

1. DATE - TIME GROUP 2 November 64 03/0220Z	2. LOCATION Redwood City, California
3. SOURCE Civilian	10. CONCLUSION Photo (FILM FLAW, DUPE FLAW) Visual (INSUFFICIENT DATA FOR EVALUATION)
4. NUMBER OF OBJECTS One	
5. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 20 Minutes	11. BRIEF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS  Photos taken of object. Report of visual observation stated stat the speed of the object was about 90 mph. Object to the West at about 30 degress elevation. Two marked inversions at the time. SEE CASE FILE.  COMMENTS: Photo analysis failed to reveal nature of the object as there was no visible image of an identifiable nature. Request for additional data not supplied as requested. Case regarded as insufficient for evaluation on the visual observation and the photo evaluation of the print regarded as a film flaw, duplicating flaw, or chip in the emulsion.
6. TYPE OF OBSERVATION Ground-Visual	
7. COURSE Unable to determine	
8. PHOTOS <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
9. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

INCOMING  
MESSAGE

*2 NOV* *03/02302*  
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH.

*3 NOV*  
UNCLASSIFIED

AF IN : 15787 (3 Nov 64) T/js

PAGE 1 of 4

ACTION : NIN-7,  
INFO : XOP-1, XOPX-7, SAF-OS-3, DIA-1,5 (34)  
SMB A265

ZCZCHQA913ZCQJA135

PP RUEAHQ

DE RUWHKP 17 03/2223Z

ZNR

P 032220Z

FM P OADS ADAIR AFS ORE

TO RUWGALE/ADC ENT AFB COLO

RUWHBH/25TH AIR DIV MCCHORD AFB WASH

RUCDSQ/AIRTECHINTEL CENTER WPAFB OHIO

RUEAHQ/HQ USAF WASH D C

RUEAHQ/SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE WASH D C

BT

UNCLAS P OODC-I 00553. FOR AFCIN - HQ USAF; SAFOI - SECRETARY  
OF THE AIR FORCE. UF OB REPORT. THE FOLLOWING UF OB REPORT IS  
SUBMITTED. PART I.

PART A.

1. A ROUND ROTATING LIGHT.
2. FIFTY-CENT PIECE.
3. COLOR--FLUCTUATING FROM WHITE TO ORANGE TO WHITE TO ORANGE.
4. ONE.
5. ALTHOUGH ONE UNIT ORIGINALLY 'IT WENT TO A STRING OF LIGHTS,  
THEN TO ONE UNIT AGAIN.'

6. NO DISCERNIBLE FEATURES.
7. NO TAIL.
8. NO SOUND.
9. NO OTHER PERTINENT FEATURES.

PART B.

1. OBSERVZR LOOKED UP AND SAW OBJECT WHILE DRIVING ALONG FREEWAY.
2. 20 DEGREE ELEVATION, 330 DEGREE AZIMUTH.
3. DISAPPEARED ON SAME PATH AS OBSERVED.
4. STRIGHT LINE FLIGHT PATH.
5. OBJECT "PULLED AWAY."
6. UNKNOWN LENGTH OF TIME.

PART C.

1. VISUAL GROUND
2. NO OPTICAL AID. COLOR PICTURES TAKEN WITH 35MM LEICA HAND CAMERA WILL BE FORWARDED TO FTD, AFSC.
3. NOT APPLICABLE.

PART D.

1. 030230Z NOVEMBER 1964.0
2. DUSK.

PART E. ON BAYSHORE FREEWAY IN REDWOOD CITY, CALIFORNIA.

INCOMING

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

MESSAGE: 15787 (3 Nov 64) STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH

PAGE 3 UNCLASSIFIED

~~PAGE 3 RUWHKP 17 UNCLAS~~

PART F. MR. D [REDACTED], [REDACTED], REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.

CLAIMS PRIOR SERVICE IN AIR FORCE AND FORMER MEMBER GROUND  
OBSERVER CORPS. PROFESSES INTEREST IN ASTRONOMY. STATES OBJECT  
REPORTED HEREIN WAS NOT WEATHER BALLOON. ESTIMATED RELIABILITY  
F-3.

