

(b)(6)

CTR (USA)

From: Gough, Susan L (Sue) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 6:14 PM
Subject: Establishment of Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Task Force

Media colleagues,

On Aug. 4, 2020, Deputy Secretary of Defense David L. Norquist approved the establishment of an Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP) Task Force (UAPTF). The Department of the Navy, under the cognizance of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security, will lead the UAPTF.

The Department of Defense established the UAPTF to improve its understanding of, and gain insight into, the nature and origins of UAPs. The mission of the task force is to detect, analyze and catalog UAPs that could potentially pose a threat to U.S. national security.

As DOD has stated previously, the safety of our personnel and the security of our operations are of paramount concern. The Department of Defense and the military departments take any incursions by unauthorized aircraft into our training ranges or designated airspace very seriously and examine each report. This includes examinations of incursions that are initially reported as UAP when the observer cannot immediately identify what he or she is observing.

Regards,
Sue Gough
Department of Defense Spokesperson

I need to get back to (b)(6)

(b)(5) [REDACTED]

(b)(5) [REDACTED]

Relatedly, my old boss, now retired VADM Matt Kohler (who was mentioned in the article) got called by the New York Times for comment.

(b)(5)

I'm in the office.

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6) USN (Ret)

N2N6 Strategic Engagements

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

1

(b)(6)

Subject: Article with Follow up query from (b)(6) (CBS)

CHINFO Team, (b)(6) and (b)(6),

The UAP article below (it was in my IW News Clips this morning... (b)(6) --- I've added you to the daily distro) mentions a still photo of a UAP supposedly taken by an F/A 18 pilot using his cellphone. See the portion highlighted.

That article has generated a follow-on query today from (b)(6) of CBS:

"I'm told there really is a cell phone picture taken by an F-18 pilot last year of a triangular shaped UFO. It's part of a classified briefing, but is the cell phone picture itself classified? If the Navy's policy is to release material that would have to be released in response to an FOIA request, can you release the photo? Or do I have to file an FOIA request? If so, who should it go to?

I told (b)(6) (by email) I was trying to contact my expert to get some details on that claim... and that I would get back to him.

No word yet.

CHINFO/Sue,

Wanted to make sure you were aware in case (b)(6) contacted you.

Will keep you posted on what I learn.

Regards,

(b)(6)

(b)(6) USN (Ret)

N2N6 Strategic Engagements

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

'Fast Movers' and Transmedium Vehicles – The Pentagon's Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Task Force

The Debrief, 2 December 2020... by Tim McMillan

In an exclusive feature for The Debrief, U.S. military and intelligence officials, as well as Pentagon emails, offer an unprecedented glimpse behind the scenes of what's currently going on with The Pentagon's investigation into UFOs, or as they term them, "Unidentified Aerial Phenomena" (UAP).

For the last two years, the Department of Defense's newly revamped "Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Task Force" (or UAPTF) has been busy briefing lawmakers, Intelligence Community stakeholders, and the highest levels of the U.S. military on encounters with what they say are mysterious airborne objects that defy conventional explanations.

Along with classified briefings, multiple senior U.S. officials with direct knowledge of the matter say two classified intelligence reports on UAP have been widely distributed to the U.S. Intelligence Community. Numerous sources from various government

agencies told The Debrief that these reports include clear photographic evidence of UAP. The reports also explicitly state that the Task Force is considering the possibility that these unidentified objects could, as stated by one source from the U.S. Intelligence Community said, be operated by “intelligences of unknown origin.”

Significantly, a retired U.S. Air Force brigadier general and head of RAND corporation’s Space Enterprise Initiative has—for the first time—gone on record to discuss some of the most likely explanations for UAP. His responses were surprising.

Briefings At The Highest Levels

In June, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence’s FY2021 Intelligence Authorization Act contained an intriguing section titled report on “Advanced Aerial Threats.” In the inclusion, the committee gave an eye-opening official hint (in recent history) the government takes UFOs seriously by offering its support for the “efforts of the Unidentified Aerial Phenomenon Task Force at the Office of Naval Intelligence.” The Intelligence Committee additionally requested an unclassified report detailing the analysis of “UAP” or “Anomalous Aerial Vehicles.”

Though already acknowledged by the Intelligence Committee, in mid-August, the Pentagon formally acknowledged they had established a task force looking into UAP. In a press announcement, the Secretary of Defense’s Office stated, “the UAPTF’s mission will be to detect, analyze and catalog UAPs that could potentially pose a threat to U.S. national security.” According to the release, authority for the Task Force was approved by the DoD’s chief operating officer, Deputy Secretary of Defense David L. Norquist.

The summer news of the establishment of the UAPTF seemingly suggests—for the first time since the shuttering of Project Blue Book (the Air Force’s official investigations into UFOs) in 1969—that the Pentagon is now taking the subject of UFOs seriously.

However, an internal email obtained by The Debrief shows that almost one year before the DoD’s announcement, the highest levels of the U.S. military were already being briefed on UAP.

The email, obtained via Freedom of Information Act request, shows an October 16th, 2019 exchange between then Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Robert Burke, and current Vice Chief of Staff for the Air Force General Stephen “Steve” Wilson.

In the email, Adm. Burke tells Gen. Wilson, “Recommend you take the brief I just received from our Director of Naval Intelligence VADM Matt Kohler, on Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP).” Adm. Burke concludes the email, “SECNAV [Secretary of the Navy] will get the same brief tomorrow at 1000.”

The “SECNAV” referenced in Adm. Burke’s email was then-Secretary of the Navy, Richard V. Spencer. A little over a month after this UAP briefing, Spencer was fired by then-Secretary of Defense Mark Esper over public disagreements stemming from a series of controversies involving the court-martial of Navy SEAL Eddie Gallagher.

Speaking on background, one U.S. Defense official lamented that a lack of continuity with DoD leadership might have hindered some of the UAPTF’s work. Within the past 24 months, there have been four different Secretaries of the Navy and five additional Secretaries of Defense. Vice Admiral Matt Kohler, noted for having provided the briefings, retired after 36 years with the Navy in June of this year.

Reaching out to several active government officials and individuals who retain their government-issued security clearances, The Debrief learned that last fall was a busy time for the UAPTF. On October 21st, 2019, a briefing on UAP was conducted at the Pentagon for several Senate Armed Services Committee staffers.

Attendees at the meeting told The Debrief that they were provided information on two previous DoD-backed UFO programs: The Advanced Aerial Weapons Systems Applications Program (AAWSAP) and the Advanced Aerospace Threat Identification Program (AATIP). They were also briefed on “highly sensitive categories of UFO investigations.” Only two days later on October 23rd, staffers with the Senate Select Intelligence Committee were provided the same information in a meeting on Capitol Hill.

A former private contractor for AAWSAP and AATIP, Dr. Hal Puthoff, confirmed for The Debrief he was one of a handful of persons who conducted the October briefings. “I have been invited to brief congressional staffers on the Senate Armed Services Committee on UAP matters in the last couple of years,” Puthoff said in an email, “and have done so on more than one occasion.” Dr. Puthoff described the staffers during these meetings as being “engaged,” and provided “positive responses, [and] more details always being requested.”

The Debrief reached out to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Office and DoD Executive Services Office and formally requested an interview with someone authorized to speak on the UAP briefings with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In an email, Senior Strategist and Pentagon spokesperson Susan Gough responded, “To maintain operations security, which includes not disseminating information publicly that may be useful to our adversaries, DOD does not discuss publicly the details of either the observations or the examination of reported incursions into our training ranges or designated airspace, including those incursions initially designated as UAP – and that includes not discussing the UAPTF publicly, also.”

Official public affairs channels indicate the Pentagon is not interested in sharing any more information on the UAP topic. However, several current and former officials with the DoD and individuals working for multiple U.S. intelligence agencies told The Debrief that there was much more going on behind closed doors.

UAP Intelligence Position Reports

Multiple sources confirmed for The Debrief that the UAPTF had issued two classified intelligence position reports, which one individual described as “shocking.” Details provided on these reports suggest both a greater degree of Pentagon involvement, and that the UAPTF’s hunt for unidentified objects isn’t confined only to aerial phenomena.

Two officials with the DoD and one from the U.S. Intelligence community were willing to provide details on the contents of the classified report. An additional three other U.S. Intelligence Officials and a federal law enforcement officer confirmed the report’s existence but were only willing to provide comments on their distribution. Given the report’s classification and their discussion of a “sensitive intelligence matter,” the officials we spoke with did so only under strict conditions of anonymity. While The Debrief has agreed not to provide information on sources, identities, and employers, though everyone we spoke with works within the U.S. Intelligence Community and under the authority of the U.S. Director of National Intelligence.

One of the intelligence reports, released in 2018, is said to have provided a general overview of the UAP topic and included details of previous military encounters. According to sources who had read it, the report also contained an unreleased photograph of an “aerial phenomena” categorized as “unidentified.”

The Debrief was told the accompanying photo was captured from within the cockpit of an F/A-18 fighter jet with a pilot’s personal cell phone. According to three U.S. officials who had seen it, the photo showed an unidentified silver “cube-shaped” object. The report is said to have indicated the object was “hovering” or completely motionless when military pilots encountered it. All three officials agreed that based on the photo, the object appeared to be at an altitude of roughly 30,000 to 35,000 feet and approximately 1,000 feet from the fighter jet.

Defense and intelligence officials willing to discuss the report and those who only wished to confirm its dissemination all expressed shock that it had been so widely distributed amongst the Intelligence community.

"In decades with the [Intelligence Community] I've never seen anything like this," said one intelligence official.

One defense official described the report's distribution as having gone through "normal, non-public, information sharing channels." Other officials who'd seen and read the report either declined to elaborate or indicated the report was distributed on various secure systems. One defense official indicated it was distributed on the DoD's Secret Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNet). Two other intelligence officials said they received the information via "NSANet" (the NSA's official intranet). An additional source said the report was distributed via the CIA's Intelink system.

According to those willing to discuss the document, the report's most disconcerting aspect was one of the potential explanations for what UAP could represent. Sources say a "list" of possible prosaic explanations for these mysterious airborne encounters was provided. However, the report expressly stated that the potential for UAP to be "alien" or "non-human" technology was of legitimate consideration.

All sources interviewed by The Debrief confirmed that the Task Force issued an updated second UAP position report later in the summer of this year. Like the first, officials say this recent intelligence report was very widely distributed and shared amongst the Intelligence Community.

"It went viral," said one intelligence official who had read the report.

Overwhelmingly, everyone The Debrief spoke with said the most striking feature of the recently released UAPTF intelligence position report was the inclusion of new and "extremely clear" photograph of an unidentifiable triangular aircraft.

The photograph, which is said to have also been taken from inside the cockpit of a military fighter jet, depicted an apparent aerospace vehicle described as a large equilateral triangle with rounded or "blunted" edges and large, perfectly spherical white "lights" in each corner. Officials who had seen it said the image was captured in 2019 by an F/A-18 fighter pilot.

Two officials that received the report said the photo was taken after the triangular craft emerged from the ocean and began to ascend straight upwards at a 90-degree angle. It was indicated that this event occurred off the eastern coast of the United States. Several other sources confirmed the photo's existence; however, they declined to provide any further specifics of the incident.

Regarding the overall theme of the recent report, officials who read it say the report primarily focused on "Unidentified Submersible Phenomena," or unidentified "transmedium" vehicles capable of operating both under water and in the air.

The three officials we spoke with said the report suggested the UAP Task Force appears to be concerned that the objects being termed as UAP may be originating from within the world's oceans. Strange as this may sound, the idea of "USOs" or "unidentified submersible objects" is not something exclusive to the current UAPTF.

In various public appearances, astronomer and chief video/image analyst for the Mutual UFO Network (MUFON), Marc D'Antonio, has shared an unusual experience involving the detection of an underwater "Fast Mover," which occurred while he was sailing as a civilian aboard one of the U.S. Navy's prized attack submarines.

Last year, defense journalist Tyler Rogoway spoke with several veteran submariners to get their take on D'Antonio's account. While at least one person expressed skepticism about D'Antonio being granted a civilian ride-along, the Navy vets being interviewed almost unanimously acknowledged that unexplained, very high-speed sonar targets are indeed recorded by some of the most sophisticated listening equipment on the planet.

Agreeing only to speak on background, a senior member of the Intelligence Community whose responsibilities for decades involved underwater surveillance and reconnaissance programs told The Debrief there was validity to claims of extremely fast-moving underwater objects being detected by U.S. military systems.

“On occasion, there are detections made of non-cavitational, extremely fast-moving objects within the ocean.” The intelligence official declined to elaborate further, citing the high-levels of security classification associated with underwater reconnaissance.

Officials who had read the reports say the UAPTF appears particularly interested in “transmedium vehicles.” While this may seem unusual, many accounts exist—some going back centuries—in which people say they have observed unidentifiable craft operating in and out of the water.

The Debrief reached out to Steven Zaloga, co-author of the annual World Military Unmanned Aerial Systems Market Profile & Forecast and senior defense analyst for the Teal Group in Virginia, about the state of current or near-future development of “transmedium” vehicles or systems. Zaloga indicated he was unaware of any past or present technologies that are close to being capable of transitioning between air and submersible travel. “I have no idea what-so-ever on objects able to cross the air/water barrier,” Zaloga said in an email.

What is The Pentagon Officially Saying ABOUT UAP?

Although The Debrief learned of the issuance and information reportedly detailed in the two UAPTF intelligence position reports, officials we spoke with declined to provide any specifics as to why the most recent report focused on waterborne associations with UAP.

One active defense official familiar with the current UAP investigations said the UAPTF has a wealth of photographic evidence, collected from military pilots’ personal devices as well as sophisticated DoD surveillance and reconnaissance platforms. The source also told us some of the best evidence the UAPTF has acquired comes from measurement and signals intelligence (MASINT), rather than from videos or still images.

Although officials we spoke with didn’t provide any specifics to this point, it is assumed that any Top-Secret or Sensitive Compartmentalized Information used to help form the UAPTF’s current opinions would not have been included in the UAP position reports, based on their wide-spread distribution.

