

# The Milwaukie “Amoeba” UFOs

## An Oregon MUFON Case Study

by

**Keith Rowell**

**Oregon MUFON Assistant State Director  
Research Specialist in Librarianship**

***May 8, 2013***

### **Abstract**

Keywords: Two UFOs—Similarity—Video—Pink—”Organic” Shape—White

<b>Description</b>	Witness Don Andersberg (pseudonym) saw and video-recorded from his backyard in blue sky daylight on two separate dates ten months apart two separate UFOs that looked and behaved very similarly. They were both small, somewhat transforming, mostly whitish, oddly-shaped objects. They both showed a pinkish area — one more prominent than the other. One of the UFOs showed two ragged “arms” that divided up into two parts at the tip at different points in the video. Don first saw the UFOs and then began video-recording them as they moved along slowly in the sky.
<b>Witness(es)</b>	One witness: Don Andersberg (pseudonym).
<b>Date and Time</b>	Amoeba UFO #1: August 10, 2012, at 1:38 to 1:40 PM. Amoeba UFO #2: April 15, 2013, at 2:00 to 2:03 PM.
<b>Place</b>	Milwaukie, Oregon.
<b>Weather</b>	Amoeba UFO #1: Temperature 75° F; winds variable at 4.6 mph; partly cloudy; visibility 10 miles.  Amoeba UFO #2: Temperature 54° F; winds were WNW at 11.5 mph; mostly cloudy; visibility 10 miles.
<b>Duration</b>	Amoeba UFO #1: Two minutes and 4 seconds total of video plus probably about 10 seconds before video started.  Amoeba UFO #2: Three minutes and 37 seconds total of video plus probably about 10 seconds before video started.

**Important Update:** Tuesday, June 11, 2013



# Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
About Balloon Mimic UFOs.....	1
Thank You, Don Andersberg.....	2
SIGHTING DESCRIPTIONS.....	2
Description of Amoeba UFO #1.....	2
Description of “Amoeba” UFO #2.....	3
ENVIRONMENT.....	4
Weather.....	5
EVIDENCE.....	6
The Witness.....	6
Don Not Hoaxing.....	6
The UFO Videos.....	7
Camera Description.....	7
Video Description: Amoeba UFO #1.....	7
Video Description: Amoeba UFO #2.....	8
ANALYSIS.....	9
UFO Color and Shape.....	9
Some Random Images of Amoeba UFO #1.....	10
UFO Photos for Amoeba UFO #2.....	13
UFO Behavior.....	15
Five Second Interval Snap Shots.....	15
Amoeba UFO #1.....	15
Amoeba UFO #2.....	16
Size, Distance, and Speed.....	19
Angular Size of Amoeba UFO #2.....	20
Amoeba UFO #2 UFO Distance.....	21
Real UFO Size.....	22
Amoeba UFO #2 Speed.....	23
Lazy(?) UFOs.....	23
A Possible ID: Oddly Shaped Balloons?.....	23
A Probable ID: Light-weight Plastic Bags.....	24
Identification Candidates.....	24
A Missing Identification Candidate.....	25
A Safeway Bag Test.....	25
Simple Safeway Bag Fails.....	26

Getting the Bags Up to Altitude .....	27
What Did the Test Video Reveal? .....	27
Amoeba UFO #2 Identity Determined Now .....	28
A Subway Bag .....	30
CONCLUSION .....	31
Identification Candidates .....	31

# ***IMPORTANT UPDATE***

Thanks to the help of an Internet *oregonmufon.com* reader and the Oregon MUFON State Director and others in addition to my own test demonstrations, I now believe that we have a plausible ID for this UFO case study. The UFO evidence leads to the probable conclusion that the two UFOs in this case study are two separate light-weight plastic bags at very high altitudes of around 3000 to 5000 feet. Air currents, perhaps summer thermal air currents in one of the UFOs, were fortuitous enough to carry these plastic bags high into the air and over Don Andersberg's Milwaukie home. He is well aware of balloons traveling at high and low altitudes over his home, but these are the first instances of plastic bags that we know of. Ironically, after this case study was published, he video-recorded a *low altitude* plastic bag for the first time. It was clearly identifiable as a Subway plastic sandwich bag. See the additional information in the *ANALYSIS* section for the full particulars.

## **INTRODUCTION**

This video case is interesting because it consists of two separate UFO incidents — separated by ten months yet occurring in the same airspace — of the “same” kind of *complex* appearing and behaving UFO.

