

PROJECT 10073 RECORD CARD

1. DATE 21-22 Mar 58	2. LOCATION Seaside Park, N.J.		12. CONCLUSIONS <input type="checkbox"/> Was Balloon <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Balloon <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Balloon <input type="checkbox"/> Was Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Aircraft <input type="checkbox"/> Was Astronomical <input type="checkbox"/> Probably Astronomical <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly Astronomical <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient Data for Evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
3. DATE-TIME GROUP Local _____ GMT 21-22/0945Z	4. TYPE OF OBSERVATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ground-Visual <input type="checkbox"/> Ground-Radar <input type="checkbox"/> Air-Visual <input type="checkbox"/> Air-Intercept Radar		
5. PHOTOS <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	6. SOURCE Civilian		
7. LENGTH OF OBSERVATION 3-4 mins	8. NUMBER OF OBJECTS one	9. COURSE ENE	
10. BRIEF SUMMARY OF SIGHTING Elliptical obj, size of large grape-fruit. Length approx 2 times as long. White to yellow light reflected on water. Steady slow course fm over water toward land. Disappeared prior to arrival over land. Two rpts, sme time succeeding days. Different observers.		11. COMMENTS Astro plot & computer indicate the star Vega was practically in position given by observers. At point of initial observation, Venus was exceptionally bright, however location near 60 deg & lower. Investigators considered possible a/c sighting. Insufficient data. Terminal point of observation not included. Duration too short for Astro sighting at this elev.	

O SQG031 YDD038 TYD038 TMA124 TTE02 ZJRA052

PP RJEPHQ RJEPNB RJEPNY RJEDDN RJEDSQ

DE RJEPJR 40A

P 241700Z

FM COMDR 539TH FIS

TO RJEDDN/COMDR ADC

RJEPNY/COMDR 26ADIV

RJEDSQ/COMDR AIR TECH INT CNTR

RJEPHQ/ASST CHIEF OF STAFF INTELL HQ USAF

RJEPHQ/OFFICE OF INFO SERV HQ USAF

INFO RJEPNB/CMMDR EADF

ZEN/COMDR NY AIR DEF SECTOR

BT

/UNCLAS/539FIS 0127 INT. ATTN: CIC: SUBJECT UFO.

1. DESCRIPTION:

A. ELLIPTICAL

B. DIAMETER OF LARGE GRAPEFRUIT; LENGTH APPROXIMATELY TWO TIMES

AS LONG.

C. WHITE TO LIGHT YELLOW (REFLECTED ON WATER)

D. ONE

E. N/A

F. NONE

G. NONE

H. NONE HEARD. OBSERVER MADE LITTLE EFFORT TO LISTEN FOR

SOUNDS.

I. NONE

2. DESCRIPTION OF COURSE

A. SIZE OF BRIGHT OBJECT

B. ELEVATION - 60 DEGREES, AZIMUTH 060 DEGREES

C. OBSERVERS COULD NOT ESTIMATE

D. STEADY APPARENTLY SLOW COURSE FROM OVER WATER TOWARDS LAND.

E. DISAPPEARED PRIOR TO ARRIVAL OVER LAND

ATIC
PASS ~~VEGA~~ R

11
2/7/54
3/1/54
4/4/54
C

Observer apparently wasn't
too dispassionate about the
sighting at the time.

Astros Computer
shows VEGA
has

36

07 22

03 40 53

3. MANNER OF OBSERVATION

A. GROUND VISUAL

B. NONE

C. N/A

4. TIME & DATE OF SIGHTING

A. 21-22/0945Z MARCH (SIGHTED TWO DIFFERENT DAYS & SAME TIME

AND PLACE.

0945 - 5 = 0445

*Note
Same position
2 days*

B. NIGHT

5. BOTH SIGHTINGS MADE FROM SEASIDE PARK, NEW JERSEY

6. IDENTIFYING INFO OF ALL OBSERVERS

A. FIRST SIGHTING

PATROLMAN J. CASTOR-59

120 "L" STREET, SEASIDE PARK, NEW JERSEY

LOCAL POLICEMAN

SECOND SIGHTING

PATROLMAN ANDERSON -29

120 5TH AVENUE, SEASIDE PARK, NEW JERSEY

LOCAL POLICEMAN

PATROLMAN LEE-52

SEASIDE HEIGHTS, NEW JERSEY

LOCAL POLICEMAN

PATROLMAN S. BREATHWEIGHT -60

WEBSTER AVENUE, SEASIDE HEIGHTS, NEW JERSEY

LOCAL POLICEMAN

B. N/A

7. WEATHER

A. CLEAR SPARSELY SCATTERED SMALL CLOUDS

B. 212600Z

SURFACE 350DEG 15KT

6,000: 70DEG 30KT

12,000: 350DEG 20KT

18,000: 300DEG 10KT

*4:45 AM
Mar 21-22
View S.E.
2nd hill
Toward 2nd hill
morning*

20,000:	LIGHT	VAR
220600Z		
SURFACE	270DEG	10KT
6,000:	330DEG	30KT
12,000:	340DEG	25KT
16,000:	320DEG	25KT
20,000:	300DEG	10KT
30,000:	3000DEG	55KT
50,000:	270DEG	30KT