Before publication, The Debrief reached out to The Pentagon for comment on the information leaked from the UAPTF reports. Pentagon Spokesperson Susan Gough did not confirm or deny the existence of the UAP intelligence reports, and declined to make any comment on their contents. We followed up and requested the current media posture outlined by the official public affairs guide for UAP and dictated by Department of Defense policy (DoDI 5405.03). Ms. Gough referred back to her previous statement, indicating that the DoD does not discuss UAP publicly. As noted elsewhere, refusal by the Pentagon to discuss UAP is hardly anything new.

In 2017, then Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Dana White confirmed to Politico that the DoD had studied UFOs under the Advanced Aerial Threat Identification Program (AATIP). Additionally, White said the program had been run by the former Director of National Programs Special Management Staff for the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence, Luis Elizondo. However, in an effort to “correct the record,” in December 2019 the Pentagon issued a statement saying AATIP was not UAP related, and that Elizondo had “no responsibilities” in the program.

In May of this year, The Debrief informed The Pentagon Public Affairs Office that we had conducted a number of interviews with former senior Pentagon officials, a senior White House advisor and obtained documents, which all showed AATIP was involved in

UAP investigations, and that indeed Luis Elizondo was the custodian of the AATIP portfolio. Additionally, information obtained showed elements of the Defense Intelligence Agency and National Reconnaissance Office had participated in AATIP.

Though this request was less than six months after The Pentagon's "no responsibilities" statement, spokeswoman Gough replied, "Please keep in mind he [Elizondo] left DoD over three years ago, and there are personnel and privacy matters involved."

Given the recent Presidential election results and impending transfer of executive power, The Debrief reached out to the transition team for President-Elect Joe Biden. While not explicitly discussing UAP, a transition team spokesperson said Biden intends to "Immediately return to daily press briefings at the White House, U.S. Department of State, and U.S. Department of Defense. Our foreign policy relies on the informed consent of the American people. That is not possible when our government refuses to communicate with the public."

What Does It All Mean?

From closed-door meetings, to senior military leadership and the issuance of classified intelligence reports, all indications suggest the DoD is indeed taking the UAP issue seriously. However, what new information has come to light about the government's UAP investigations provides us with few answers, and certainly raises a number of questions.

Classification has long surrounded the U.S. government's most sophisticated airborne platforms. However, when it comes to underwater systems, the extremity of official secrecy falls into a class by itself. For instance, retired Navy Admiral Bobby Ray Inman acknowledged that he served as director for the National Underwater Reconnaissance Office (NURO) decades ago; yet despite this, to date the government denies that the NURO even exists.

Even if the Senate Select Intelligence Committee's request for an unclassified UAP report ends up being enacted in the FY2021 Intelligence Act, as legislative experts have pointed out, the UAP report provision is not not binding law. In essence, there's no guarantee the public will be provided any comprehensive information on UAP. Equally, while Congress is required to have access to classified information, only the executive branch has the authority to declassify national security information in order to make it public.

Should the DoD become more willing to discuss UAP publicly, there are plenty of indications that it might be a disappointment compared to many of the popular myths and narratives intertwined with the UFO subject over the last 70 years.

Every source The Debrief spoke with who had either seen the published position reports or were familiar with the activities of the UAPTF said that no concise estimate of the situation for UAP has been achieved. While they acknowledged that many hypotheses are being explored, the U.S. government presently lacks any definite explanation for UAP-related events.

Focusing on the DoD's statements that the mission of the UAPTF is to "detect, analyze and catalog UAPs that could potentially pose a threat to U.S. national security," The Debrief spoke with retired U.S. Air Force Brigadier General Bruce McClintock.

During his 30-year career with the Air Force, McClintock's assignments included White House Fellow to President George W. Bush, Executive Assistant to the Commander of NORAD, Executive Assistant to the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Special Assistant to the Commander of Air Force Space Command. Before retiring in 2017, Gen. McClintock amassed more than 3,000 flight hours on more than 35 aircraft, including the A-10, F-15B/D, F-16A/B/C/D, and the F-111. Presently, Gen. McClintock heads up the RAND corporation's Space Enterprise Initiative and serves as the focal point for all RAND space-related research for the U.S. government and U.S. allies.

McClintock was dismissive of the idea that U.S. military encounters with UAP could be related to any form of classified aerospace testing.

“It is unlikely that the U.S. government would intentionally conduct tests against its own unwitting military assets,” he told The Debrief in an interview. “To do so would require a very high level of coordination and approval for the potential safety and operational security risks.”

In separate interviews last year, aerospace engineer and Area-51 veteran T.D. Barnes and former CIA executive S. Eugene “Gene” Poteat both suggested radar detections by the Navy of extreme aerial maneuvers sounded suspiciously similar to a top-secret electronic warfare program they were involved with in the 1960s, codenamed PALLADIUM.

However, Poteat and Barnes acknowledged they had no explanation for any of the physical sightings by military aviators. Coinciding with Gen. McClintock’s comments, both men said everyone involved in any classified assessments involving the use of classified aerospace platforms was made aware they were participating in a test. This even included times when the platforms were deemed “UFOs because they were so secret that they didn’t exist.”

McClintock, who also served as Senior Defense Attaché to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, seemed equally doubtful that UAP might represent the technology of a foreign adversary.

“It is not outside the realm of the plausible that an adversary would test the ability of the United States to detect some new capability, although it would be more likely they would only do this after testing the capability within or closer to their own territory before trying to penetrate U.S. airspace,” he stated.

Ultimately, after asking numerous current and former defense officials and subject matter experts, The Debrief has been unable to find anyone of authority—whether on, or off the record—willing to say the UAP encounters reported by military aviators are consistent with black budget testing, or “ferreting” of U.S. air defense by foreign governments. Equally, we have been unable to find anyone of credentialed background willing to say what, exactly, this means the source of these UAP could be.

Offering The Pentagon one final opportunity to discuss what we intended to report or comment on McClintock’s statement, The Debrief once more reached out to spokeswoman Susan Gough. Our offer went unanswered.

At least from an official position, the source behind unidentified aerial phenomena appears to remain a mystery.

[Article](#)

(b)(5) ; (b)(6)

(b)(5); (b)(6)

(b)(5) ; (b)(6)

(b)(5) ; (b)(6)


(b)(5) ; (b)(6)

(b)(5); (b)(6)



From: (b)(6)
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2020 4:28 PM
To: Gough, Susan L (Sue) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Subject: Re: [Non-DoD Source] (MEDIA REQUEST- TIME SENSITIVE) Request For Popular Mechanics

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.



Ms. Gough,

Thank you for your reply and I apologize for not being more concise with my question. In effort to best clarify this specific question, along with the others I sent you, it's probably advantageous to share some information I'm attempting to verify, which was provided to me by non-government sources. If accurate, it could potentially offer an explanation for some of the confusion or contention you've inherited and had to deal with on this particular topic.

Confidentiality Notice: The following content shall not be disclosed outside the Government, and shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed - in whole or in part- for any purpose other than to evaluate and/or be utilized by the Government to assist in the production and/or publication of statements, comments, materials, or information which is expressly considered for attributable public release. This confidentiality notice is made in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552 (b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905.

Recently, I was allowed to examine a "10 Month Report" produced in 2009 by Bigelow Advanced Aerospace Studies, which I was told was produced as part of their involvement with the Advanced Aviation Weapons Systems Applications Program (AAWSAP) for the DIA. The entirety of the report (494 pages) exclusively discussed matters related to UAP. The report is marked as "classified proprietary information" and did not contain any data or information that was obtained through Government resources.

Examining the original solicitation for AAWSAP (# HHM402-08-R-0211) it appears the acquisition was set-aside 100% for "small business," which, to my understanding, would mean non-Government, non-competitive data produced by the program would be subject to the Small Business Innovative Research rights clause and restricted from release by the Government unless provided express permission by Bigelow Aerospace. This is the basis for the third question I was hoping you could be able to verify - *"In regards to the contract award for AAWSAP to Bigelow Aerospace (BAAS) can you tell me if the data rights granted to the government in association with noncommercial data collected by BAAS was considered Unlimited; Government Purpose; Specifically Negotiated License; Small Business Innovative Research; or Limited?"*

When it comes to my first question that you asked me to clarify, ultimately I'm trying to determine if it is possible whether or not someone may using an "unconventional" definition for the word "foreign" in the stated purpose of AAWSAP. In essence, could the word "foreign" have been coyly used to incorporate studies related to UAP? Even if this was done solely on the part of BAAS; or is there other information produced by the AAWSAP program that demonstrates UAP was not a part of the program?

In regards to my 4th question about Mr. Elizondo, I was given information suggesting in 2011 the AAWSAP was unfunded, however, it was not "formally closed down." Having taken a particular interest in the UAP component that's said to have gone on in AAWSAP, while at OUSD(I) Mr. Elizondo may have unofficially continued to look into UAP events in conjunction with his official roles within the NPSMS office. I understand it is difficult, if not impossible, for you to try and provide an attributable comment on what sounds like could an "unofficial" or personal "assignment" on Mr. Elizondo's part, however, anything you might be able to provide which you think could be germane to this question would be helpful. Potentially, I should amend my question to also asking if its possible to acknowledge whether or not Mr. Elizondo's role while with the DoD would have provided him access to reports of UAP events.

I apologize for the long-winded email, but I hope giving you some background on what I've been provided might be of some assistance in trying to track information down. I understand this is likely a subject you've enjoyed being hounded with since taking over as the "UAP point-person," but I do very much appreciate your assistance.

Best Wishes,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-www.(b)(6) < Caution-http://www.(b)(6) >

Confidentiality Notice - The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any privilege, including legal-client privilege that may be attached to this communication. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities whom are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure - in whole or in part- for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner proscribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.

On Tue, Jan 14, 2020 at 7:52 PM Gough, Susan L (Sue) CIV OSD PA (USA)

(b)(6) < Caution-mailto:(b)(6) > > wrote:

(b)(6)

I need some clarification on your first question. When you say, "under the definition being used, ...," what term are you talking about -- the definition of what? Also, where you ask about the term "foreign," are you asking about the use of the term in my previous statement, or are you asking about using that term outside of AATIP to describe "UAP encounters or events involving technology that was not readily identified"?

Regards,


(b)(6)

- The following statement has been attributed to you by several outlets recently, "**Neither AATIP nor AAWSAP were UAP related. The purpose of AATIP was to investigate foreign advanced aerospace weapons system applications with future technology projections over the next 40 years, and to create a center of expertise on advanced aerospace technologies.**" Under the definition being used, could the term "foreign" be used to describe UAP encounters or events involving technology that was not readily identified?
- In a previous statement regarding the release of the 3 UAP videos, you told me, "**The two 2015 videos appeared in the New York Times in December 2017. At that time, AFOSI conducted an investigation, focusing on the classification of the information in the video.**" Since the videos were originally captured by the Navy, the Navy was listed as the OCA on the DD Form 1910 for their release, and the videos are still retain in position of the Navy, can you elaborate on why AFOSI conducted the investigation into the classification of the information in the video?
- In regards to the contract award for AAWSAP to Bigelow Aerospace (BAAS) can you tell me if the data rights granted to the government in association with noncommercial data collected by BAAS was considered Unlimited; Government Purpose; Specifically Negotiated License; Small Business Innovative Research; or Limited?
- In regards to Mr. Luis Elizondo's claims of running a UAP investigation program while serving as a director within the National Programs Security Management Office, is it possible that Mr. Elizondo conducted these matters unofficially and not as a component of his stated job role with of OUSD(i). In effect, was he looking into UAP in an unofficial capacity during his time with DoD?

Thank you again for your help.

Best Wishes,

(b)(6)



(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-Caution-www.(b)(6) < Caution-http://Caution-Caution-
www.(b)(6) > < Caution-Caution-http://www.(b)(6) < Caution-
http://www.(b)(6) > >

Confidentiality Notice - The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any privilege, including legal-client privilege that may be attached to this communication. Thank you for your cooperation.

(b)(6) **CTR (USA)**

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 10:11 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Cc: (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] (Media Inquiry) Opportunity To Provide Comment Ref: Statement by Ret. USAF Gen.

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.



Good morning,

The following comments were provided to us by USAF Gen. Bruce McClintock (Ret.) and will appear in an article related to UAP we will be publishing on Dec. 2nd.

Q: Would it be consistent to see classified aerospace platforms tested or flown against your own unwitting military assets?

A: "It is unlikely that the U.S. government would intentionally conduct tests against its own unwitting military assets. To do so would require a very high level of coordination and approval for the potential safety and operational security risks."

Q: How likely would it be that a foreign government would be willing to employ, by appearances sake, what seems to be highly-advanced aerospace technologies, within restricted airspace in or around the continental United States?

A: "It is not outside the realm of the plausible that an adversary would test the ability of the United States to detect some new capability, although it would be more likely they would only do this after testing the capability within or closer to their own territory before trying to penetrate U.S. airspace."

1. Would the PAO or DoD like to make any additional comment to the questions asked or comments by Gen. McClintock?
2. Can the DoD provide an attributable comment in response to anyone in the public who believes the UAPTF or UAP news in general is really a disinformation or counterintelligence campaign?

Thanks for your assistance,
 Best Wishes,

(b)(6)

--
 (b)(6)

Senior Investigative Journalist | The Debrief Media

Phone: (b)(6)
Signal | WhatsApp: (b)(6)
Encrypted Email: (b)(6) < Caution-
mailto:(b)(6) >
Caution-www.TheDebrief.org < Caution-<http://www.TheDebrief.org> >



Confidentiality Notice - *The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any legal protections afforded under Electronic Communications Act 18 U.S.C. 3121. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities who are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure – in whole or in part– for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner prescribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.*

(b)(6) **CTR (USA)**

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2021 10:17 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] (Media Inquiry) Personnel Change on UAPTF

Categories: UAP AATIP Elizondo UFO, Press Queries

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.



Good morning (b)(6)

In light of all the craziness going on right now, I hope everything is going well for you.

I've been told there was recently a personnel change regarding whose heading up the UAP Task Force. Additionally, the UAP Task Force is now being managed in a Navy billet out of OUSDI.

- Can you confirm this information?
- Is Navy's ONI still the primary component responsible for the UAPTF or is it now OUSDI?