The witness, Don Andersberg (pseudonym), has seen and video'd many similarly shaped, behaving, and colored *single* UFOs before these two, but they were almost always of simple shapes and simple colors, for example, red and shiny spheres/orbs or white spheres/orbs.

This is essentially the first time a complex appearing UFO has seemingly showed up again. The two UFOs are similar, but not the same. They are both basically white with some highlighting. Both have an odd pinkish color on the surface or seemingly inside as a definite spot. Both have some gray spots. Both have some shape changes with odd protuberances. Both tumbled around in the sky at they moved slowly along seemingly on the wind.

An ordinary analogy might help here. Imagine one make and model of car, say, a Volkswagen Beetle automobile, of the same factory white color but with an odd pink hood. Now imagine that you saw this car go by your house one day and happened to notice it perhaps because of the odd pink hood. Then say you were looking out ten months later and saw the “same” car (because of the pink hood) go by, but this time the car had evidently been in a pretty bad car crash and the body was severely banged up and crumpled. But the pink hood was still visible along with the white body and the car could still drive by. This might give you a quick idea of the basic similarities but differences in the two UFOs highlighted in this interesting case. Did you see two separate cars or, as I said, one car that was altered in a car crash?

Of course, if Don's “amoeba” UFOs are genuine UFOs, we can hardly begin to imagine what is going on in this case. But if this UFO is the result of some “mad genius” young adult(s) playing a prank on Don with a gas bag airborne contraption with some pink glowing LED lights incorporated, perhaps, then why aren't the two UFOs more similar? But more pertinent, why does Don keep video'ing his oddball UFOs on a regular basis over three and more years?

## **About Balloon Mimic UFOs**

This case reveals yet another kind of balloon mimic UFO floating around in the skies over a major metropolitan area—the suburb of Milwaukie in the Portland, Oregon, metro area. See some of Don's earlier documented cases up on *oregonmufon.com* for more examples of balloon mimic UFOs. See the *Milwaukie “Sprouting Potato” UFO*; *Milwaukie Colorful, Transforming UFO*; *Milwaukie Green Snake UFO*; and *Milwaukie Pink, White, and Blue Orbs Cluster UFO*.

Don and I know from his many hours of video that he is video-recording the genuine UFO phenomenon, but we will try to make that idea plausible here from the evidence in yet another one of his better videos to

date. We believe that these two different cases of “amoeba” type UFOs are simply *not* the closest natural or human-made object/phenomenon that they vaguely resemble: some sort of bizarre-looking balloon type contraption concocted by some DIY “maker” aficionado. In other words, this UFO is a genuine UFO, that is, an intelligently behaving, guided, and created aerial object and not at all some natural or human-made IFO. In this report, you are looking at images of a genuine UFO, we believe. See what you think.

## **Thank You, Don Andersberg**

I thank UFO witness and video-recorder, Don Andersberg, for his full cooperation in my investigations of these and his many other UFO videos. He has continually made all of his videos (and photos) freely available to me for analysis. I have been to his house (and he has been to mine) many times and I consider him a good friend.

Don says his motive for spending hours looking for and occasionally video-recording truly anomalous UFO occurrences is to create concrete evidence about the phenomenon. I believe him. He has done nothing to dissuade me in what he has said or done. He is simply curious about “what the heck they are” as so many people around the world are. Unlike the vast majority, however, he puts in the time (hours and hours a month) scanning the skies and zeroing in on the occasional UFO.

Thanks, Don, for your patience and diligence so that the rest of us can get a little closer to understanding this elusive phenomenon.

## **SIGHTING DESCRIPTIONS**

This case consists of two separate UFO sightings of very similar, somewhat complex-looking objects. The viewing and recording circumstances are very similar. Essentially, only the time of day and time of year varies along with some shape differences. Otherwise, these two sightings are very similar.

### **Description of Amoeba UFO #1**

On August 10, 2012, in the backyard of his Milwaukie, Oregon, home at 1:38 to 1:40 PM, Don video-recorded yet another UFO high up in the sky. This one appeared to him first off to the northwest between his roof and some trees in his backyard.

Amoeba UFO #1 was an irregularly shaped object with two “arms” of somewhat varying appearance and shape during the length of the video. Some highlighting appeared as the object actively tumbled and moved along in the sky. A curious definite pinkish spot appeared inside and in the middle of the object. Some darkish smaller spots came and went as the object was seen in the video viewfinder of Don’s camera.

