

P U F O I C

PLYMOUTH U.F.O. INVESTIGATION CENTRE.
Est: 1978.

INVESTIGATION & RESEARCH INTO
UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Section 40

Ref:- PUF01C - 42/85 (Cpř 38/85)

17th May 85

Dear Community Relations Officer,

I am the Chairman of the above Society, and also the Regional Investigations Officer - South- West, for the British U.F.O. Research Association. (B.U.F.O.R.A.).

This is my second letter to you - during a telephone conversation, to your Establishment today, they were not aware of my previous one, therefore, I am writing you another.

I am writing to request an appointment with you, hopefully in the near future to talk about a U.F.O. sighting that occurred early February. The sighting was extremely close to the perimeter of your Base and we believe that the object might have 'landed' on the ground, for some time. Our belief here, lies with evidence of a 'landing' in the discovery of an area of damaged and burned grass, soil and trees, and also another tree that has been hit at the top, snapping several large branches off it. It is this, that I feel more relevant.

Obviously we have not dismissed the possibility, that whatever caused this damage, and more importantly, what our witness observed, was in fact some form of aircraft being tested from RAF St Mawgan. However I must add, that, when airborne, the craft was only 8 -15ft above the ground!

Should you be unable to account for this sighting, then did you manage to record it on your radar system, at the Base? Our own calculations indicate the object could have passed over the Base.

Since my last letter to you, we have taken radioactivity readings at the areas of damage, stated above, and I am happy to report there were no abnormalities detected. However, following the hypothetical theories put forward, which were neither denied, nor confirmed by the M.O.D. ; at RAF Woodbridge in Suffolk, after their strange incident in December 1980, our own theories must be similar to those in Suffolk, which were:-
(a) UFO - (b) crashed aerial craft (c) experimental craft, or (d) missile going astray. I state these simply because the description of the Woodbridge incident, and the one close to your Base, were nearly identical both in description and in size, and also aerial capability.

We thought that the best way to begin our task of solving this sighting, is to ask your advice, prior to approaching D.S.S. in London.

We look forward to your reply to this correspondence.

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40

CHAIRMAN - PUF01C.
REGIONAL INVESTIGATIONS OFFICER - B.U.F.O.R.A.
(S.W. 001).