PART G.

1. DUSK BUT VISIBILITY STILL GOOD.

2. WIND DIRECTION AND VELOCITY

SURFACE FROM 340 AT 05K

6M FROM 340 AT 15K

10M FROM 330 AT 30K

16M FROM 340 AT 35K

20M FROM 310 AT 50K

30M FROM 300 AT 75K

50M FROM 300 AT 40K

80M FROM 270 AT 20K

3. NO CEILING

4. VISIBILITY 15 MILES.

5. SCATTERED CLOUD COVER.

6. NO THUNDERSTORMS IN AREA.

INCOMING

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

MESSAGE

STAFF MESSAGE BRANCH

PAGE 4 OF 11 UNCLASSIFIED

AF IN: 15787 (3 Nov 64)

PAGE 4 RUWHKP 17 UNCLAS

7. VERTICAL TEMPERATURE GRADIENT INVERSION 4800 TO 5500 FEET.

PART H. NO DATA ON UNUSUAL CONDITIONS WHICH MIGHT ACCOUNT FOR SIGHTING.

PART I. NONE.

PART J. NO AIR TRAFFIC OR BALLOON RELEASED WHICH MIGHT ACCOUNT FOR THIS SIGHTING.

PART K. 2D LT JAMES L. YOUNG, ALTERNATE INTELLIGENCE OFFICER, PORTLAND AIR DEFENSE SECTOR. CONCUR THAT SIGHTING WAS NOT WEATHER BALLOON SINCE PREVAILING WINDS PRECLUDED 0000Z OAKLAND WEATHER BUREAU BALLOON BEING AT AREA OF SIGHTING.

PART L. NEGATIVES AND PRINTS WILL BE MAILED TO TDEW AFSC AS SOON AS OBTAINED FROM SOURCE. PICTURES TAKEN ON COLOR FILM WITH 35MM LEICA HAND CAMERA.

BT NOTE: Advance copy delivered to DIA, NIN.

HEADQUARTERS  
HAMILTON AIR FORCE BASE and 78TH COMBAT SUPPORT GROUP  
United States Air Force  
Hamilton Air Force Base, California 94935



REPLY TO  
ATTN OF: SGOTN-BO

1 Dec 1964

SUBJECT: UFO

TO: AFSC (FTD)  
Wright Patterson AFB, Ohio

1. The enclosed UFO sighting was reported to the Mill Valley Radar Site (ADC) as the enclosed letter indicates. However, by the time the information reached this office, it was too late for an on-the-spot investigation.
2. This same phenomenon was seen by several other persons. Since their reports coincide with the enclosed information, statements were not obtained.
3. The person who supplied the report and the color slide is a professional photographer.
4. Probable identity of this object has not been determined. As far as can be determined, there were no weather balloons or missiles in the area at the time of the sighting.

FOR THE COMMANDER

*Edward O. Willeford*

EDWARD O. WILLEFORD  
Lt Colonel, USAF  
Chief, Base Ops & Tng Div



4 Atch:

1. Ltr Mr ████████ to Lt Wolfram
2. Ltr Mr ████████ to Maj Walls
3. Ltr Lt Wolfram to Mr ████████
4. Film



Lieutenant Walfram,

In reply to your letter on the 5th, here are some details. The sighting was made on Monday, November 2 at 18:20 to 18:40 hours or 6:20 PM to 6:40 PM civilian time. I was on Bayshore Freeway and the object was toward skyline.

I first noticed "it" at the Whipple street turnoff in Redwood city. The object appeared to be left and slightly north of me and appeared to be west of the coast range of hills. The object appeared to be composed of several lights connected together and rotating in a counter clockwise direction. The object kept constant speed of about 80-90 miles per hour - it was slightly faster than the traffic on Bayshore but slower than any aircraft I have seen. The lights did not blink but were a steady white light which slowly went to pale orange back to white to orange to white etc. Also, at times the single lights appeared to merge to form a one continuous round light similar to the round fluorescent tubes formed in a circle sometimes used in lighting a kitchen. Something like this →  it might be described as a ring of light. Then it would switch back to individual lights again like this  the rotation was about every 5 or ten seconds and was constant.