Don’s house and backyard are oriented to the compass directions with the fences in his backyard running parallel to the cardinal directions. He has trees and shrubs in the backyard, which obscure the horizon but allow him to have an approximately 120° angle look at the sky if he is in the middle of his yard. His house is to the west of the backyard.



Source: Don Andersberg and Keith Rowell

### **Figure 1. Don's Backyard with Amoeba UFO #1**

*Please note: This illustration is a **photo composite of two different frames** of Don's video. The size of the UFO in this illustration is the final size only after Don has zoomed all the way in on the tiny UFO. When Don's camera is zoomed in to its fullest extent when he video-records his UFOs (with his latest camera), he is video-recording at the equivalent of a 20 power telescope. So, it takes a good pair of binoculars to see, or a good, long telephoto to photograph or video-record, most of the UFOs Don sees. They truly are tiny in the sky! This illustration is meant only to give you an idea of where in the sky the UFO appeared. The direction is off to the NW from Don's backyard.*

### **Description of "Amoeba" UFO #2**

On April 15, 2013, in the backyard of his Milwaukie, Oregon, home at 2:00 to 2:03 PM, Don video-recorded yet another UFO high up in the sky. This one appeared to him first off to the northwest between his roof and some trees in his backyard.

Amoeba UFO #2 was an irregularly shaped object with somewhat varying appearance and shape during the length of the video. Some highlighting appeared as the object actively tumbled and moved along in the sky. A curious definite pinkish tinge extending inward appeared on the side of the UFO. But the pinkish areas were not nearly as prominent as in Amoeba UFO #1. Some darkish smaller spots came and went as the object was seen in the video viewfinder of Don's camera.



Source: Don Andersberg and Keith Rowell

**Figure 2. Don's Backyard with Amoeba UFO #2**

*Please note: This illustration is a **photo composite of two different frames** of Don's video. The size of the UFO in this illustration is the final size only after Don has zoomed all the way in on the tiny UFO. (Note that this composite illustration borrows the initial frame from Don's Amoeba UFO #1 video since Don did not happen to include a "scene setting" frame with his Amoeba UFO #2 video as he usually does with all his UFO videos.)*

## ENVIRONMENT

The environment for this sighting is Milwaukie, Oregon. See *Figure 3, Milwaukie, Oregon, and Environs*. Don lives in about the middle of this aerial view of Milwaukie, Oregon, near the oval track in the center. A bend of the Willamette River is to the left, a light industry area is to the north, and a shopping center and more light industry is to the southeast. None of these factors have anything to do with the UFOs that Don sees and video-records on an almost routine basis.

However, the Portland, Oregon, metropolitan area as a whole that Milwaukie is part of does tend to produce a small number of balloons that Don also video-records and that we must distinguish from his genuine UFOs.

Additionally, car sales lots—with balloon displays at times—are to the south of Don starting at a mile away to five or more miles away. UFOs virtually never come from the south for Don, however. But he has taken one video of some large, strung-together balloons that we suspect were escaped car sales lot display balloons.





Source: Google Maps

**Figure 3. Milwaukie, Oregon, and Environs**

## Weather

See the details in *Table 1, Weather on Sighting Days*, for the weather on the days of the UFO sightings and video-recordings.

**Table 1. Weather on Sighting Days**

Event Date	Event Time	Temp (F)	Visibility (miles)	Wind Direction	Wind Speed (mph)	Conditions
8/10/12	1:38 PM	75°	10	Variable	3.5	Partly Cloudy
4/15/13	2:00 PM	54°	10	WNW	11.5	Mostly Cloudy

# EVIDENCE

The evidence in this case consists of the following:

- Don Andersberg's testimony.
- Amoeba UFO #1: A two minute and four second video (DSCN3866.MOV).
- Amoeba UFO #2: A three minute and 36 second video (DSCN6439.MOV).
- Four photos of Amoeba UFO #2 taken at maximum resolution with Don's Nikon Coolpix P510.

## The Witness

Don Andersberg is a quiet and unassuming man in his early fifties who currently works for a custodial services company. A few years ago (2009), Don found his way to one of our public Oregon MUFON meetings. After the meeting, he approached me and said that he had been photographing and video-recording what he thought were UFOs from his backyard in a suburb of Portland, Oregon. He explained that in the past year he decided to try to capture UFOs with his (consumer grade) camera and video equipment. He added that he had seen a few things he thought were probably UFOs earlier in his life. He gave me some short video clips and some photos shot over a couple of months.