Thanks for your help,
 Best Wishes,

(b)(6)

--
 (b)(6)

Senior Investigative Journalist | The Debrief Media

Phone: (b)(6)

Signal | WhatsApp: (b)(6)

Encrypted Email: (b)(6) < Caution-mailto:(b)(6)>

Caution-www.TheDebrief.org < Caution-http://www.TheDebrief.org >



Confidentiality Notice - The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are

not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any legal protections afforded under Electronic Communications Act 18 U.S.C. 3121. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities who are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure – in whole or in part– for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner prescribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.

(b)(6) CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 1:02 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA); (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Re: Navy Query

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

Greetings,

Just following up on this request. Thank you so much for your time.

Regards,

(b)(6)
 The Debrief

On Thu, Nov 19, 2020 at 1:00 PM (b)(6) <(b)(6)> <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> > wrote:
 (b)(6) and (b)(6).

Thank you so much for your time. I was hoping to get a few statements for an upcoming piece I am working on concerning UAPs and the Navy reporting protocol. If possible, any replies to the following questions would be greatly appreciated.

According to the U.S. Navy on April 23rd, 2019, "the Navy is updating and formalizing the process by which reports of any such suspected incursions can be made to the cognizant authorities. A new message to the fleet that will detail the steps for reporting is in draft." I have reached out to about a dozen active Navy servicemen/women who were unaware of such a message, including never being made aware of UAP reporting through NAVYADMIN either. Has a formal message been sent out Navy-wide yet, and if so, is there anything that can be shared about the reporting protocol?

Are there any updates on the Senate Intelligence Committee's request for a portion of UAP information to be made public by the UAP Task Force?

Will the UAPTF, or Navy in general, when looking at UAP reports, be looking at UAP nationwide, or is it strictly related to military ranges/restricted airspace?

Is the U.S. Navy or Department of Defense aware of a photo and possible accompanying memo related to a triangular-shaped aerial vehicle emerging from a body of water?

Again, thank you so much for your time and consideration, and looking forward to any answers you may be able to provide at your earliest convenience.

Regards,

(b)(6)

The Debrief

On Wed, Nov 18, 2020 at 4:10 PM (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA)

(b)(6) < Caution-mailto:(b)(6) > wrote:

(b)(6)

I am the Navy's point person for UAP questions and queries.

However, all media questions and queries are being directly referred to Sue Gough in DoD PAO for coordination and response. She is cc'd in this note.

Please send your specific query to her... and cc me.

Thanks

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Sent with BlackBerry Work

(Caution-www.blackberry.com < Caution-http://www.blackberry.com >)

(b)(6)

CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2020 6:35 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] (Media Inquiry/Time Sensitive/Follow-up) Additional Information That May Be Of Assistance

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

(b)(6)

Confidentiality Notice: The following content shall not be disclosed outside the Government, and shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed - in whole or in part- for any purpose other than to evaluate and/or be utilized by the Government to assist in the production and/or publication of statements, comments, materials, or information which is expressly considered for attributable public release. This confidentiality notice is made in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552 (b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905.

To follow-up on some more information that may assist you, recently I've spoken "on-the-record" to someone who is verifiably associated with of the DIRDs described in a January 9, 2018 letter to the Senate Armed Services Committee as being "products produced under the AATIP contract for the DIA to publish." (Here is a link to the FOIA release of this letter and list of DIRDs : Caution-<https://fas.org/irp/dia/aatip-list.pdf> < Caution-<https://fas.org/irp/dia/aatip-list.pdf> >)

According to who I spoke with, the "Field Effects on Biological Tissues" DIRD, which is listed by the DIA as a product of AATIP, was a literature review and forensic medical analysis of historical claims of injury as result of encounters with UAP. In the letter to the Armed Services Committee DIA Congressional Relations Staff indicated the "Field Effects on Biological Tissues" attachment is not accessible on the Capitol Network (CapNet), however, they are "happy to provide directly upon request." I wondering if it may be possible to coordinate with the DIA in effort to review this published report, as it may bear influence on recent official statements that AATIP nor AAWSAP were involved with the research or study of UAP.

I understand you're hindered by both length of time since these programs were being officially conducted and what information is available or provided to you. However, I have no doubts about your intentions to provide as accurate information as possible, so I wanted to pass this additional information along in case it might be of assistance.

If indeed any of this information does influence the current stance on whether or not AATIP or AAWSAP was involved in UAP research, I would ask if you would be able to provide me with a new attributable statement.

Thanks again for your assistance.
 Best Wishes,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-www (b)(6) < Caution-http://www (b)(6) >

Confidentiality Notice - *The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any privilege, including legal-client privilege that may be attached to this communication. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities who are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure – in whole or in part– for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner proscribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.*

(b)(6) CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2020 10:49 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] (Media Inquiry) General Follow-up and Specific Request about AFOSI and the UAP videos

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

(b)(6)

I just wanted to follow-up with you to see if you'd been able to get some answers to the questions I've previously asked approved yet.

Additionally, I wanted to follow-up on a specific question I asked back in December of last year related to - Why did AFOSI investigate the classification of the 3 released UAP videos given the Navy was the OCA and Mr. Elizondo was a civilian employee with OSD?

In terms of most pressing, I recently got a copy of the AFOSI report into the investigation of the videos and I'm working on quick follow-up article for Vice News on it.

Thanks for your help.

Best Wishes,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-www.(b)(6) < Caution-http://www.(b)(6) >

Confidentiality Notice - The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any privilege, including legal-client privilege that may be attached to this communication. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities who are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure - in whole or in part- for any

purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner proscribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.

(b)(6) CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2020 12:10 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] (Media Inquiry) (Time Sensitive) Request For Clarification

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

(b)(6)

I hope everything is well with you. Yesterday, Swedish researcher (b)(6) published a series of answers you provided to him and I had a few questions about them.

Regarding (b)(6) question : *"In the Navy's effort to investigate sightings of Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP) is there a centralized office, program or council, that analyse such sightings?"* You were quoted as responding:

- "Under the cognizance of the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)), there is an interagency team charged with gathering data and conducting investigations into range incursions. As the preponderance of recent/reported sightings are from naval aviators, the Navy is leading much of the effort. All reports of range incursions are sent to this team for inclusion in the overall effort, thus maximizing the data available for analysis."
1. **While it has been stated that while working for (OUSD(I)) Mr. Luis Elizondo did not have any responsibilities within the AATIP program. It is my understanding that post-2012 and until his resignation in October of 2017, as Director for Defense Intelligence, Collection and Special Programs in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, Mr. Elizondo's position served as the cognizant authority responsible for the interagency team charged with gathering data and conducting investigations into range incursions by UAP. Can you confirm if this is accurate?**

Thank you for your assistance.

Best Wishes,

(b)(6)



(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-www (b)(6) < Caution-http://www (b)(6) >

Confidentiality Notice - *The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any privilege, including legal-client privilege that may be attached to this communication. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities who are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure – in whole or in part– for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner proscribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.*

 < Caution-
https://chrome.google.com/webstore/detail/free-
email-
tracker/nknojfcInachdkpdkjbbhbkgnladhnj >
Powered by
cloudHQ < Caution-
https://chrome.google.com/webstore/detail/free-
email-
tracker/nknojfcInachdkpdkjbbhbkgnladhnj >

(b)(6) CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2021 5:41 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Fwd: AATIP/AAWSAP Role

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

Hi (b)(6)

Please excuse me being somewhat mischievous, but today marks the one year anniversary of my question about AATIP and the Drake Equation (see below).

You told me on February 21 - following questions raised as a result of Tim McMillan's February 14 article in Popular Mechanics - that the response to my question would be incorporated into a more general updated statement on the role of AATIP/AAWSAP.

Where do things stand on that statement, please?

Best wishes,

Nick

----- Forwarded message -----

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)> <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> >
Date: Mon, Jan 13, 2020 at 3:30 PM
Subject: AATIP/AAWSAP Role
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) <(b)(6)> <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> >

Hi (b)(6)

I have a question that follows from what I believe is your most recent (hopefully accurately-quoted by me!) position statement on the AATIP/AAWSAP role:

Neither AATIP nor AAWSAP were UAP related. The purpose of AATIP was to investigate foreign advanced aerospace weapons system applications with future technology projections over the next 40 years, and to create a center of expertise on advanced aerospace technologies."

My question is this: The 15th of the 38 technical reports produced under the AAWSAP contract vehicle is *An Introduction to the Statistical Drake Equation*, by Dr. Claudio Maccone. Given that the Statistical Drake Equation is a probabilistic argument, the sole purpose of which is to estimate the number of communicable

civilizations in the galaxy, why did this form part of AATIP/AAWSAP and what is the connection with the purpose of AATIP/AAWSAP as described in the current official position statement?

Best wishes,

(b)(6)

A rectangular box with a black border, filled with a solid gray color, representing a redacted signature.

(b)(6) CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) (b)(6)
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 4:34 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Please Add to Distribution list for UAP Related Press Releases

Categories: UAP AATIP Elizondo UFO

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

Good Afternoon (b)(6),

I hope all is well with you. After CNN's recent article hinting that a new press release regarding the UAP Task Force may be coming soon, I just wanted to ask that you please include me on any list for email distribution of UAP related press releases.

Thanks for your assistance,
Best Wishes,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-www (b)(6)

(b)(6)

CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 2:44 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: Re: [Non-DoD Source] [Media Inquiry] Trying to Confirm Something was or was not released by the DoD

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.



(b)(6)

Thank you for your response. I assumed that the media outlet had incorrectly attributed the photo, but I thought I'd just double check.

Have a great rest of week and best wishes,

(b)(6)

On Tue, Dec 15, 2020 at 3:42 PM (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
 <(b)(6)> <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> > wrote:

(b)(6)

Without anything more to go on (such as, when was the alleged original release? And what DoD agency, office, or department allegedly released it?), it may take some time to find out anything about this. I can tell you that my office did not release that photo any time in the last 20 months.

Regards,

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)> <Caution-mailto:tim@thedebrief.org >
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2020 5:48 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) <(b)(6)> <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> >
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] [Media Inquiry] Trying to Confirm Something was or was not released by the DoD

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.


Good Morning (b)(6),

I hope this email finds you well. The defense news site SOFREP recently published an article < Caution-
Caution-https://sofrep.com/news/israeli-official-claims-the-truth-is-out-there/ < Caution-
https://sofrep.com/news/israeli-official-claims-the-truth-is-out-there/ > > accompanied by the attached
photograph. The site attributed the photo as being a "DoD release." Can you confirm whether or not this indeed
is a photo that was released by the DoD?

Thanks for your help,

Best Wishes,

(b)(6)



(b)(6)


Senior Investigative Journalist | The Debrief Media

Phone: (b)(6)

Signal | WhatsApp: (b)(6)

Encrypted Email: (b)(6) < Caution-
mailto:(b)(6) > < Caution-Caution-
mailto:(b)(6) < Caution-mailto:(b)(6) > >

Caution-Caution-www.TheDebrief.org < Caution-http://Caution-Caution-
www.TheDebrief.org > < Caution-Caution-http://www.TheDebrief.org < Caution-
http://www.TheDebrief.org > >



Confidentiality Notice - The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any legal protections afforded under Electronic Communications Act 18 U.S.C. 3121. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities who are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure – in whole or in part – for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner prescribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.

--
(b)(6)

Senior Investigative Journalist | The Debrief Media

Phone: (b)(6)

Signal | WhatsApp: (b)(6)

Encrypted Email: (b)(6) < Caution-
mailto:(b)(6) >

Caution-www.TheDebrief.org < Caution-http://www.TheDebrief.org >



Confidentiality Notice - The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any legal protections afforded under Electronic Communications Act 18 U.S.C. 3121. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities who are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure – in whole or in part– for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner prescribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.

(b)(6) CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 6:05 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: Re: [Non-DoD Source] (MEDIA REQUEST- TIME SENSITIVE) Request For Popular Mechanics

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.



(b)(6)

Confidentiality Notice: The following content shall not be disclosed outside the Government, and shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed - in whole or in part- for any purpose other than to evaluate and/or be utilized by the Government to assist in the production and/or publication of statements, comments, materials, or information which is expressly considered for attributable public release. This confidentiality notice is made in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552 (b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905.

To follow-up on some more information that may assist you, recently I've spoken "on-the-record" to someone who is verifiably associated with of the DIRDs described in a January 9, 2018 letter to the Senate Armed Services Committee as being "products produced under the AATIP contract for the DIA to publish." (Here is a link to the FOIA release of this letter and list of DIRDs : Caution-<https://fas.org/irp/dia/aatip-list.pdf> < Caution-<https://fas.org/irp/dia/aatip-list.pdf> >)

According to who I spoke with, the "Field Effects on Biological Tissues" DIRD, which is listed by the DIA as a product of AATIP, was a literature review and forensic medical analysis of historical claims of injury as result of encounters with UAP. In the letter to the Armed Services Committee DIA Congressional Relations Staff indicated the "Field Effects on Biological Tissues" attachment is not accessible on the Capitol Network (CapNet), however, they are "happy to provide directly upon request." I wondering if it may be possible to coordinate with the DIA in effort to review this published report, as it may bear influence on recent official statements that AATIP nor AAWSAP were involved with the research or study of UAP.

I understand you're hindered by both length of time since these programs were being officially conducted and what information is available or provided to you. However, I have no doubts about your intentions to provide as accurate information as possible, so I wanted to pass this additional information along in case it might be of assistance.

If indeed any of this information does influence the current stance on whether or not AATIP or AAWSAP was involved in UAP research, I would ask if you would be able to provide me with a new attributable statement.

Thanks again for your assistance.

Best Wishes,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-www (b)(6) < Caution-http://www (b)(6) >

Confidentiality Notice - The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any privilege, including legal-client privilege that may be attached to this communication. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities who are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure - in whole or in part - for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner proscribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.

On Wed, Jan 15, 2020 at 7:04 PM (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)

(b)(6) < Caution-mailto: (b)(6) > wrote:

Thanks, Tim, it's going to take a bit of time to track down some of this.

Regards,

(b)(6)

Sent by my iPhone

From: (b)(6) < (b)(6) < Caution-mailto: (b)(6) > >

Date: Tuesday, January 14, 2020 at 4:29:10 PM

To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)" (b)(6) < Caution-mailto: (b)(6) >

Subject: Re: [Non-DoD Source] (MEDIA REQUEST- TIME SENSITIVE) Request For Popular Mechanics

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

(b)(6)

Thank you for your reply and I apologize for not being more concise with my question. In effort to best clarify this specific question, along with the others I sent you, it's probably advantageous to share some information I'm attempting to verify, which was provided to me by non-government sources. If accurate, it could potentially offer an explanation for some of the confusion or contention you've inherited and had to deal with on this particular topic.