I stopped the car and got out twice and it appeared no different. The path of the object was roughly parallel to the coast, possibly a little toward the ocean. I saw it until I turned off of Bayshore for I had to go to work

atch #1

Major Walls,

In answer to your call, here is a description as I remember it.

Going back to work at 6:20, I turned onto Bayshore Freeway from the Whipple Street overpass at Redwood City and proceeded north. A bright light in the West caught my eye and I looked over. I saw a bright object going roughly parallel to my line of travel although later it headed more to the ocean. Anyway, the object was about 20-30 degrees above the horizon and seemed to stay at a steady altitude, in speed, it was a little faster than the traffic on Bayshore. The color of the light(s) ~~the~~ went from white to orange to white etc. The lights were rotating counterclockwise. Also, the object appeared to change from several smaller lights to merge into a "ring of light" then go back to single lights then merge again and so on. Duration of observation was 15 minutes for I had to turn off Bayshore at Peninsular Avenue to go to work. I stopped the car twice and got out just to be sure I was actually seeing something.

Color slides were taken. Only one (1) is good enough to get data from. Here is information on that picture. Film was Agfa Chrome CT-18. Exposure  $\frac{1}{125}$  sec. f/2.8. The camera is a Leica M-3. The lens is a 90 millimeter focal length  $\frac{1}{2}$  Summicron (SUMMICRON)

atch #2



As to my background, I am a professional photographer, I was in the ground observer corps and I am an astronomer. Thus I have experience in observing sky phenomena such as weather balloons, meteors, aircraft at night, bright planets, aurora borealis, helicopters at night, heat inversions and so on. Also, the object had no noise.

The color slide is being sent ~~and~~ in a separate package to make sure it will not be damaged in the mails.

Sincerely yours  
~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

666 Radar Sq (SAGE)(ADC)  
MILL VALLEY AFS

666C10

UFO Report

Mr. ~~Robert [redacted]~~

1. I tried to call you several times today but was unable to make contact.
2. So that the Air Force can better evaluate your report of sighting an UFO it will be necessary to forward the following information to Base Operations at Hamilton AFB, California.
  - a. Place, time and date of sighting.
  - b. Approximately how long the object was in sight.
  - c. Since a camera was used it will be necessary for Base Operations to make duplicates of the negatives. They would appreciate it if you would send them the film developed or not, and also the following information.
    - (1) Type camera used
    - (2) Type and make of lens
    - (3) Focal length of lens
    - (4) Shutter speed
    - (5) F-stop
    - (6) Brand and type of film
3. Any future reportings should be made directly to Base Operations at Hamilton. They are better equipped and can handle sightings much faster.

Sincerely

*Gerald D. Wolfram*  
GERALD D. WOLFRAM  
1st Lt. USAF  
Information Officer

*atch #3*

3 Nov 67



22 January 1965

Dear Mr. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

This is in reply to your observation of an unidentified flying object on the night of 2 November 1964 and the photograph taken of this object.

The analysis and microscopic study of the 35mm film has been completed. The area of interest was enlarged to a power of 20 and is attached for your use.


The conclusions of the study after photo analysis are as follows: (1) No true photographic image is visible on the clip. (2) The visible image could be a film flaw or a duplicated flaw or chip in the emulsion. (3) The constant density from film edge to film edge could indicate that the film was not exposed in a camera but in the open. Also, it appears that the photograph was taken after dark while the time of the sighting was reported as dusk. This could indicate that the film could have been accidentally exposed without your knowledge.