*astro plot and computer
 also indicate star Vega
 was practically in position
 given by observers*

- D. CLEAR
- D. EXCELLENT
- E. SCATTERED
- F. NONE

clouds

G. NONE KNOWN

H. NO ACTION TAKEN

I. 646TH AC & W SQUADRON REPORTED NO KNOWN ACTIVITY IN AREA ON DATES OR TIME OF SIGHTINGS.

J. INTELLIGENCE OFFICER 539TH FIGHTER INTERCEPTOR SQUADRON, OBSERVER CONTACTED (PATROLMAN CASTOR) SEEMED COMPLETELY RELIABLE. PROVISIONAL ANALYSIS - POSSIBLE NAVY P2V NEPTUNE EQUIPPED WITH SEARCHLIGHT OR JET AIRCRAFT IN AFTERBURNER. LAKEHURST WAS NOTIFIED OF SIGHTING 210915Z BY OBSERVER; NO KNOWN ACTION WAS TAKEN.

K. NONE

4/2145Z MAR RJEPJR

The star Vega has been in the position given for centuries, as has other astro bodies. The four observers probably saw the same object, possibly under different weather conditions, several times and apparently didn't consider it hostile. It seems that since the start of the 'flying saucer' era, stars and planets appear hostile to some people.

*Review of 20
 1-2-50
 3-3-50
 4-1-50
 4-16*

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
ASTROPHYSICAL OBSERVATORY

SECTION OF UPPER ATMOSPHERE STUDIES
IGY OPTICAL SATELLITE TRACKING PROGRAM
60 GARDEN STREET
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

May 23, 1958

Captain George T. Gregory
Hqtrs, Air Technical Intelligence Center
Box 9307
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

Dear Captain:

I now have had a chance to look through all the reports you sent, and the one concerning the "satellite-type sighting" from Denver interests me very much and I am giving it the full treatment. It is clear that this could not have been any of the American satellites, not only because of the excessive brightness, but because no American satellite at present could be seen approaching from the northwest at the latitude of Denver. On April 30th there were no known Russian Sputnik's up, but even had there been it is almost inconceivable that objects that bright would escape detection by our Moonwatch teams. This is a corker; so much so, that I wish I had the time and the opportunity to talk with these two officers. It could be that in casual conversation some clue might be obtained which is not apparent in their report.

I had an experience the other night which may bear on this. I had been instructing my young daughter in figuring sidereal time, and we had gone out on the lawn to check our calculations when there came along a sputnik-like object---correct brightness, correct speed, correct color, and I almost stood agnast. There was no sound. A few minutes later another such object came through in another direction, and then a few minutes still another. On the third one I was able to detect over ambient noises the sound of jet motors. Lights were not blinking. If the other object had not gone through I might honestly be puzzled to this day as to whether I had seen an unknown satellite. I didn't know that jets ever carried such lights.

It is almost inconceivable two such experienced officers could have made the mistake I had first made, but strange things do happen. In the meantime, I am having this observation checked against all other "unknown sputnik's" that our teams from time to time reported.

As to the other cases, which I am returning (I will return the Denver case very soon), we certainly seem to have a fine bunch of meteor observations--five of them. Two others remain: one, the object that was seen the same time on two nights just before sunrise

(period of morning twilight had already begun). Vega was, as you say, near the point of sighting but it seems to me that it was somewhat higher than 60°. There was of course a very fine spectacular object in the sky at that time but, unfortunately, in the southeastern sky. The planet Venus was at its brightest in the pre-sunrise sky, and I know from past experience how easily it can be mistaken for an unknown object. My only reaction is to question the stated position and to consider the possibility that it was Venus.

The case of the "daylight meteor" is greatly ambiguous. While a daylight fireball cannot be ruled out, I would myself favor the accidental release of some object from an aircraft. However, much hinges on the statement "orange flame". If it really was flaming then it looks as though we must accredit this to a daylight meteor. If the light was simply a bright reflection of sunlight, then we have the other possibility. In either case, there is nothing hostile, and I say to this "insufficient information to be able to distinguish between daylight meteor or object falling from aircraft". I don't think it is worthwhile to pursue this one, although I think if I could talk to the chap a better analysis might be made. It just occurs to me that perhaps the object might have been a burst weather or cosmic ray balloon, with the reflection from the trailing material accounting for the "tail four times the diameter of object". In fact, I think this is a distinct possibility since it occurred in the neighborhood of the municipal airport from which, I suppose, balloons are launched. The time of observation was 4:00 p.m., their time which, I believe, is about the time of such launchings. So, three possibilities: daylight meteor---part of aircraft---burst balloon. All harmless but, I now tend to prefer the latter.

I am looking forward to visiting you in your new quarters--- I hope in early June.

Cheers,

J. Allen Hynek

JAH:lc

Encls.