Confidentiality Notice: The following content shall not be disclosed outside the Government, and shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed - in whole or in part- for any purpose other than to evaluate and/or be utilized by the Government to assist in the production and/or publication of statements, comments, materials, or information which is expressly considered for attributable public release. This confidentiality notice is made in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552 (b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905.

Recently, I was allowed to examine a "10 Month Report" produced in 2009 by Bigelow Advanced Aerospace Studies, which I was told was produced as part of their involvement with the Advanced Aviation Weapons Systems Applications Program (AAWSAP) for the DIA. The entirety of the report (494 pages) exclusively discussed matters related to UAP. The report is marked as "classified proprietary information" and did not contain any data or information that was obtained through Government resources.

Examining the original solicitation for AAWSAP (# HHM402-08-R-0211) it appears the acquisition was set-aside 100% for "small business," which, to my understanding, would mean non-Government, non-competitive data produced by the program would be subject to the Small Business Innovative Research rights clause and restricted from release by the Government unless provided express permission by Bigelow Aerospace. This is the basis for the third question I was hoping you could be able to verify - *"In regards to the contract award for AAWSAP to Bigelow Aerospace (BAAS) can you tell me if the data rights granted to the government in association with noncommercial data collected by BAAS was considered Unlimited; Government Purpose; Specifically Negotiated License; Small Business Innovative Research; or Limited?"*

When it comes to my first question that you asked me to clarify, ultimately I'm trying to determine if it is possible whether or not someone may using an "unconventional" definition for the word "foreign" in the stated purpose of AAWSAP. In essence, could the word "foreign" have been coyly used to incorporate studies related to UAP? Even if this was done solely on the part of BAAS; or is there other information produced by the AAWSAP program that demonstrates UAP was not a part of the program?

In regards to my 4th question about Mr. Elizondo, I was given information suggesting in 2011 the AAWSAP was unfunded, however, it was not "formally closed down." Having taken a particular interest in the UAP component that's said to have gone on in AAWSAP, while at OUSD(I) Mr. Elizondo may have unofficially continued to look into UAP events in conjunction with his official roles within the NPSMS office. I understand it is difficult, if not impossible, for you to try and provide an attributable comment on what sounds like could an "unofficial" or personal "assignment" on Mr. Elizondo's part, however, anything you might be able to provide which you think could be germane to this question would be helpful. Potentially, I should amend my question to also asking if

its possible to acknowledge whether or not Mr. Elizondo's role while with the DoD would have provided him access to reports of UAP events.

I apologize for the long-winded email, but I hope giving you some background on what I've been provided might be of some assistance in trying to track information down. I understand this is likely a subject you've enjoyed being hounded with since taking over as the "UAP point-person," but I do very much appreciate your assistance.

Best Wishes,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-Caution-www (b)(6) < Caution-http://Caution-Caution-
www (b)(6) > < Caution-Caution-http://www. (b)(6) < Caution-
http://www (b)(6) > >

Confidentiality Notice - The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any privilege, including legal-client privilege that may be attached to this communication. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities whom are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure - in whole or in part- for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner proscribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.

On Tue, Jan 14, 2020 at 7:52 PM (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)

< (b)(6) < Caution-mailto: (b)(6) > < Caution-Caution-
mailto: (b)(6) < Caution-mailto (b)(6) > > > wrote:

(b)(6)

I need some clarification on your first question. When you say, "under the definition being used, ...," what term are you talking about -- the definition of what? Also, where you ask about the term "foreign," are you asking about the use of the term in my previous statement, or are you asking about using that term outside of AATIP to describe "UAP encounters or events involving technology that was not readily identified"?

Regards,

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2020 12:59 PM
To: (b)(6) (b)(6) <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> <Caution-Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> >>
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] (MEDIA REQUEST- TIME SENSITIVE) Request For Popular Mechanics

(b)(6) Sorry, working on these now. It may take a couple days to get cleared responses on all of them.

From: (b)(6) (b)(6) <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> <Caution-Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> >>
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2020 6:08 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6) <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> <Caution-Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> <Caution-mailto:(b)(6)> >>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] (MEDIA REQUEST- TIME SENSITIVE) Request For Popular Mechanics

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

(b)(6)

I understand you're likely very busy, however, I wanted to follow-up again on several questions I asked back on December 9th of last year. I'm sure you're likely tired of answering questions related to UAP, UFOs, or AATIP, however, I may be on the cusp of being able to provide clarity to a number of these issues, which ultimately could help get some of these constant request directed to you office reduced. If you could assist me at your earliest convenience, it would be greatly appreciated.

Here are the questions I asked on December 9th, along with just a few others I'm hoping you'll be able to answer. Thank you again for all your assistance.

- The following statement has been attributed to you by several outlets recently, "**Neither AATIP nor AAWSAP were UAP related. The purpose of AATIP was to investigate foreign**


advanced aerospace weapons system applications with future technology projections over the next 40 years, and to create a center of expertise on advanced aerospace technologies." Under the definition being used, could the term "foreign" be used to describe UAP encounters or events involving technology that was not readily identified?

- In a previous statement regarding the release of the 3 UAP videos, you told me, **"The two 2015 videos appeared in the New York Times in December 2017. At that time, AFOSI conducted an investigation, focusing on the classification of the information in the video."** Since the videos were originally captured by the Navy, the Navy was listed as the OCA on the DD Form 1910 for their release, and the videos are still retain in position of the Navy, can you elaborate on why AFOSI conducted the investigation into the classification of the information in the video?
- In regards to the contract award for AAWSAP to Bigelow Aerospace (BAAS) can you tell me if the data rights granted to the government in association with noncommercial data collected by BAAS was considered Unlimited; Government Purpose; Specifically Negotiated License; Small Business Innovative Research; or Limited?
- In regards to Mr. Luis Elizondo's claims of running a UAP investigation program while serving as a director within the National Programs Security Management Office, is it possible that Mr. Elizondo conducted these matters unofficially and not as a component of his stated job role with of OUSD(i). In effect, was he looking into UAP in an unofficial capacity during his time with DoD?

Thank you again for your help.

Best Wishes,

(b)(6)



(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-Caution-Caution-www.(b)(6) < Caution-http://Caution-Caution-Caution-
www.(b)(6) > < Caution-Caution-http://Caution-Caution-Caution-
www < Caution-http://Caution-Caution-Caution-
www > > < Caution-Caution-Caution-http://www.(b)(6) < Caution-

http://(b)(6) > < Caution-Caution-http://www.(b)(6) < Caution-
http:// > > >

Confidentiality Notice - The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any privilege, including legal-client privilege that may be attached to this communication. Thank you for your cooperation.

(b)(6) CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 5:35 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: Re: [Non-DoD Source] (Meida Inquiry) Follow-Up On Statement Regarding AATIP

Categories: UAP AATIP Elizondo UFO

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

(b)(6)

Thanks for the response. I'm sure it's been pretty crazy with everything going on. Please do include me if you release any new statements on AATIP.

Best Wishes,

(b)(6)



(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-www (b)(6) < Caution-http://www. (b)(6) >

Confidentiality Notice - The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any privilege, including legal-client privilege that may be attached to this communication. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities who are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure - in whole or in part - for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner proscribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.

On Wed, Apr 29, 2020 at 10:20 PM (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)

(b)(6) < Caution-mailto: (b)(6) > > wrote:

(b)(5); (b)(6)

(b)(5)

Regards,

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) < (b)(6) < Caution-mailto: (b)(6) > >

Sent: Monday, April 27, 2020 3:01 PM

To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) < (b)(6) < Caution-mailto: (b)(6) > >

Subject: [Non-DoD Source] (Meida Inquiry) Follow-Up On Statement Regarding AATIP

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

Good Afternoon (b)(6),

I hope things haven't been too crazy for you with the whole pandemic. I saw the public release of the three UAP videos today. I just wanted to touch base with you to see if you were expecting to release a statement on AATIP in the near future as well.

Best Wishes,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Investigative Writer and Research Consultant

Phone: (b)(6)

Website: Caution-Caution-www (b)(6) < Caution-http://Caution-Caution-
www. (b)(6) > < Caution-Caution-http://www (b)(6) < Caution-
http://www. (b)(6) >

Confidentiality Notice - *The content of this electronic mail transmission may contain information that is confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message, any part of it, or any attachments. If you have received this in error, please delete this message and any attachments from your system without reading the content and notify the sender immediately of the inadvertent transmission. There is no intent on the part of the sender to waive any privilege, including legal-client privilege that may be attached to this communication. Additionally, the content of this electronic mail transmission shall also not be disclosed outside of any Government agencies or entities who are the intended and authorized recipient. This includes any duplication, use, or disclosure – in whole or in part– for any purpose other than evaluation or utilization in the manner proscribed in the content. Unless specifically stated, the content of this electronic mail transmission is considered exempt from disclosure under The Freedom of Information Act in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) and the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905. Thank you for your cooperation.*

(b)(6) **CTR (USA)**

From: Kozik, David A SES OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA)
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 3:13 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA); (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA)
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] Comment on Debrief article on UAP?

Sue—

I've got no record of either Senator receiving a UAP specific briefing in the past two years, or attending a briefing/hearing where the topic came up (it came up in our annual budget hearing to the SSCI earlier in 2020—the first time that I can recall that the subject's come up in a generalized hearing-- but neither Senator was present).

V/R,
 DK

 David A. Kozik
 Director, OUSD(I&S) Congressional Activities / Chief, ASD/LA Intel Team
 Room (b)(6) Unclass phone: (b)(6) / TS VOIP: (b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 3:06 PM
To: (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6)
Cc: Kozik, David A SES OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6)
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] Comment on Debrief article on UAP?

Thanks, (b)(5); (b)(6)

(b)(5)

From: (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 2:50 PM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Cc: Kozik, David A SES OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6)
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] Comment on Debrief article on UAP?

+ Dave Kozik

(b)(6)

Unfortunately, I am on telework this week (returning on Monday), and practically all of my UAP EXSUMS are on JWICS.

(b)(5); (b)(6)

(b)(5)

R,

(b)(6)

(b)(6), USN

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (I&S)/Congressional Activities

Pentagon, Room (b)(6)

Comm: (b)(6); Telework: (b)(6)

NSTS: (b)(6)

SIPR: (b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)

Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 2:20 PM

To: (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6)

Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] Comment on Debrief article on UAP?

(b)(5); (b)(6)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6)

Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 10:42 AM

To: (b)(6) OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6); Cummings, Matthew C
(Matt) SES OSD OUSD INTEL (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)

(b)(6); (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA)

(b)(6)
Cc: Stratton, John F (Jay) SES USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6) CIV USN NIA
WASHINGTON DC (USA) (b)(6)

Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] Comment on Debrief article on UAP?

(b)(6) All,

I would not comment one way or the other on the accuracy/inaccuracy of the article.

Sticking to our standard language seems to be the best course.

Here's what we've used previously in response to Qs about Congressional engagement:

Navy officials provided a classified briefing to the House Armed Services Committee on March 11, 2020. Navy officials, as part of the UAPTF, have and will continue to meet with interested Congressional members and staffers to provide classified briefings on the progress of our efforts to understand and identify these threats to the safety of our aviators and security of our operations. Follow-up discussions with other interested members and/or staffers will also continue as necessary or requested. We will not comment on the specific information provided in these Hill briefings.

Regards,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

(b)(6) USN (Ret)

N2N6 Strategic Engagements

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) USAF OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6)

Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 10:19 AM

To: Cummings, Matthew C (Matt) SES OSD OUSD INTEL (USA) (b)(6)

(b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA)

(b)(6); (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA)

(b)(6)

Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] Comment on Debrief article on UAP?

(b)(5)

Brig Gen McClintock's (b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(6)

TW: (b)(6)

From: Cummings, Matthew C (Matt) SES OSD OUSD INTEL (USA)

Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2020 10:02 AM

To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA); (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA); (b)(6)

CAPT USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA); (b)(6) USAF OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA)

Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] Comment on Debrief article on UAP?

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

~~(U//CUI)~~ I can confirm that the two Senators in question have not been briefed on this matter.

Thanks!

Matt

Matthew C. Cummings, DISL

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)

Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 9:11 AM

To: (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6); Cummings, Matthew C (Matt) SES OSD OUSD INTEL (USA)

(b)(6); (b)(6) USAF OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA)

(b)(6)

Subject: FW: [Non-DoD Source] Comment on Debrief article on UAP?

Get ready for a lot of queries on The Debrief article. On her questions:

-- I'll answer the first, as it's an accurate quote

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

Regards,

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>

Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 8:44 AM

To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)

Cc: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>; (b)(6) <(b)(6)>; (b)(6)

<(b)(6)>; (b)(6) <(b)(6)>

Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Comment on Debrief article on UAP?

All active links contained in this email were disabled. Please verify the identity of the sender, and confirm the authenticity of all links contained within the message prior to copying and pasting the address to a Web browser.

Hello, (b)(6)

Can you confirm for (b)(6) that the quote attributed to you below is accurate?

Does the Pentagon have any comment as to the accuracy or inaccuracy of anything mentioned in the article below?

Can you confirm that Sens. Diane Feinstein and Kamala Harris have been involved in briefings on UAPs?

(b)(6)

(b)(6) assignment desk

(b)(6)

In an email, Senior Strategist and Pentagon spokesperson Susan Gough responded, "To maintain operations security, which includes not disseminating information publicly that may be useful to our adversaries, DOD does not discuss publicly the details of either the observations or the examination of reported incursions into our training ranges or designated airspace, including those incursions initially designated as UAP – and that includes not discussing the UAPTF publicly, also."

Caution-<https://www.thedebrief.org/fast-movers-and-transmedium-vehicles-the-pentagons-uap-task-force/?fbclid=IwAR2bJtq8vPslhxJrMmckYLjIRr27aOSqEQ-TulX8xb8uTbdowsUKaSkSOdM> < Caution-<https://www.thedebrief.org/fast-movers-and-transmedium-vehicles-the-pentagons-uap-task-force/?fbclid=IwAR2bJtq8vPslhxJrMmckYLjIRr27aOSqEQ-TulX8xb8uTbdowsUKaSkSOdM> >

In an exclusive feature for *The Debrief*, U.S. military and intelligence officials, as well as Pentagon emails, offer an unprecedented glimpse behind the scenes of what's currently going on with The Pentagon's investigation into UFOs, or as they term them, "Unidentified Aerial Phenomena" (UAP).

