 57

(B) NIGHT

5. (A) 17 MILES SOUTH OF MINOT N.D. 786TH ACW SQ.

6. (A) N/A

(B) A/2C CHARLES A, WAGNER. 786TH ACW SQ. RADAR MAINTENANCE FIVE

(5) MONTH EXPERIENCE.

7. N/A

8. NEGATIVE

3. (A) GROUND ELECTRONIC HRI (FPS-6

(B) N/A

(C) N/A

4. (A) TIME AND DATE OF SIGHTING

(A) 1020Z 30 NOV 57

(B) NIGHT

5. (A) 17 MILES SOUTH OF MINOT N.D. 786TH ACW SQ.

6. (A) N/A

(B) A/2C CHARLES A, WAGNER. 786TH ACW SQ. RADAR MAINTENANCE FIVE

(5) MONTH EXPERIENCE.

7. N/A

8. NEGATIVE

PAGE THREE RJWPGU 3H

9. N/A

10. NONE

11. SENIOR DIRECTOR , 786TH ACW SQ, POSSIBILITY OF INTERFERENCE
ON SCOPE WAS CHECKED WITH RADAR MAINTENANCE, NEGATIVE INTERFERENCE.

12. N/A

BT

30/1151Z NOV RJWPGU

AFCIN-4E-1 Comments / Conclusions:

Signed: _____