PROJECT 10073 RECORD

1. DATE - TIME GROUP 12 June 1947	2. LOCATION Weiser, Idaho
3. SOURCE Civilian	10. CONCLUSION Other (CONTRAILS)
4. NUMBER OF OBJECTS One	
5. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION Several Seconds	11. BRIEF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS Object shot up and down before leveling out with a glistening trail.
6. TYPE OF OBSERVATION Ground-Visual	
7. COURSE SE	
8. PHOTOS ☐ Yes XX No	
9. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE ☐ Yes XX No	

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

CSUDO — UFOW — UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Interview # 21

2. Time [illegible] evening

3. Location Weiser, Idaho

4. Name of Observer [redacted]

5. Occupation of Observer Ferry Student

6. Address of Observer #2, Weiser, Idaho

7. Place of observation Weiser, Idaho toward the river

8. Number of objects 1 at first observation 1 more

9. Distance of object from observer Not stated

10. Time in sight few seconds

11. Altitude Not stated

12. Speed Not stated

13. Direction of flight South eastward, downward

14. Path of flight Straight and slant

15. Sound None

16. Size Not stated due to fact away, no determine

17. Color Glistening in the sun

18. Shape Not stated due to fast away, no determine

19. Other distorted Not stated

20. Apparent construction Fuzzy object with a streamed vapor

21. Behavior details Vapor looked like clouds, kept shape and seemed to glide across the sky to the east.

22. Weather conditions Clear

23. Effect on clouds Not stated

24. Sketches or photographs None

25. Manner of disappearance only a glisten and vapor could no longer be see

26. Remarks (over)

On the evening of June 12 at [illegible] 6:15, a neighbor and I return[illegible] home from another neighbors, glanced into the sky toward the West, and saw what we thought was smoke from an airplane. She mentioned that she had never seen that before, so we stopped to look and listen, thinking we would see the plane. But there was no sound. So we kept looking until we saw a tiny object from which the vapor was [illegible]. It was so far away we could not determine the size or even the shape. Its only identity was a glisten in the sun. We had watched this one for a few seconds, when from the general direction of the sun, another object shot into the sky. It followed the general direction of the first, shooting up and down before settling to a south-easterly course across the sky, where we followed them until they were only a glisten and the vapor could no longer be seen. After the objects were gone, we continued to look and to watch the vapor that had been left which now looked like clouds but kept a shape, and this shape seemed to glide across the sky to the East where there was a black streak leading to the horizon. The vapor stayed in the sky for over an hour.

HEADQUARTERS
AIR MATERIEL COMMAND
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Dayton, Ohio

MCIAXO-3/RMB/ra
Jan 5 1949

1 MCIAXO

SUBJECT: Project "SIGN"

TO: Chief, Air Weather Service,
Andrews Air Force Base,
Washington 25, D. C.
ATTN: DSS

1. Project "SIGN" is responsible for the collection, investigation and interpretation of data relative to sighting of unidentified flying objects. Attached Incident Summaries 1 thru 172 from the files of Project "SIGN" are forwarded for study and recommendations as to which of the incidents may be eliminated as balloons released on routine synoptic ascents by the Air Weather Service, the Navy Aerological Service or the United States Weather Bureau. The summaries attached may be retained in your headquarters for working and reference purposes.

2. The Air Weather Service is the only agency of its type that has been asked to assist in the accomplishment of Project "SIGN" except that the United States Weather Bureau has provided information on ball lightning. Research projects in which balloons are used and which are conducted or sponsored by the Army, Navy or United States Air Force are checked by the Intelligence Department of this Command. These checks areusually made direct from the Project "SIGN" Office, MCIAXO-3. These checks are distinct from the check of synoptic balloon flights made by weather service stations of the Air Force, the Navy and the Department of Commerce. (U. S. Weather Bureau) requested of Air Weather Service.

3. It is the opinion of this office that the below listed incidents are those having the greatest possibility of being balloons. This list does not eliminate the possibility that many of the remaining incidents are balloons.

2	24	50	91	113	155
3	25	52	92	115	156
4	28	72	96	126	157
11	30	73	104	141	159
14	31	81	105	148	163
16	32	87	107,8,9	151	167
22	33	89	112(See122)	154	169
23	48				

T-84481-A

Hq AMC, Chief, Air Weather Service, Washington 25, D. C.
Subj: Project "SIGN"

4. The form used in interrogating witnesses to sightings is inclosed as a matter of interest. Comment as to possible improvement of the "Essential Elements of Information" in regard to routine synoptic balloon flights is invited.