For the last two years, the Department of Defense’s newly revamped “Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Task Force” (or UAPTF) has been busy briefing lawmakers, Intelligence Community stakeholders, and the highest levels of the U.S. military on encounters with what they say are mysterious airborne objects that defy conventional explanations.

Along with classified briefings, multiple senior U.S. officials with direct knowledge of the matter say two classified intelligence reports on UAP have been widely distributed to the U.S. Intelligence Community. Numerous sources from various government agencies told *The Debrief* that these reports include clear photographic evidence of UAP. The reports also explicitly state that the Task Force is considering the possibility that these unidentified objects could, as stated by one source from the U.S. Intelligence Community said, be operated by “intelligences of unknown origin.”

Significantly, a retired U.S. Air Force brigadier general and head of RAND corporation’s Space Enterprise Initiative has—for the first time—gone on record to discuss some of the most likely explanations for UAP. His responses were surprising.

BRIEFINGS AT THE HIGHEST LEVELS

In June, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence’s [FY2021 Intelligence Authorization Act](https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CRPT-116srpt233/pdf/CRPT-116srpt233.pdf) < Caution-<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CRPT-116srpt233/pdf/CRPT-116srpt233.pdf> > contained an intriguing section titled report on “Advanced Aerial Threats.” In the inclusion, the committee gave an eye-opening official hint (in recent history) the government takes UFOs seriously by offering its support for the “efforts of the Unidentified Aerial Phenomenon Task Force at the Office of Naval Intelligence.” The Intelligence Committee additionally requested an unclassified report detailing the analysis of “UAP” or “Anomalous Aerial Vehicles.”

Though already acknowledged by the Intelligence Committee, in mid-August, the Pentagon [formally acknowledged](https://www.thedebrief.org/the-dod-has-officially-announced-it-has-a-uap-task-force-heres-what-that-means/) < Caution-<https://www.thedebrief.org/the-dod-has-officially-announced-it-has-a-uap-task-force-heres-what-that-means/> > they had established a task force looking into UAP. In a press announcement, the Secretary of Defense’s Office [stated](https://www.defense.gov/Newsroom/Releases/Release/Article/2314065/establishment-of-unidentified-aerial-phenomena-task-force/) < Caution-<https://www.defense.gov/Newsroom/Releases/Release/Article/2314065/establishment-of-unidentified-aerial-phenomena-task-force/> > , “the UAPTF’s mission will be to detect, analyze and catalog UAPs that could potentially pose a threat to U.S. national security.” According to the release, authority for the Task Force was approved by the DoD’s chief operating officer, Deputy Secretary of Defense David L. Norquist.

The summer news of the establishment of the UAPTF seemingly suggests—for the first time since the shuttering of Project Blue Book (the Air Force’s official investigations into UFOs) in 1969—that the Pentagon is now taking the subject of UFOs seriously.

However, an internal email obtained by *The Debrief* shows that almost one year before the DoD’s announcement, the highest levels of the U.S. military were already being briefed on UAP.

The email, obtained via Freedom of Information Act request, shows an October 16th, 2019 exchange between then Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Robert Burke, and current Vice Chief of Staff for the Air Force General Stephen “Steve” Wilson.

In the email, Adm. Burke tells Gen. Wilson, “Recommend you take the brief I just received from our Director of Naval Intelligence VADM Matt Kohler, on Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP).” Adm. Burke concludes the email, “SECNAV [Secretary of the Navy] will get the same brief tomorrow at 1000.”

The “SECNAV” referenced in Adm. Burke’s email was then-Secretary of the Navy, Richard V. Spencer. A little over a month after this UAP briefing, Spencer was fired by then-Secretary of Defense Mark Esper over public disagreements stemming from a [series of controversies](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2019/nov/28/navy-secretary-richard-spencer-donald-trump-navy-seal) < Caution-<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2019/nov/28/navy-secretary-richard-spencer-donald-trump-navy-seal> > involving the court-martial of Navy SEAL Eddie Gallagher.

Speaking on background, one U.S. Defense official lamented that a lack of continuity with DoD leadership might have hindered some of the UAPTF’s work. Within the past 24 months, there have been four different Secretaries of the Navy and five

additional Secretaries of Defense. Vice Admiral Matt Kohler, noted for having provided the briefings, retired after 36 years with the Navy in June of this year.

Reaching out to several active government officials and individuals who retain their government-issued security clearances, *The Debrief* learned that last fall was a busy time for the UAPTF. On October 21st, 2019, a briefing on UAP was conducted at the Pentagon for several Senate Armed Services Committee staffers.

Attendees at the meeting told *The Debrief* that they were provided information on two previous DoD-backed UFO programs: The Advanced Aerial Weapons Systems Applications Program (AAWSAP) and the Advanced Aerospace Threat Identification Program (AATIP). They were also briefed on “highly sensitive categories of UFO investigations.” Only two days later on October 23rd, staffers with the Senate Select Intelligence Committee were provided the same information in a meeting on Capitol Hill.

A former private contractor for AAWSAP and AATIP, Dr. Hal Puthoff, confirmed for *The Debrief* he was one of a handful of persons who conducted the October briefings. “I have been invited to brief congressional staffers on the Senate Armed Services Committee on UAP matters in the last couple of years,” Puthoff said in an email, “and have done so on more than one occasion.” Dr. Puthoff described the staffers during these meetings as being “engaged,” and provided “positive responses, [and] more details always being requested.”



The Pentagon Press Briefing Room seal (Credit: DoD/photo by Lisa Ferdinando)


The Debrief reached out to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Office and DoD Executive Services Office and formally requested an interview with someone authorized to speak on the UAP briefings with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In an email, Senior Strategist and Pentagon spokesperson Susan Gough responded, “To maintain operations security, which includes not disseminating information publicly that may be useful to our adversaries, DOD does not discuss publicly the details of either the observations or the examination of reported incursions into our training ranges or designated airspace, including those incursions initially designated as UAP – and that includes not discussing the UAPTF publicly, also.”

Official public affairs channels indicate the Pentagon is not interested in sharing any more information on the UAP topic. However, several current and former officials with the DoD and individuals working for multiple U.S. intelligence agencies told *The Debrief* that there was much more going on behind closed doors.

UAP INTELLIGENCE POSITION REPORTS

Multiple sources confirmed for *The Debrief* that the UAPTF had issued two classified intelligence position reports, which one individual described as “shocking.” Details provided on these reports suggest both a greater degree of Pentagon involvement, and that the UAPTF’s hunt for unidentified objects isn’t confined only to aerial phenomena.

Two officials with the DoD and one from the U.S. Intelligence community were willing to provide details on the contents of the classified report. An additional three other U.S. Intelligence Officials and a federal law enforcement officer confirmed the report’s existence but were only willing to provide comments on their distribution. Given the report’s classification and their discussion of a “sensitive intelligence matter,” the officials we spoke with did so only under strict conditions of anonymity. While *The Debrief* has agreed not to provide information on sources, identities, and employers, though everyone we spoke with works within the U.S. Intelligence Community and under the authority of the U.S. Director of National Intelligence.



Aerial view of the headquarters of the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) in Chantilly, Virginia, by Trevor Paglen.

One of the intelligence reports, released in 2018, is said to have provided a general overview of the UAP topic and included details of previous military encounters. According to sources who had read it, the report also contained an unreleased photograph of an “aerial phenomena” categorized as “unidentified.”

The Debrief was told the accompanying photo was captured from within the cockpit of an F/A-18 fighter jet with a pilot's personal cell phone. According to three U.S. officials who had seen it, the photo showed an unidentified silver "cube-shaped" object. The report is said to have indicated the object was "hovering" or completely motionless when military pilots encountered it. All three officials agreed that based on the photo, the object appeared to be at an altitude of roughly 30,000 to 35,000 feet and approximately 1,000 feet from the fighter jet.

Defense and intelligence officials willing to discuss the report and those who only wished to confirm its dissemination all expressed shock that it had been so widely distributed amongst the Intelligence community.

"In decades with the [Intelligence Community] I've never seen anything like this," said one intelligence official.

One defense official described the report's distribution as having gone through "normal, non-public, information sharing channels." Other officials who'd seen and read the report either declined to elaborate or indicated the report was distributed on various secure systems. One defense official indicated it was distributed on the DoD's Secret Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNet). Two other intelligence officials said they received the information via "NSANet" (the NSA's official intranet). An additional source said the report was distributed via the CIA's Intelink system.

According to those willing to discuss the document, the report's most disconcerting aspect was one of the potential explanations for what UAP could represent. Sources say a "list" of possible prosaic explanations for these mysterious airborne encounters was provided. However, the report expressly stated that the potential for UAP to be "alien" or "non-human" technology was of legitimate consideration.

All sources interviewed by *The Debrief* confirmed that the Task Force issued an updated second UAP position report later in the summer of this year. Like the first, officials say this recent intelligence report was very widely distributed and shared amongst the Intelligence Community.

"It went viral," said one intelligence official who had read the report.



Artist's recreation of the image as described in the UAPTF Intelligence Report issued in 2020 (Image by Dave Beaty of *The Nimitz Encounters*, 2020).

Overwhelmingly, everyone *The Debrief* spoke with said the most striking feature of the recently released UAPTF intelligence position report was the inclusion of new and “extremely clear” photograph of an unidentifiable triangular aircraft.

The photograph, which is said to have also been taken from inside the cockpit of a military fighter jet, depicted an apparent aerospace vehicle described as a large equilateral triangle with rounded or “blunted” edges and large, perfectly spherical white “lights” in each corner. Officials who had seen it said the image was captured in 2019 by an F/A-18 fighter pilot.

Two officials that received the report said the photo was taken after the triangular craft emerged from the ocean and began to ascend straight upwards at a 90-degree angle. It was indicated that this event occurred off the eastern coast of the United States. Several other sources confirmed the photo's existence; however, they declined to provide any further specifics of the incident.

Regarding the overall theme of the recent report, officials who read it say the report primarily focused on “Unidentified Submersible Phenomena,” or unidentified “transmedium” vehicles capable of operating both under water and in the air.

The three officials we spoke with said the report suggested the UAP Task Force appears to be concerned that the objects being termed as UAP may be originating from within the world's oceans. Strange as this may sound, the idea of “USOs” or “unidentified submersible objects” is not something exclusive to the current UAPTF.

In various public appearances, astronomer and chief video/image analyst for the Mutual UFO Network (MUFON), Marc D'Antonio, has [shared](https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/4487506/us-navy-is-running-top-secret-programme-to-detect-alien-spacecraft-under-the-ocean-ufo-expert-claims/) < Caution-<https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/4487506/us-navy-is-running-top-secret-programme-to-detect-alien-spacecraft-under-the-ocean-ufo-expert-claims/> > an unusual experience involving the detection of an underwater “Fast Mover,” which occurred while he was sailing as a civilian aboard one of the U.S. Navy's prized attack submarines.


Last year, defense journalist Tyler Rogoway [spoke with several veteran submariners](https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/25784/what-u-s-submariners-actually-say-about-detection-of-so-called-unidentified-submerged-objects) < Caution-<https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/25784/what-u-s-submariners-actually-say-about-detection-of-so-called-unidentified-submerged-objects> > to get their take on D'Antonio's account. While at least one person expressed skepticism about D'Antonio being granted a civilian ride-along, the Navy vets being interviewed almost unanimously acknowledged that unexplained, very high-speed sonar targets are indeed recorded by some of the most sophisticated listening equipment on the planet.

Agreeing only to speak on background, a senior member of the Intelligence Community whose responsibilities for decades involved underwater surveillance and reconnaissance programs told *The Debrief* there was validity to claims of extremely fast-moving underwater objects being detected by U.S. military systems.

“On occasion, there are detections made of non-cavitation, extremely fast-moving objects within the ocean.” The intelligence official declined to elaborate further, citing the high-levels of security classification associated with underwater reconnaissance.

Officials who had read the reports say the UAPTF appears particularly interested in “transmedium vehicles.” While this may seem unusual, many accounts exist—some going back centuries—in which people say they have observed unidentifiable craft operating in and out of the water.

The Debrief reached out to Steven Zaloga, co-author of the annual [World Military Unmanned Aerial Systems Market Profile & Forecast](https://shop.tealgroup.com/products/2019-2020-world-military-unmanned-aerial-systems-market-profile-forecast) < Caution-<https://shop.tealgroup.com/products/2019-2020-world-military-unmanned-aerial-systems-market-profile-forecast> > and senior defense analyst for the [Teal Group](https://www.tealgroup.com/index.php/about/analysts/steven-j-zaloga) < Caution-<https://www.tealgroup.com/index.php/about/analysts/steven-j-zaloga> > in Virginia, about the state of current or near-future development of “transmedium” vehicles or systems. Zaloga indicated he was unaware of any past or present technologies that are close to being capable of transitioning between air and submersible travel. “I have no idea what-so-ever on objects able to cross the air/water barrier,” Zaloga said in an email.



U.S. Navy photo by Mass Communication Specialist 3rd Class Pedro A. Rodriguez

WHAT IS THE PENTAGON OFFICIALLY SAYING ABOUT UAP?

Although *The Debrief* learned of the issuance and information reportedly detailed in the two UAPTF intelligence position reports, officials we spoke with declined to provide any specifics as to why the most recent report focused on waterborne associations with UAP.

One active defense official familiar with the current UAP investigations said the UAPTF has a wealth of photographic evidence, collected from military pilots' personal devices as well as sophisticated DoD surveillance and reconnaissance platforms. The source also told us some of the best evidence the UAPTF has acquired comes from measurement and signals intelligence (MASINT), rather than from videos or still images.

Although officials we spoke with didn't provide any specifics to this point, it is assumed that any Top-Secret or Sensitive Compartmentalized Information used to help form the UAPTF's current opinions would not have been included in the UAP position reports, based on their wide-spread distribution.

