	PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD			
	Washington, D.C.		Conculsions  Co Was Baltons  Co Probably L. con	
PHOTOS  C Yes  C Yes  C Yes		C Air-Intercept Radar	D Was Aircraft D Probably Aircraft D Possibly Aircraft D Probably Aircraft D Probably Astronomical D Possibly Astronomical D Possibly Astronomical	
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION  one hour	5. NUMBER OF OBJECTS	9. COURSE	Insufficient Data for Evaluation Unknown	
Stationary - feded and glowed.		Stationary light, on and off - possibly a warning beacon in water tank building.  Report scant - no weather. No elevation of object above the horison.		

ATIC FORM 329 (REV 26 SEP 52)

1. attai RADES WPA102 YDA106 TYEGOO TDCØ76 JEPHQ B65 PP JEDUP JEDEN JEPLG 333 DE JEPHQ Ø3A P 290538Z ZNJ FM HQ USAF WASHDC TO JEDWP/CGAIRDEFCOM ENT AFB COLO JEDEN/CHIEF ATIC WRIGHT PATTERSON AFB FROM AFOIN 56755 FLYOBRPT. ATTN CLN ATIAA -2C. ONE UNIDENTIFIED OBJECT OBSERVED OVER WASHINGTON CMA D.C. SIZE OF OBJECT COULD NOT BE DETERMINED. NO AERODYNAMIC FEATURES NOTED. NO TRAIL OR EXHAUST NOTED . OBJECT WAS STATIONARY AND FADED AND GLOWED AT INTERVALS. OBJECT FLOWED BRILLIANTLY-FROM WHAT APPEARED A CONTROLLED LIGHT. OBJECT SIGHTED AT 2200 28 AUGUST BY MR WHO IS A NAVY VETERAN AND CLAIMS TO BE FAMILIAR WITH ASTRONOMY AND AIRCRAFT TYPES. RELIABILITY UNKNOWN. FIVE OTHER ADULTS OBSERVED THE OBJECT FOR APPROXIMATELY ONE HOUR. TWO AIRCRAFT PASSED OVER THE AREA DURING THE OBSERVATION. EACH TIME THE LIGHT FADED AND REAPPEARED AFTER THE AIRCRAFT HAD PASSED. A VISUAL CROUND OBSERVATION WITH BINNOCULARS WAS MADE. WEATHER CLEAR AND VISIBILITY PERFECT. 29/Ø641Z AUG JEPHQ

## PROJECT 10073 WORKSHEET

I. GENERAL

1. GENE	MAL
A. DATE   2. LOCATION	3. TIME 2 3 3
	Toonle 27 -
WAS OBJECT OBSERVED FROM THE GROUND?	Zebra:
WAS CHUECT OBSERVED FROM THE GROUND?	L) Yos C) No
	□ Naked Eye
	Binoculars
	Toloscope
	[] Theodolite
. WAS OBJECT OBSERVED BY GROUND RADAR?	[] Yes [] No
	LI By One Sot
	☐ By Taro Sets
	Dy Three Sets
. WAS OBJECT OBSERVED FROM THE AIR?	☐ You . □ No
	MC Observed Object
	[]Interception Attempted
	No Intercept Attempted
WERE AIRCRAFT SCHAMBLED TO INTERCEPT?	[] Yes El No
	A/C Scrambled
	DVisual Contact Made
	CIN/I Contact Made
	Ci No Contact Mado
S. DID OBJECT CHANGE DIRECTION AT ANY TILE?	☐ Yes ☐ INo
	[] Normal
	[]Violent
9. IF OBJECT WAS A "LIGHT", WAS IT:	E-inlinking
	[] Steady
TO. LENGTH OF TIME IN SIGHT:	(11-15 Seconds
	CJ 1-5 Minutes
	Flover 10 Minutes / ha
11. REPORTING AGENCY (Unit Number and Pailing	
II. ASTRONOL	
12. WHAT ASTRONOMICAL ACTIVITY WAS NUTED?	
13. DID OBJECT APPEAR TO ARCH DOWNWARD?	L'I Yes Lilio
14. DID OBJECT HAVE A TAIL?	[] Yes [L) No
15. DID OBJECT APPEAR TO DISINTEGRATE?	l'iYes ErNo
16. TIME OF SIGHTING RELATIVE TO SUNRISE OR ST	
	Wight
	L! Day
	L. Sunrise
	[   Sunset
III. AIRC	RAFT DATA
17. WERE AIRCRAFT NOTED IN AREA?	TYes Dic
	Cone Aircraft
	Diore Than One Aircraft
18. WAS ANY SOUND HEARD?	[2] He
19. WERE THERE INDICATIONS OF HIGH BACKGROUND	NOISE'V Yes
CO. WAS THE OBJECT VIEWED ABOVE 450 ELEVATION	

## IV. BALLOON DATA

	THE SINCE SCHEDULED BALLOON RELEAS		HTTNG:				
23. POSSIBLE BALLOON LAUNCH SITES DOWNW				[ Idghted?			
_	Location	Тура	Launching Agency	Yes No	Lighting		
a.	10800A	Boursey,	2500 telests	Ren			
b.	11 ( Amore ortice)	silul	U.S. Marca /	unelle	11		
c.	" (Andrews AFR)	railin	19m. 5	4			
d.							
		ttach over					
21	EVALUATION OF SOURCE:	V. EVALUATI	DETAILS OF REPORT	P.			
-1.							
	Cood		Good				
	Fair		Poor				
	Poor Unreliable		Insufficient	t to Evaluat	•		
	Extremely Doubtful	1000					
	[] Hoax						
23.	FINAL EVALUATION:						
Was Balloon Probably Balloon			☐ Was Astronomical				
		Probably Astronomical Possibly Astronomical					
	Possibly Balloon						
Was Aircraft   Probably Aircraft   Possibly Aircraft		Other:					
			Insufficient Data For Evaluation				
			Unknown .				
24.	COLOGENTS:						