5. It is requested that correspondence be forwarded to the Commanding General, Headquarters, Air Materiel Command, attention MCIAXO-3.

FOR THE COMMANDING GENERAL:

/s/ W. R. Clingerman, Col, USAF
for H. M. McCOY
Colonel, USAF
Chief, Intelligence Dept

2 Incls:
Summaries 1-172 incl
"EEI"

Copies furnished:

AFOIR, Hq. USAF
Capt Trakowski, Geophysics Lab
Major Kodis, MCREEP
Colonel Neal, MCLAWS

T-84451-A

Dr HYNEK'S EVALUATIONS EXTRACTED FROM PROJECT GRUDGE REPORT.

EVIDENT INDEX

1. Astronomical

a. High probability:
#26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 48, 49, 59, 60, 66, 69, 70, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 116, 119, 132, 136, 140, 147, 148, 156, 174, 184, 185, 187, 197, 203, 204, 208, 216, 219, 238.

b. Fair or low probability:
#19, 20, 23, (24), 28, 35, 36, 46, 50, 63, 67, 80, 82, 93, 100, 112, 120, 121, 129, 130, 144, 153, 163, 166, 167, 175, 192, 199, 202, 205, 220, 230, 240.

2. Non-astronomical but suggestive of other explanations

a. Balloons or ordinary aircraft:
#3, 11, 22, 41, 42, 53, 54, 73, 81, 83, 91, 92, 113, 114, 115, 126, 131, 138, 141, 145, 155, 156, 157, 159, 160, 161, 163, 169, 171, 173, 178, 180, 182, 188, 190, 194, 195, 196, 198, 200, 201, 209, 210, 217, 222, 235, 237, 239.

b. Rockets, flares or falling bodies:
#4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 25, 56, 65, 78, 106, 107, 108, 109, 133, 170, 211, 218.

c. Miscellaneous (reflections, auroral streamers, birds, etc.):
#39, 89, 123, 124, 128, 146, 164, 181, 189, 214, 221, 231, 234.

3. Non-astronomical, with no explanation evident

a. Lack of evidence precludes explanation:
#38, 44, 45, 47, 55, 57, 72, 86, 87, 88, 90, 99, 110, 117, 118, 125, 127, 137, 139, 149, 150, 177, 179, 191, 206, 212, 213, 229, 232, 233.

b. Evidence offered suggests no explanation:
#1, 2, 10, 17, 21, 29, 37, 40, 51, 52, 58, 61, 62, 64, 68, 71, 75, 76, 77, 79, 84, 105, 111, 122, 135, 151, 152, 154, 162, 168, 172, 176, 183, 186, 193, 207, 215, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 236, 241, 242, 243, 244, 134.

[redacted]

Incident #24 -- Weiser, Idaho -- 12 June 1947

There is nothing in the description of this incident that is fatal to the hypothesis that the objects observed were parts of a "double fireball," but any such identification must remain uncertain.

The most convincing element favoring the meteoric hypothesis is the persistent train. Fireballs occasionally leave trains that persist for over an hour.

As far as trajectory is concerned, this is in agreement with that to be expected from a meteor on its way out from the sun (it having gone toward the sun several weeks previously and now being on its return journey toward outer space). Such a fireball would be travelling relatively slowly, and could appear to "shoot out from the sun" and to travel in a southeasterly direction.

The absence of bright flare and of noise is not unusual, since reported daylight meteors are frequently not luminous (but do leave a trail), and often no noise is heard.

Nor is the fact that there were two such objects fatal to the hypothesis. The object could easily have been single and have broken in two, either in its journey around the sun or upon entering the earth's atmosphere. There have been several cases of comets that were single on their trip toward the sun and double on the way out. Since comets and meteors are closely related as far as structure is concerned, the double feature is entirely possible.

- more -

[redacted]

[redacted]

The shooting up and down might be dismissed as subjective and illusory, although small bits shooting off from the main meteor could also give this effect.

In spite of all this, this investigator would prefer a terrestrial explanation for the incident.

[redacted]