Before publication, *The Debrief* reached out to The Pentagon for comment on the information leaked from the UAPTF reports. Pentagon Spokesperson Susan Gough did not confirm or deny the existence of the UAP intelligence reports, and declined to make any comment on their contents. We followed up and requested the current media posture outlined by the official public affairs guide for UAP and dictated by [Department of Defense policy \(DoDI 5405.03\)](#) < Caution-<https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/540503p.pdf> > . Ms. Gough referred back to her previous statement, indicating that the DoD does not discuss UAP publicly. As noted elsewhere, refusal by the Pentagon to discuss UAP is [hardly anything new](#) < Caution-<https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/32550/what-the-pentagon-is-not-answering-about-the-air-force-and-recent-ufo-encounters> > .

In 2017, then Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Dana White [confirmed to Politico](#) < Caution-<https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/12/16/pentagon-ufo-search-harry-reid-216111> > that the DoD had studied UFOs under the Advanced Aerial Threat Identification Program (AATIP). Additionally, White said the program had been run by the former Director of National Programs Special Management Staff for the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence, Luis Elizondo. However, in an effort to "correct the record," in December 2019 the Pentagon [issued a statement](#) < Caution-<https://www.theblackvault.com/documentarchive/the-pentagon-corrects-record-on-secret-ufo-program/?fbclid=IwAR0R76wx-tx5gIZd5dYWknI4kLNSDRAiCe--3QxdBFSqxlhGQRUwF7ZSszUI> > saying AATIP was not UAP related, and that Elizondo had "no responsibilities" in the program.

In May of this year, *The Debrief* informed The Pentagon Public Affairs Office that we had conducted a number of interviews with former senior Pentagon officials, a senior White House advisor and obtained documents, which all showed AATIP was involved in UAP investigations, and that indeed Luis Elizondo was the custodian of the AATIP portfolio. Additionally, information obtained showed elements of the Defense Intelligence Agency and National Reconnaissance Office had participated in AATIP.

Though this request was less than six months after The Pentagon's "no responsibilities" statement, spokeswoman Gough replied, "Please keep in mind he [Elizondo] left DoD over three years ago, and there are personnel and privacy matters involved."

Given the recent Presidential election results and impending transfer of executive power, *The Debrief* reached out to the transition team for President-Elect Joe Biden. While not explicitly discussing UAP, a transition team spokesperson said Biden intends to "Immediately return to daily press briefings at the White House, U.S. Department of State, and U.S. Department of Defense. Our foreign policy relies on the informed consent of the American people. That is not possible when our government refuses to communicate with the public."



WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?

From closed-door meetings, to senior military leadership and the issuance of classified intelligence reports, all indications suggest the DoD is indeed taking the UAP issue seriously. However, what new information has come to light about the government's UAP investigations provides us with few answers, and certainly raises a number of questions.

Classification has long surrounded the U.S. government's most sophisticated airborne platforms. However, when it comes to underwater systems, the extremity of official secrecy falls into a class by itself. For instance, retired Navy Admiral Bobby Ray Inman [acknowledged](#) < Caution-https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_QEQ9SGZxYU > that he served as director for the National Underwater Reconnaissance Office (NURO) decades ago; yet despite this, to date the government denies that the NURO even exists.

Even if the Senate Select Intelligence Committee's request for an unclassified UAP report ends up being enacted in the FY2021 Intelligence Act, as legislative experts have pointed out, the UAP report provision is not not binding law. In essence, there's no guarantee the public will be provided any comprehensive information on UAP. Equally, while Congress is required to have access to classified information, only the executive branch has the authority to declassify national security information in order to make it public.

Should the DoD become more willing to discuss UAP publicly, there are plenty of indications that it might be a disappointment compared to many of the popular myths and narratives intertwined with the UFO subject over the last 70 years.

Every source *The Debrief* spoke with who had either seen the published position reports or were familiar with the activities of the UAPTF said that no concise estimate of the situation for UAP has been achieved. While they acknowledged that many hypotheses are being explored, the U.S. government presently lacks any definite explanation for UAP-related events.

Focusing on the DoD's statements that the mission of the UAPTF is to "detect, analyze and catalog UAPs that could potentially pose a threat to U.S. national security," *The Debrief* spoke with retired U.S. Air Force [Brigadier](#) < Caution-<https://www.af.mil/About-Us/Biographies/Display/Article/108833/brigadier-general-bruce-h-mcclintock/> > [General Bruce McClintock](#). < Caution-<https://www.af.mil/About-Us/Biographies/Display/Article/108833/brigadier-general-bruce-h-mcclintock/> >



Official Photo – Brig Gen Bruce McClintock (U.S. Air Force

Photo by Michael Pausic).

During his 30-year career with the Air Force, McClintock's assignments included White House Fellow to President George W. Bush, Executive Assistant to the Commander of NORAD, Executive Assistant to the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Special Assistant to the Commander of Air Force Space Command. Before retiring in 2017, Gen. McClintock amassed more than 3,000 flight hours on more than 35 aircraft, including the A-10, F-15B/D, F-16A/B/C/D, and the F-111. Presently, Gen. McClintock heads up the RAND corporation's [Space Enterprise Initiative](https://www.rand.org/about/people/m/mcclintock_bruce.html) < Caution-
https://www.rand.org/about/people/m/mcclintock_bruce.html > and serves as the focal point for all RAND space-related research for the U.S. government and U.S. allies.

McClintock was dismissive of the idea that U.S. military encounters with UAP could be related to any form of classified aerospace testing.

"It is unlikely that the U.S. government would intentionally conduct tests against its own unwitting military assets," he told *The Debrief* in an interview. "To do so would require a very high level of coordination and approval for the potential safety and operational security risks."

In [separate interviews](https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/31151/area-51-veteran-and-cia-electronic-warfare-pioneer-weigh-in-on-navy-ufo-encounters) < Caution-<https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/31151/area-51-veteran-and-cia-electronic-warfare-pioneer-weigh-in-on-navy-ufo-encounters> > last year, aerospace engineer and Area-51 veteran T.D. Barnes and former CIA executive S. Eugene "Gene" Poteat both suggested radar detections by the Navy of extreme aerial maneuvers sounded suspiciously similar to a top-secret electronic warfare program they were involved with in the 1960s, codenamed PALLADIUM.

However, Poteat and Barnes acknowledged they had no explanation for any of the physical sightings by military aviators. Coinciding with Gen. McClintock's comments, both men said everyone involved in any classified assessments involving the

use of classified aerospace platforms was made aware they were participating in a test. This even included times when the platforms were deemed “UFOs because they were so secret that they didn’t exist.”

McClintock, who also served as Senior Defense Attaché to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, seemed equally doubtful that UAP might represent the technology of a foreign adversary.

“It is not outside the realm of the plausible that an adversary would test the ability of the United States to detect some new capability, although it would be more likely they would only do this after testing the capability within or closer to their own territory before trying to penetrate U.S. airspace,” he stated.

Ultimately, after asking numerous current and former defense officials and subject matter experts, *The Debrief* has been unable to find anyone of authority—whether on, or off the record—willing to say the UAP encounters reported by military aviators are consistent with black budget testing, or “ferreting” of U.S. air defense by foreign governments. Equally, we have been unable to find anyone of credentialed background willing to say what, exactly, this means the source of these UAP could be.

Offering The Pentagon one final opportunity to discuss what we intended to report or comment on McClintock’s statement, The Debrief once more reached out to spokeswoman Susan Gough. Our offer went unanswered.

At least from an official position, the source behind unidentified aerial phenomena appears to remain a mystery.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 10:36 AM
To: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Cc: OSD Pentagon PA Mailbox Duty Officer Press Operations <(b)(6)>; (b)(6) USN
OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] FW: Can Norquist comment on creation of UFO task force?

CAUTION: This message was sent from outside the Nexstar organization. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

(b)(6) CTR (USA)

From: Kozik, David A SES OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA)
Sent: Friday, December 4, 2020 8:17 AM
To: Cummings, Matthew C (Matt) SES OSD OUSD INTEL (USA); (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Cc: (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA); (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA); Cuca, Alexi N CDR USN OLA WASHINGTON DC (USA)
Subject: RE: Debrief article
Signed By: (b)(6)

Copy, that's what I figured. Will work.

From: Cummings, Matthew C (Matt) SES OSD OUSD INTEL (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Friday, December 4, 2020 8:16 AM
To: Kozik, David A SES OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6)
Subject: Re: Debrief article

(b)(5) Dave, pls see email I just sent you and (b)(6) explaining. If you want the one product, (b)(6) at Navy should be able to deliver.

Matt

From: "Kozik, David A SES OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA)" (b)(6)
Date: Friday, December 4, 2020 at 8:10:06 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)" (b)(6)
Cc: (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA)" (b)(6) "Cummings, Matthew C (Matt) SES OSD OUSD INTEL (USA)" (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Debrief article

Thanks (b)(6)

From: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 8:23 PM
To: Kozik, David A SES OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6)
Subject: FW: Debrief article

David,
 Here's The Debrief article.

Regards,

(b)(6)

Caution-<https://www.thedebrief.org/fast-movers-and-transmedium-vehicles-the-pentagons-uap-task-force/?fbclid=IwAR2bJtq8vPslhxJrMmckYLjIRr27aOSqEQ-TulX8xb8uTbdowsUKaSkSOdM> < Caution-
<https://www.thedebrief.org/fast-movers-and-transmedium-vehicles-the-pentagons-uap-task-force/?fbclid=IwAR2bJtq8vPslhxJrMmckYLjIRr27aOSqEQ-TulX8xb8uTbdowsUKaSkSOdM> >

In an exclusive feature for *The Debrief*, U.S. military and intelligence officials, as well as Pentagon emails, offer an unprecedented glimpse behind the scenes of what's currently going on with The Pentagon's investigation into UFOs, or as they term them, "Unidentified Aerial Phenomena" (UAP).

For the last two years, the Department of Defense's newly revamped "Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Task Force" (or UAPTF) has been busy briefing lawmakers, Intelligence Community stakeholders, and the highest levels of the U.S. military on encounters with what they say are mysterious airborne objects that defy conventional explanations.

Along with classified briefings, multiple senior U.S. officials with direct knowledge of the matter say two classified intelligence reports on UAP have been widely distributed to the U.S. Intelligence Community. Numerous sources from various government agencies told *The Debrief* that these reports include clear photographic evidence of UAP. The reports also explicitly state that the Task Force is considering the possibility that these unidentified objects could, as stated by one source from the U.S. Intelligence Community said, be operated by "intelligences of unknown origin."

Significantly, a retired U.S. Air Force brigadier general and head of RAND corporation's Space Enterprise Initiative has—for the first time—gone on record to discuss some of the most likely explanations for UAP. His responses were surprising.

BRIEFINGS AT THE HIGHEST LEVELS

In June, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's [FY2021 Intelligence Authorization Act](#) < Caution-
<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CRPT-116srpt233/pdf/CRPT-116srpt233.pdf> > contained an intriguing section titled report on "Advanced Aerial Threats." In the inclusion, the committee gave an eye-opening official hint (in recent history) the government takes UFOs seriously by offering its support for the "efforts of the Unidentified Aerial Phenomenon Task Force at the Office of Naval Intelligence." The Intelligence Committee additionally requested an unclassified report detailing the analysis of "UAP" or "Anomalous Aerial Vehicles."

Though already acknowledged by the Intelligence Committee, in mid-August, the Pentagon [formally acknowledged](#) < Caution-
<https://www.thedebrief.org/the-dod-has-officially-announced-it-has-a-uap-task-force-heres-what-that-means/> > they had established a task force looking into UAP. In a press announcement, the Secretary of Defense's Office [stated](#) < Caution-
<https://www.defense.gov/Newsroom/Releases/Release/Article/2314065/establishment-of-unidentified-aerial-phenomena-task-force/> >, "the UAPTF's mission will be to detect, analyze and catalog UAPs that could potentially pose a threat to U.S. national security." According to the release, authority for the Task Force was approved by the DoD's chief operating officer, Deputy Secretary of Defense David L. Norquist.

The summer news of the establishment of the UAPTF seemingly suggests—for the first time since the shuttering of Project Blue Book (the Air Force's official investigations into UFOs) in 1969—that the Pentagon is now taking the subject of UFOs seriously.

However, an internal email obtained by *The Debrief* shows that almost one year before the DoD's announcement, the highest levels of the U.S. military were already being briefed on UAP.

The email, obtained via Freedom of Information Act request, shows an October 16th, 2019 exchange between then Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Robert Burke, and current Vice Chief of Staff for the Air Force General Stephen "Steve" Wilson.

In the email, Adm. Burke tells Gen. Wilson, “Recommend you take the brief I just received from our Director of Naval Intelligence VADM Matt Kohler, on Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP).” Adm. Burke concludes the email, “SECNAV [Secretary of the Navy] will get the same brief tomorrow at 1000.”

The “SECNAV” referenced in Adm. Burke’s email was then-Secretary of the Navy, Richard V. Spencer. A little over a month after this UAP briefing, Spencer was fired by then-Secretary of Defense Mark Esper over public disagreements stemming from a [series of controversies](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2019/nov/28/navy-secretary-richard-spencer-donald-trump-navy-seal) < Caution-<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2019/nov/28/navy-secretary-richard-spencer-donald-trump-navy-seal> > involving the court-martial of Navy SEAL Eddie Gallagher.

Speaking on background, one U.S. Defense official lamented that a lack of continuity with DoD leadership might have hindered some of the UAPTF’s work. Within the past 24 months, there have been four different Secretaries of the Navy and five additional Secretaries of Defense. Vice Admiral Matt Kohler, noted for having provided the briefings, retired after 36 years with the Navy in June of this year.

Reaching out to several active government officials and individuals who retain their government-issued security clearances, *The Debrief* learned that last fall was a busy time for the UAPTF. On October 21st, 2019, a briefing on UAP was conducted at the Pentagon for several Senate Armed Services Committee staffers.

Attendees at the meeting told *The Debrief* that they were provided information on two previous DoD-backed UFO programs: The Advanced Aerial Weapons Systems Applications Program (AAWSAP) and the Advanced Aerospace Threat Identification Program (AATIP). They were also briefed on “highly sensitive categories of UFO investigations.” Only two days later on October 23rd, staffers with the Senate Select Intelligence Committee were provided the same information in a meeting on Capitol Hill.