When I looked at them later at home, I saw pretty quickly that Don was yet another person who was capturing UFOs on a regular basis. By that time, I knew definitely that some people were seeing UFOs on a more or less continuing, but non-periodic, basis. You never knew when the darned things were going to show up. But show up they did—off and on—seemingly on their own, mysterious schedule. I myself by that time had also seen, photographed, and videotaped a few of the same kinds of oddball, usually glowing, orb-type UFOs that were most closely similar to party balloons, or clusters of party balloons. (See the *Appaloosa Way UFO* and the *Lake Grove Spherical UFOs* case studies on [oregonmufon.com](http://oregonmufon.com).)

## Don Not Hoaxing

Since that time a couple of years ago now, I have come to know Don better and better since he's been to my house a number of times and I've been to his a number of times. We even drove out together to visit James Gilliland's ECETI ranch for some UFO viewing in September 2011. (The five of us in our little Oregon MUFON group didn't end up seeing anything anomalous.) I feel I know Don very well now and far better than I do the average UFO witnesses that we MUFON investigators deal with on a regular basis. So, I know beyond a shadow of a doubt that Don is not faking or hoaxing anything.

The photos and videos that he has taken and shares with me for my analysis are offered freely and without restrictions of any kind. He simply wants the fact of UFO reality to be shared with as many people as possible.

Don knows the basics about cameras at a level above the average user, I would say. His knowledge of computers is more at a basic level, however. He likes learning about computers but freely admits that he has a lot to learn. He learns just enough to examine his videos and photos up close and magnified, but, even though he purchased Final Cut Express (a sophisticated program for producing high quality videos) at my suggestion, he finds it too difficult to learn. (I know what he means—the learning curve is steep and I still have a long way to go myself.)

All these facts are something you need to know to be able to properly evaluate the evidence in this case study. Don has not hoaxed or altered in any way any of the evidence he has given me to evaluate. And for that matter, I am not hoaxing anything in this case, and, in general, I do the very minimum with the photographic and video evidence that UFO witnesses lend me to illustrate the points I am trying to make in my case studies.

## The UFO Videos

The video files for this case study were copied to my computer as MOV files with the properties as shown in *Table 2, Video File Properties*.

**Table 2. Video File Properties**

UFO Name	File Name	Frame Size (pixels)	Video Rate (fps)	Duration (mm:ss)	Format
Amoeba UFO #1	DSCN3866.MOV	1,920 x 1,080	29.97	2:04	AVC Coding
Amoeba UFO #2	DSCN6439.MOV	1,920 x 1,080	29.97	3:36	AVC Coding

## Camera Description

Don's camera for the videos and photos in this case is a Nikon Coolpix P510. This compact digital camera has a 42X zoom lens and takes full HD (1080p) resolution video, which it stores as files in removable memory cards. The lens when fully zoomed in giving the maximum image magnification is equivalent to a 20 power telescope or pair of binoculars. The camera has a high quality Nikon made lens. The camera lens can be focused manually with a switch on the outside of the body. This is quite handy when trying to focus well on the very small UFOs that Don video-records.

## Video Description: Amoeba UFO #1

*Figure 4, Full Frame of Amoeba UFO #1* shows what the UFO looked like to Don through the electronic viewfinder as he was video-recording the UFO as it "drifted" along in the sky. The UFO in pixels measures around 50 pixels horizontal and 35 pixels at its largest. This varies some, of course, as the UFO changes image size as it moves along in the sky. These pixel dimensions are large for most of Don's UFOs so far—though balloons identified as real balloons come in bigger sizes frequently and sometimes smaller, down to around 20 pixels in size. (Below about 15 pixels across it is getting difficult to tell UFOs from real balloons; there just isn't enough detail in the image if all you have is the image itself as evidence. However, UFO behavior can sometimes differentiate UFOs from balloons when the pixel count is low.) We are hoping that Don's UFO images will continue to get bigger and bigger and more detailed as he continues to video-record them. This has been the basic trend over the latest few years especially.



Source: Don Andersberg

#### **Figure 4. Full Frame of Amoeba UFO #1**

*This is a full frame still from a frame near frame 00:26;00 of video DSCN3866. The UFO is the small white irregular-shaped object in the clear blue sky field. You can see the two projections and just barely make out a small pink "heart" in the middle of the object. The focal length equivalent is a 1000 mm lens on a 35 mm film camera. The telescopic power magnification is around 20 power. Most binoculars are usually 6 to 10 power.*

#### **Video Description: Amoeba UFO #2**

*Figure 5, Full Frame of Amoeba UFO #2, shows what the UFO looked like to Don through the electronic viewfinder as he was video-recording the UFO as it "drifted" along in the sky. The UFO in pixels measures around 30 pixels horizontal and 30 pixels vertical at its largest. This varies some, of course, as the UFO changes image size as it moves along in the sky.*

Don decided for Amoeba UFO #2 at the start of the recording to do some regular still photographs and he managed to capture four good ones, which you can see in *Figure 9, Comparison of Amoeba UFO #2 Photos*. He then went on to video-record over three minutes as noted above. So we have the luxury of viewing some extra-high resolution photos along with the behavior-revealing video for Amoeba UFO #2. The pixel sizes in Photo 6434 of Amoeba UFO #2 are approximately 70 pixels horizontal and 62 pixels vertical.