From the data presented in your report we are unable to make a positive identification of the object you observed. The size of the object was indicated as the size of a fifty-cent piece held at arm's length. This indicates an object of tremendous size since the size of the moon is less than a dime held at arm's length. Your description and time motion sequence were not included. There were two particular temperature inversions in the area, one at 480 feet and the other at 550 feet. The position of the object was given as 20 degrees elevation, 330 degrees azimuth. Disappearance azimuth was reported. No major astronomical object appeared in this location.

SAC

11-22-64

Major Walls,  
Sorry to take so long but things just kept piling up. Anyway, the slide is enclosed between the two pieces of black cardboard. When ~~apds~~ opened, the slide will look like this ↓




The ~~four~~ four (4) crosslines are for visual identification of the ~~of~~ object just connect the two coordinates and the object will be at the intersection but upside down because in this position it is set up for projection from a slide projector.

If there are any questions, let me know and I will answer if I can.

~~Redwood City~~  
~~California~~  
Redwood City  
CALIFORNIA  
~~Redwood City~~ (after 6 PM)

To leave message - Business Phone # ~~Redwood City~~



2 Nov 64  
Redwood City, Cal.

20+

The following information is requested for analysis of the visual observation: (1) A local map of the area and the location (direction of object from the observer's location) including azimuth and location of the object observed. (2) A time motion sequence of the object's flight in relation to the motion of your car and the direction and flight path of the object after the car was stopped. (3) Of particular interest is the manner of disappearance of the object. (4) Any information pertaining to the description of the object in changes, size, or intensity are also desired.

We regret the delay in asking for this information and hope that the data requested may not have been forgotten with the passage of time.

Sincerely,

MASTON M. JACKS  
Major, USAF  
Public Information Division  
Office of Information

1 Atch  
Photo

Mr. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~  
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~  
Redwood City, California

OFFICIAL FILE COPY

TDEW

UFO Sighting and Photo, Redwood City, California, 2 Nov 64 5 Jan 65

Hq USAF SAFOI PB (Mrs Hunt)  
Wash D C 20330

This office is in receipt of a UFO report from ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ of ~~XXXXXXXXXX Street~~, Redwood City, California. The following is a suggested reply:

Dear Mr. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

This is in reply to your observation of an unidentified flying object on the night of 2 November 1964 and the photograph taken of this object.

The analysis and microscopic study of the 35mm film has been completed. The area of interest was enlarged to a power of twenty and is attached for your use.

The conclusions of the study after photo analysis are as follows:  
(1) No true photographic image is visible on the chip, (2) The visible image could be a film flaw or a duplicated flaw or chip in the emulsion, (3) The constant density from film edge to film edge could indicate that the film was not exposed in a camera, but rather had exposed in the open. Also, it appears that the photograph was taken after dark, while the time of the sighting was reported as dusk. This would tend to indicate that the film could quite likely have been exposed without your knowledge.

From the data presented in your report we are unable to make a positive identification of the object which you observed. The size of the object was indicated as the size of a fifty cent piece held at arms length. The size of the moon is less than a dime at arms length. This indicates an object of tremendous size while the remainder of the description indicates a much smaller object. The duration and time motion sequence was not included. There were two particular temperature inversions in the area, one at 480 ft and the other at

OFFICIAL FILE COPY

550 ft. The position of the object was given as 20 degrees elevation, 330 degrees azimuth, disappearance was listed on the same heading but no elevation or azimuth was reported. No major astronomical object appeared in this location.

We had hoped that the photograph would reveal an identifiable image. However, photo analysis revealed that the image on the print is not the same as the object observed by you.

The following information is desirable for analysis of the visual observation: (1) A local map of the area and the location (direction of object from the observers location) including azimuth and location of the object observed, (2) A time motion sequence of the object's flight in relation to the motion of your car and the direction and flight path of the object after the car was stopped, (3) Of particular interest is the manner of disappearance of the object, (4) Any information pertaining to the description of the object in changes, in size, or intensity are also desired.

We regret the delay in asking for this information and hope that some of the data requested may not have been forgotten with the passage of time. We had expected the photograph to reveal the true nature of the image.