A former private contractor for AAWSAP and AATIP, Dr. Hal Puthoff, confirmed for *The Debrief* he was one of a handful of persons who conducted the October briefings. “I have been invited to brief congressional staffers on the Senate Armed Services Committee on UAP matters in the last couple of years,” Puthoff said in an email, “and have done so on more than one occasion.” Dr. Puthoff described the staffers during these meetings as being “engaged,” and provided “positive responses, [and] more details always being requested.”



The Pentagon Press Briefing Room seal (Credit: DoD/photo by Lisa Ferdinando)


The Debrief reached out to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Office and DoD Executive Services Office and formally requested an interview with someone authorized to speak on the UAP briefings with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In an email, Senior Strategist and Pentagon spokesperson Susan Gough responded, “To maintain operations security, which includes not disseminating information publicly that may be useful to our adversaries, DOD does not discuss publicly the details of either the observations or the examination of reported incursions into our training ranges or designated airspace, including those incursions initially designated as UAP – and that includes not discussing the UAPTF publicly, also.”

Official public affairs channels indicate the Pentagon is not interested in sharing any more information on the UAP topic. However, several current and former officials with the DoD and individuals working for multiple U.S. intelligence agencies told *The Debrief* that there was much more going on behind closed doors.

UAP INTELLIGENCE POSITION REPORTS

Multiple sources confirmed for *The Debrief* that the UAPTF had issued two classified intelligence position reports, which one individual described as “shocking.” Details provided on these reports suggest both a greater degree of Pentagon involvement, and that the UAPTF’s hunt for unidentified objects isn’t confined only to aerial phenomena.

Two officials with the DoD and one from the U.S. Intelligence community were willing to provide details on the contents of the classified report. An additional three other U.S. Intelligence Officials and a federal law enforcement officer confirmed the report’s existence but were only willing to provide comments on their distribution. Given the report’s classification and their discussion of a “sensitive intelligence matter,” the officials we spoke with did so only under strict conditions of anonymity. While *The Debrief* has agreed not to provide information on sources, identities, and employers, though everyone we spoke with works within the U.S. Intelligence Community and under the authority of the U.S. Director of National Intelligence.



Aerial view of the headquarters of the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) in Chantilly, Virginia, by Trevor Paglen.

One of the intelligence reports, released in 2018, is said to have provided a general overview of the UAP topic and included details of previous military encounters. According to sources who had read it, the report also contained an unreleased photograph of an “aerial phenomena” categorized as “unidentified.”

The Debrief was told the accompanying photo was captured from within the cockpit of an F/A-18 fighter jet with a pilot's personal cell phone. According to three U.S. officials who had seen it, the photo showed an unidentified silver "cube-shaped" object. The report is said to have indicated the object was "hovering" or completely motionless when military pilots encountered it. All three officials agreed that based on the photo, the object appeared to be at an altitude of roughly 30,000 to 35,000 feet and approximately 1,000 feet from the fighter jet.

Defense and intelligence officials willing to discuss the report and those who only wished to confirm its dissemination all expressed shock that it had been so widely distributed amongst the Intelligence community.

"In decades with the [Intelligence Community] I've never seen anything like this," said one intelligence official.

One defense official described the report's distribution as having gone through "normal, non-public, information sharing channels." Other officials who'd seen and read the report either declined to elaborate or indicated the report was distributed on various secure systems. One defense official indicated it was distributed on the DoD's Secret Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNet). Two other intelligence officials said they received the information via "NSANet" (the NSA's official intranet). An additional source said the report was distributed via the CIA's Intelink system.

According to those willing to discuss the document, the report's most disconcerting aspect was one of the potential explanations for what UAP could represent. Sources say a "list" of possible prosaic explanations for these mysterious airborne encounters was provided. However, the report expressly stated that the potential for UAP to be "alien" or "non-human" technology was of legitimate consideration.

All sources interviewed by *The Debrief* confirmed that the Task Force issued an updated second UAP position report later in the summer of this year. Like the first, officials say this recent intelligence report was very widely distributed and shared amongst the Intelligence Community.

"It went viral," said one intelligence official who had read the report.



Artist's recreation of the image as described in the UAPTF Intelligence Report issued in 2020 (Image by Dave Beaty of *The Nimitz Encounters*, 2020).

Overwhelmingly, everyone *The Debrief* spoke with said the most striking feature of the recently released UAPTF intelligence position report was the inclusion of new and “extremely clear” photograph of an unidentifiable triangular aircraft.

The photograph, which is said to have also been taken from inside the cockpit of a military fighter jet, depicted an apparent aerospace vehicle described as a large equilateral triangle with rounded or “blunted” edges and large, perfectly spherical white “lights” in each corner. Officials who had seen it said the image was captured in 2019 by an F/A-18 fighter pilot.

Two officials that received the report said the photo was taken after the triangular craft emerged from the ocean and began to ascend straight upwards at a 90-degree angle. It was indicated that this event occurred off the eastern coast of the United States. Several other sources confirmed the photo's existence; however, they declined to provide any further specifics of the incident.

Regarding the overall theme of the recent report, officials who read it say the report primarily focused on “Unidentified Submersible Phenomena,” or unidentified “transmedium” vehicles capable of operating both under water and in the air.

The three officials we spoke with said the report suggested the UAP Task Force appears to be concerned that the objects being termed as UAP may be originating from within the world's oceans. Strange as this may sound, the idea of “USOs” or “unidentified submersible objects” is not something exclusive to the current UAPTF.

In various public appearances, astronomer and chief video/image analyst for the Mutual UFO Network (MUFON), Marc D'Antonio, has [shared](https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/4487506/us-navy-is-running-top-secret-programme-to-detect-alien-spacecraft-under-the-ocean-ufo-expert-claims/) < Caution-<https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/4487506/us-navy-is-running-top-secret-programme-to-detect-alien-spacecraft-under-the-ocean-ufo-expert-claims/> > an unusual experience involving the detection of an underwater “Fast Mover,” which occurred while he was sailing as a civilian aboard one of the U.S. Navy's prized attack submarines.


Last year, defense journalist Tyler Rogoway [spoke with several veteran submariners](https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/25784/what-u-s-submariners-actually-say-about-detection-of-so-called-unidentified-submerged-objects) < Caution-<https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/25784/what-u-s-submariners-actually-say-about-detection-of-so-called-unidentified-submerged-objects> > to get their take on D'Antonio's account. While at least one person expressed skepticism about D'Antonio being granted a civilian ride-along, the Navy vets being interviewed almost unanimously acknowledged that unexplained, very high-speed sonar targets are indeed recorded by some of the most sophisticated listening equipment on the planet.

Agreeing only to speak on background, a senior member of the Intelligence Community whose responsibilities for decades involved underwater surveillance and reconnaissance programs told *The Debrief* there was validity to claims of extremely fast-moving underwater objects being detected by U.S. military systems.

“On occasion, there are detections made of non-cavitational, extremely fast-moving objects within the ocean.” The intelligence official declined to elaborate further, citing the high-levels of security classification associated with underwater reconnaissance.

Officials who had read the reports say the UAPTF appears particularly interested in “transmedium vehicles.” While this may seem unusual, many accounts exist—some going back centuries—in which people say they have observed unidentifiable craft operating in and out of the water.

The Debrief reached out to Steven Zaloga, co-author of the annual [World Military Unmanned Aerial Systems Market Profile & Forecast](https://shop.tealgroup.com/products/2019-2020-world-military-unmanned-aerial-systems-market-profile-forecast) < Caution-<https://shop.tealgroup.com/products/2019-2020-world-military-unmanned-aerial-systems-market-profile-forecast> > and senior defense analyst for the [Teal Group](https://www.tealgroup.com/index.php/about/analysts/steven-j-zaloga) < Caution-<https://www.tealgroup.com/index.php/about/analysts/steven-j-zaloga> > in Virginia, about the state of current or near-future development of “transmedium” vehicles or systems. Zaloga indicated he was unaware of any past or present technologies that are close to being capable of transitioning between air and submersible travel. “I have no idea what-so-ever on objects able to cross the air/water barrier,” Zaloga said in an email.



U.S. Navy photo by Mass Communication Specialist 3rd Class Pedro A. Rodriguez

WHAT IS THE PENTAGON OFFICIALLY SAYING ABOUT UAP?

Although *The Debrief* learned of the issuance and information reportedly detailed in the two UAPTF intelligence position reports, officials we spoke with declined to provide any specifics as to why the most recent report focused on waterborne associations with UAP.

One active defense official familiar with the current UAP investigations said the UAPTF has a wealth of photographic evidence, collected from military pilots' personal devices as well as sophisticated DoD surveillance and reconnaissance platforms. The source also told us some of the best evidence the UAPTF has acquired comes from measurement and signals intelligence (MASINT), rather than from videos or still images.

Although officials we spoke with didn't provide any specifics to this point, it is assumed that any Top-Secret or Sensitive Compartmentalized Information used to help form the UAPTF's current opinions would not have been included in the UAP position reports, based on their wide-spread distribution.

Before publication, *The Debrief* reached out to The Pentagon for comment on the information leaked from the UAPTF reports. Pentagon Spokesperson Susan Gough did not confirm or deny the existence of the UAP intelligence reports, and declined to make any comment on their contents. We followed up and requested the current media posture outlined by the official public affairs guide for UAP and dictated by [Department of Defense policy \(DoDI 5405.03\)](#) < Caution-<https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/540503p.pdf> > . Ms. Gough referred back to her previous statement, indicating that the DoD does not discuss UAP publicly. As noted elsewhere, refusal by the Pentagon to discuss UAP is [hardly anything new](#) < Caution-<https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/32550/what-the-pentagon-is-not-answering-about-the-air-force-and-recent-ufo-encounters> > .

In 2017, then Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Dana White [confirmed to Politico](#) < Caution-<https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/12/16/pentagon-ufo-search-harry-reid-216111> > that the DoD had studied UFOs under the Advanced Aerial Threat Identification Program (AATIP). Additionally, White said the program had been run by the former Director of National Programs Special Management Staff for the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence, Luis Elizondo. However, in an effort to "correct the record," in December 2019 the Pentagon [issued a statement](#) < Caution-<https://www.theblackvault.com/documentarchive/the-pentagon-corrects-record-on-secret-ufo-program/?fbclid=IwAR0R76wx-tx5gIZd5dYWknI4kLNSDRAiCe--3QxdBFSqxIhGQRUwF7ZSszUI> > saying AATIP was not UAP related, and that Elizondo had "no responsibilities" in the program.

In May of this year, *The Debrief* informed The Pentagon Public Affairs Office that we had conducted a number of interviews with former senior Pentagon officials, a senior White House advisor and obtained documents, which all showed AATIP was involved in UAP investigations, and that indeed Luis Elizondo was the custodian of the AATIP portfolio. Additionally, information obtained showed elements of the Defense Intelligence Agency and National Reconnaissance Office had participated in AATIP.

Though this request was less than six months after The Pentagon's "no responsibilities" statement, spokeswoman Gough replied, "Please keep in mind he [Elizondo] left DoD over three years ago, and there are personnel and privacy matters involved."

Given the recent Presidential election results and impending transfer of executive power, *The Debrief* reached out to the transition team for President-Elect Joe Biden. While not explicitly discussing UAP, a transition team spokesperson said Biden intends to "Immediately return to daily press briefings at the White House, U.S. Department of State, and U.S. Department of Defense. Our foreign policy relies on the informed consent of the American people. That is not possible when our government refuses to communicate with the public."



WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?

From closed-door meetings, to senior military leadership and the issuance of classified intelligence reports, all indications suggest the DoD is indeed taking the UAP issue seriously. However, what new information has come to light about the government's UAP investigations provides us with few answers, and certainly raises a number of questions.

Classification has long surrounded the U.S. government's most sophisticated airborne platforms. However, when it comes to underwater systems, the extremity of official secrecy falls into a class by itself. For instance, retired Navy Admiral Bobby Ray Inman [acknowledged](#) < Caution-https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_QE9SGZxYU > that he served as director for the National Underwater Reconnaissance Office (NURO) decades ago; yet despite this, to date the government denies that the NURO even exists.

Even if the Senate Select Intelligence Committee's request for an unclassified UAP report ends up being enacted in the FY2021 Intelligence Act, as legislative experts have pointed out, the UAP report provision is not not binding law. In essence, there's no guarantee the public will be provided any comprehensive information on UAP. Equally, while Congress is required to have access to classified information, only the executive branch has the authority to declassify national security information in order to make it public.

Should the DoD become more willing to discuss UAP publicly, there are plenty of indications that it might be a disappointment compared to many of the popular myths and narratives intertwined with the UFO subject over the last 70 years.

Every source *The Debrief* spoke with who had either seen the published position reports or were familiar with the activities of the UAPTF said that no concise estimate of the situation for UAP has been achieved. While they acknowledged that many hypotheses are being explored, the U.S. government presently lacks any definite explanation for UAP-related events.

Focusing on the DoD's statements that the mission of the UAPTF is to "detect, analyze and catalog UAPs that could potentially pose a threat to U.S. national security," *The Debrief* spoke with retired U.S. Air Force [Brigadier](#) < Caution-<https://www.af.mil/About-Us/Biographies/Display/Article/108833/brigadier-general-bruce-h-mcclintock/> > [General Bruce McClintock](#). < Caution-<https://www.af.mil/About-Us/Biographies/Display/Article/108833/brigadier-general-bruce-h-mcclintock/> >



Official Photo – Brig Gen Bruce McClintock (U.S. Air Force

Photo by Michael Pausic).

During his 30-year career with the Air Force, McClintock's assignments included White House Fellow to President George W. Bush, Executive Assistant to the Commander of NORAD, Executive Assistant to the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Special Assistant to the Commander of Air Force Space Command. Before retiring in 2017, Gen. McClintock amassed more than 3,000 flight hours on more than 35 aircraft, including the A-10, F-15B/D, F-16A/B/C/D, and the F-111. Presently, Gen. McClintock heads up the RAND corporation's [Space Enterprise Initiative](https://www.rand.org/about/people/m/mcclintock_bruce.html) < Caution-
https://www.rand.org/about/people/m/mcclintock_bruce.html > and serves as the focal point for all RAND space-related research for the U.S. government and U.S. allies.

McClintock was dismissive of the idea that U.S. military encounters with UAP could be related to any form of classified aerospace testing.

"It is unlikely that the U.S. government would intentionally conduct tests against its own unwitting military assets," he told *The Debrief* in an interview. "To do so would require a very high level of coordination and approval for the potential safety and operational security risks."

In [separate interviews](https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/31151/area-51-veteran-and-cia-electronic-warfare-pioneer-weigh-in-on-navy-ufo-encounters) < Caution-<https://www.thedrive.com/the-war-zone/31151/area-51-veteran-and-cia-electronic-warfare-pioneer-weigh-in-on-navy-ufo-encounters> > last year, aerospace engineer and Area-51 veteran T.D. Barnes and former CIA executive S. Eugene "Gene" Poteat both suggested radar detections by the Navy of extreme aerial maneuvers sounded suspiciously similar to a top-secret electronic warfare program they were involved with in the 1960s, codenamed PALLADIUM.

However, Poteat and Barnes acknowledged they had no explanation for any of the physical sightings by military aviators. Coinciding with Gen. McClintock's comments, both men said everyone involved in any classified assessments involving the

use of classified aerospace platforms was made aware they were participating in a test. This even included times when the platforms were deemed “UFOs because they were so secret that they didn’t exist.”

McClintock, who also served as Senior Defense Attaché to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, seemed equally doubtful that UAP might represent the technology of a foreign adversary.

“It is not outside the realm of the plausible that an adversary would test the ability of the United States to detect some new capability, although it would be more likely they would only do this after testing the capability within or closer to their own territory before trying to penetrate U.S. airspace,” he stated.

Ultimately, after asking numerous current and former defense officials and subject matter experts, *The Debrief* has been unable to find anyone of authority—whether on, or off the record—willing to say the UAP encounters reported by military aviators are consistent with black budget testing, or “ferreting” of U.S. air defense by foreign governments. Equally, we have been unable to find anyone of credentialed background willing to say what, exactly, this means the source of these UAP could be.

Offering The Pentagon one final opportunity to discuss what we intended to report or comment on McClintock’s statement, The Debrief once more reached out to spokeswoman Susan Gough. Our offer went unanswered.

At least from an official position, the source behind unidentified aerial phenomena appears to remain a mystery.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 10:36 AM
To: (b)(6) <(b)(6)>
Cc: OSD Pentagon PA Mailbox Duty Officer Press Operations (b)(6) (b)(6) USN
OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] FW: Can Norquist comment on creation of UFO task force?

CAUTION: This message was sent from outside the Nexstar organization. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

(b)(6)

CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 6:28 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: RE: Mainstream News Coverage on UAPTF

Categories: UAP AATIP Elizondo UFO

[MJ's article:](#)

Pentagon Announces Task Force to Study UFOs

The mission of the Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Task Force is to "detect, analyze, and catalog UAPs that could potentially pose a threat to U.S. national security."

Vice Motherboard, 17 August 2020... by MJ Banias and Tim McMillan

The Pentagon announced on Friday that it had elevated the status of its UAP task force following pressure from Congress and the fact that multiple instances have been reported of unknown objects reportedly making incursions into military airspace.

According to an emailed statement from Pentagon spokesperson Susan Gough and a press release from the Department of Defense, on August 4th, the military approved the establishment of an Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Task Force (UAPTF).

"The Department of Defense established the UAPTF to improve its understanding of, and gain insight into, the nature and origins of UAPs," read a statement made by Gough. "The mission of the task force is to detect, analyze, and catalog UAPs that could potentially pose a threat to U.S. national security."

The Pentagon's recent announcement comes on the heels of a provision added to the annual Intelligence Authorization Act titled "Advanced Aerial Threats." In the provision, the Senate Select Intelligence Committee offered their support for the "efforts of the Unidentified Aerial Phenomenon Task Force," and requested a "detailed analysis of unidentified aerial phenomena data and intelligence reporting collected or held by the Office of Naval Intelligence, including data and intelligence reporting held by the Unidentified Aerial Phenomena Task Force."

Some have interpreted this to mean The Pentagon is now suddenly creating a new UFO task force, equivalent to a Project Blue Book 2.0. However, what the government really just did was give some significant muscle to its relatively reclusive but long-standing involvement with UFOs.

Beginning in 2008, the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) was actively studying UFOs. The Advanced Aerospace Weapons System Application Program or AAWSAP was a UFO research project contracted out to hotel magnate Robert Bigelow's Bigelow Advanced Space Studies.

In 2012, the DIA ended funding for AAWSAP. However, former Department of Defense Supervisory Intelligence Specialist, Luis Elizondo, says he continued pursuing UFO investigations from his position as the Director of National Programs Special Management Staff. Under the moniker Advanced Aerial Threat Identification Program or AATIP, Elizondo directed the program until the Fall of

2017. Elizondo resigned from the DoD in protest because he believed that senior DoD officials were not taking claims of encounters with strange and unexplained aerial objects seriously.

While the Pentagon has been very cagey in discussing its UFO involvement going back to 2008, additional leaked documents published by Popular Mechanics show discussions regarding the transfer of responsibilities for AATIP to another unnamed official in the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence just before Elizondo's departure.

In a statement obtained in May by UFO writer Roger Glassel and reported by the Black Vault, Pentagon spokesperson Susan Gough acknowledged a "multi-agency task force" led by the Navy and under the cognizance of the Office of the Undersecretary of Defence for Intelligence has been in operation for some time now.

Some have expressed skepticism or criticism of the DoD's investigations into UFOs. Instead of dismissing the idea, the Pentagon continues to bolster credibility that indeed some mysterious unidentified objects are soaring through American airspace.

Rather than establishing a new program, the ongoing and existing UAP Task Force's authority will come directly from the top of the DoD food chain via the Deputy Secretary of Defense's Office.

In addition to the Pentagon's various branches, indications suggest the "multi-agencies" currently working with the UAP Task Force extend beyond just the DoD. When asked about any potential current involvement, an official with the FBI told Motherboard, "The FBI has a range of legal authorities that enable it to investigate federal crimes and threats to national security." However, specifically, when it comes to UFOs, the FBI official said, "We will defer to the Office of Naval Intelligence for comment."

NASA, on the other hand, said that "through its Earth-observing satellites, NASA] collects extensive data about Earth's atmosphere, often in collaboration with the other space agencies of the world. While these data are not specifically collected to identify atypical technosignatures, they are publicly available and anyone may use them to search for atypical technosignatures."

The space agency would rely on the broader scientific community to help search for and identify atypical or anomalous technosignatures, that might offer some answers to the DoD's current UAP problem. When explicitly asked about NASA's willingness to work with UAP Task Force, New said, "NASA is always open to collaborating with other agencies on areas of common interest."

"Unfortunately, I cannot speak officially as to the current nature of the UAP Task Force, but I have every indication to believe that it is up and running, and is executing the mission consistent with the fundamental principles of AATIP," Elizondo told Motherboard in an interview in July of this year. Elizondo then explained that the current task force has better resources and "is far more robust" than AATIP was while he served with the Pentagon.

This task force and the subsequent Congressional requests for unclassified information regarding unidentified aerial objects have made many in the UFO community very excited. While there are high hopes for some more public information, an official with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence told Motherboard, "We will evaluate the proposed provision and how best to respond to [Senate's] interest."

[Article](#)

From: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 4:18 PM

To: (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6); Stratton, John F (Jay) SES USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6); Cummings, Matthew C (Matt) SES OSD OUSD INTEL (USA) (b)(6); Tipton, Neill T SES OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6) USN (USA) (b)(6); Kozik, David A SES OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6) USN OSD OUSD INTEL & SEC (USA) (b)(6); Carranza, Guillermo R SES OSD OGC (USA) (b)(6); **Cc:** (b)(6) USN CHINFO WASHINGTON DC (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6) (b)(6) (b)(6) USAF AFELM OSD (USA) (b)(6)

Subject: Mainstream News Coverage on UAPTF

Folks,

Attached is a compilation of mainstream print/online and TV/radio news reports on Friday's announcement of the establishment of the UAPTF. There were multiple tv/radio mentions in several markets nationwide on the 14th/15th. The CBNC clip is representative of most segments, but our Media Analysis Team also included links to the major ABC and FOX hits.

Regards,

(b)(6)

(b)(6) CTR (USA)

From: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2020 9:32 AM
To: Stratton, John F (Jay) SES USN DCNO N2N6 (USA); (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA); Cummings, Matthew C (Matt) SES OSD OUSD INTEL (USA)
Cc: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)
Subject: RE: Hmmm...

I answered multiple queries about DOPSR, the DOPSR process, and the leak of the videos back when I first started assisting (b)(6), right after Navy released their new guidance to pilots on UAPs – that’s how I initially got involved, because DOPSR falls under my portfolio. A copy of the DD1910 that Elizondo had submitted to DOPSR to release the videos for research/database purposes got out to Greenwald, (b)(6), and others. I also answered some queries about whether DoD did an investigation, which included what you provided me regarding the Navy investigations, and that the DoD investigation had only looked at whether classified info had been leaked (so the first sentence of the third paragraph of the article is accurate). AFOSI, of course, never provided PA with a copy of their report, so neither (b)(6) nor I knew what was in it. The only info we were provided was that their investigation focused on whether classified information had been leaked, and that the determination eventually was that none had been (keep in mind this was 2019, two years after the leak to NYT/Politico).

And we’ve never said Elizondo never worked on UFOs at all, we’ve only reiterated over and over and over again that he had no assigned responsibilities for AATIP. There was one set of queries very early on that we replied that he had done some coordination/introductions but did not run AATIP/was not part of AATIP. This was per input from (b)(6). I’d have to dig around to find that verbage; per OGC, though, we don’t use it anymore.

I don’t recall (b)(6) asking about AFOSI back in April.

From: Stratton, John F (Jay) SES USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2020 8:42 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Hmmm...

Do we know if this was covered in the AFOSI investigation conducted a few years ago?

<https://www.vice.com/en/article/akwmdk/this-is-the-pentagons-real-men-in-black-investigation-of-tom-delonges-ufo-videos>

From: (b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2020 10:31 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6); Stratton, John F (Jay) SES USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6)
Subject: Re: Hmmm...

Jay,

DOPSR never approved release of the videos to the general public. They only approved release to other USG and contractors specifically for use in research/database development. Elizondo was the requestor and after the initial request, he asked if it could be expanded to general public release. That approval was never granted.

(b)(6)

Regarding VADM Trussler's question, that would ultimately need to go to OSD OGC and OUSD(I&S), but first we'd need to check the date for when (b)(6) departed DoD — was he still an official at the time of the leak?

Sent from my iPhone

From: (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA)" (b)(6)
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2020 at 9:07:25 AM
To: "Stratton, John F (Jay) SES USN DCNO N2N6 (USA)" (b)(6)
(b)(6) CIV OSD PA (USA)" (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Hmmm...

Good timing issue to know.

(b)(5)

From: Stratton, John F (Jay) SES USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2020 6:55 AM
To: (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6); (b)(6)
CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Hmmm...

(b)(5)
(b)(5)

Sent with BlackBerry Work
(www.blackberry.com)

From: (b)(6) CIV USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6)
Date: Wednesday, Oct 21, 2020, 6:36 AM

To: Stratton, John F (Jav) SES USN DCNO N2N6 (USA) (b)(6)
CIV OSD PA (USA) (b)(6)

Subject: FW: Hmmm...

<https://www.vice.com/en/article/5dpm45/this-guy-says-he-was-the-source-of-the-pentagons-ufo-videos>

Ex Intel Official Says He Was the Source of the Pentagon's UFO Videos

In the [recently released UFO documentary The Phenomenon](#), Chris Mellon, the former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, stated that he was the source who [provided the New York Times](#) with the three infamous UFO videos it published in 2017.

Mellon, who is currently a member of Tom DeLonge's To the Stars Academy, told filmmaker James Fox in an on-camera interview that he met with an unnamed individual in the parking lot of the Pentagon and was handed a package containing the [three videos](#) that formed the basis of the most important UFO article in many years.

"I received the videos, the now famous videos in the Pentagon parking lot from a Defense Department official. I still have the packaging," Mellon said. "This is a case where somebody bent the rules a little bit, and they did so for the larger good and we're absolutely all better off because of it."

Motherboard has been unable to independently verify that Mellon was the source of the videos, but his story tracks with everything we know about them. We know that To the Stars Academy ultimately published the videos, and Mellon was one of the earliest members of that group.

One of the *New York Times* journalists who worked on that story, Leslie Kean, also appears in the documentary. In that story, the *Times* unveiled a secretive Pentagon UFO program called the Advanced Aerospace Threat Identification Program, or AATIP, and released videos shot by Navy pilots who intercepted a strange object off the coast of San Diego on November 14th, 2004. The pilots [managed to shoot video of the object with their F-18's gun camera](#). Two other videos recorded on January 21st, 2015, were released [showing another anomalous aerial vehicle](#) rotating while in flight and [another object quickly flying over the water below](#).

Months earlier, in late August of 2017, the former head of AATIP, Luis Elizondo, worked with the Defense Office of Prepublication and Security Review to [have the three videos declassified](#). On October 4th, Kean [met with Elizondo](#) as well as other individuals where she was told about the secret UFO program. Elizondo told Motherboard that Chris Mellon was in the room as well, and showed Kean videos on a laptop. Elizondo believes that the videos Kean was shown were the three UAP videos in question, but could not confirm it outright because he was not looking at the computer during that time.

Earlier that same day, [Elizondo resigned](#) from his position at the Pentagon. Only days later, Elizondo along with Mellon [would appear on stage](#) with former Blink 182 punk rocker Tom DeLonge and announce a new UFO research organization named “To The Stars Academy of Arts and Science.”

As a result, UFOs have become a hot topic. Publicly, the Department of Defence established a new UAP Task Force on August 4th, 2020 to continue investigating UFO reports made by military personnel. However, [previous statements by the Pentagon contradict this and seem to indicate](#) that the Office of Naval Intelligence along with the Office of the Secretary of Defense has had such a task force well before August of 2020.

Motherboard reached out to Kean and she stated that due to policies concerning source identity at the New York Times, she could not comment. Mellon was also unable to comment at this time and declined an interview. A spokesperson for the *New York Times* told Motherboard “the Department of Defense was the on the record source of the videos in our coverage. We don’t plan to comment beyond that.”