The Air Force wishes to take this opportunity to thank you for your interest in unidentified flying objects and your reported observation.

FOR THE COMMANDER

ERIC T de JONCKHEERE  
Colonel, USAF  
Deputy for Technology  
and Subsystems

1 Atch  
~~Attachment~~ Photo, 2 Nov 64

OFFICIAL FILE COPY

OFFICIAL FILE COPY

TDEW/Maj Quintanilla/69216

UFO Sighting, 2 Nov 62, Redwood City, California

23 Dec 64

SGOIN-BO  
78th Combat Support Group  
Hamilton AFB, California 94935

1. Reference your letter, SGOIN-BO, 1 Dec 64, subject UFO.
2. Attached is one slide taken by [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] St, Redwood City, California on 2 Nov 64. It is requested that this film be returned to him with an explanation that due to a backlog in duplication of film and analysis that an evaluation has not been made regarding his sighting as yet. He will be informed of our evaluation upon completion.

FOR THE COMMANDER

ERIC T de JONCKHEERE  
Colonel, USAF  
Deputy for Technology  
and Subsystems

1 Atch  
a/s

PHOTO ANALYSIS REPORT

NR 64-64

PAGE 1 OF 1 PAGES

DATE OF REPORT 16 December 1964

SUBJECT UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

LOCATION Redwood City, California

DATE

PHOTOGRAPHY

AF \_\_\_\_\_ IR \_\_\_\_\_ QUALITY Poor

P NRS One 35MM color slide provided by TDEW

1. PURPOSE: This report answers work order #64-120 submitted by Major H. Quintanilla TDEW. The request forwarded a photo and color slide of a purported unidentified flying object.

2. ANALYSIS: Microscopic study of the attached 35MM slide by the photo analysts and photo processing personnel resulted in the following conclusions.

- a. No true photographic image is visible on the chip.
- b. The visible image could be film flaw or a duplicated flaw or chip in the emulsion.
- c. The constant density from film edge to film edge could indicate that the film was not exposed in a camera, but rather had been exposed in the open.

PHOTO ANALYSIS BY:

*Charles A. Radler*  
CHARLES A. RADER, Captain, USAF  
Photo Interpreter

APPROVED BY:

*William L. Turner*  
WILLIAM L. TURNER  
Captain, USAF  
Chief, Photo Analysis Division

*Wilber Price, Jr.*  
WILBER PRICE, JR.  
Director, Photo Exploitation Directorate

UNCLASSIFIED

# ENGINEERING SUPPORT WORK REQUEST

ENGINEERING ANALYSIS     
  PHOTO ANALYSIS     
  MACHINE COMPUTATION

PPT NUMBER: A68002

DESCRIPTION OF WORK: Request analysis of image on attached photo.

REFERENCE MATERIAL: Case File, 2 Nov 64, Redwood City, California, ~~Photos~~ Photos.  
 Request return of case file upon completion of analysis.

REQUESTED BY RECTOR CHIVANILLA, JR MAJOR     
 SYMBOL TDEW/UFO     
 PHONE 69216/66378

I CERTIFY THAT THIS WORK IS AUTHORIZED BY ME AND THAT IT HAS THE FOLLOWING PRIORITY AND DEADLINE WITHIN MY DIVISION.

PRIORITY	DEADLINE DATE	SIGNATURE OF APPROVING DIVISION CHIEF	DATE
	23 Dec 64		

ENGINEERING SUPPORT MONITOR \_\_\_\_\_ ASSISTANT \_\_\_\_\_

FINAL WORK TO BE IN FORM OF :

ENGINEERING NOTE     
  COMPUTATION     
  PI REPORT     
  DRAWING     
  PROGRAM

WORK REQUEST APPROVED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ DEADLINE DATE \_\_\_\_\_

PRIORITY NUMBER   
 ONE                     
 TWO                     
 THREE

WORK ORDER NUMBER

ORIGINAL FILE COPY

This case includes one (1) 8" x 10"  
photograph and one (1) 9½" x 10"  
negative.