Source: Don Andersberg

### **Figure 5. Full Frame of Amoeba UFO #2**

*This is a full frame still from a frame near frame 00:37:00 of video DSCN6439. The UFO is the small white irregular-shaped object in the clear blue sky field. The focal length equivalent is a 1000 mm lens on a 35 mm film camera, or about 20 power.*

## **ANALYSIS**

This case offers not only color, shape, and behavior for analysis, but also the opportunity to calculate real size, distance, and speed because the Amoeba UFO #2 passed under some clouds, so we could obtain weather data that gives us approximate cloud heights.

### **UFO Color and Shape**

The figures under this heading are created to show a representative sample of the basic colors and tones and the subtle changes in shape that the UFOs went through as they moved along in the sky. See *Figure 6, Random Amoeba UFO #1 Images (#1)*, *Figure 7, Random Amoeba UFO #1 Images (#2)*, *Figure 8, Random Amoeba UFO #1 Images (#3)*, and *Figure 9, Comparison of Amoeba UFO #2 Photos*.

Note the following characteristics general to both UFOs:

- The UFOs exhibit two basic colors: pink and whitish. The basic bodies of the UFOs are whitish. Both have pink associated with them: Amoeba UFO #1 has a very prominent pink spot seemingly on the interior of the object while Amoeba UFO #2 has only a pinkish tinge and no spot. This latter is clearly shown in *Figure 9, Comparison of Amoeba UFO #2 Photos*.
- The overall brightness of colors does not vary significantly except for some bright highlighting at different portions of both objects. On Amoeba UFO #1, the bright spots are found on the tips of the arms and other parts of the body. On Amoeba UFO #2, the bright spots are not nearly so prominent, but the overall size of the video image is smaller, so bright spots might be harder to detect clearly. However, we believe they are there.
- Both UFOs have regions of darker gray tone lending some modeling and shading to the UFOs. The texture is overall roughish for both.
- Both UFOs seem to have no particular axis of rotation. They seem to be tumbling in a more or less random fashion.


Examine the following figures for a good idea of the variation in the colors, configurations, and surface textures in these UFOs.

### **Some Random Images of Amoeba UFO #1**

The images in chronological order, but randomly chosen, in *Figure 6, Random Amoeba UFO #1 Images (#1)* through *Figure 8, Random Amoeba UFO #1 Images (#3)*, are captured at 200% in Final Cut Pro X. The image size was increased because added detail is available in this sequence since the inherent pixel dimensions are pretty good.


Note some interesting characteristics for Amoeba UFO #1:

- The arm-type protuberances vary somewhat as the UFO twists, turns, and tumbles as it moves along in the sky.
- In images 4215, 10527, and 13028, one of the arm-type protuberances definitely is split at the end, which it is not in all the other images. Curious.
- The pink “heart” spot varies quite a bit in intensity and position as the UFO moves along in the sky.
- The highlighting seems to vary some but not as much as the shape of the arms and pink “heart” spot do.
- Some dark gray (internal?) spots on the object also move around from the arms to the body and back.



Source: Don Andersberg and Keith Rowell


**Figure 6. Random Amoeba UFO #1 Images (#1)**



Source: Don Andersberg and Keith Rowell

**Figure 7. Random Amoeba UFO #1 Images (#2)**





Source: Don Andersberg and Keith Rowell

**Figure 8. Random Amoeba UFO #1 Images (#3)**

### **UFO Photos for Amoeba UFO #2**

Lately, in 2013, I've been encouraging Don to take some photos of his UFOs if he can and not jeopardize his video-recording. I've suggested taking some video first and then if he's got some good video, stop the video, put the camera in photo mode and take some photos. Then if the UFO is still around, go back to video mode and take some more video.

The reasoning is this. The resolution of HD video is 1920 horizontal by 1080 vertical, but the resolution of the highest resolution setting on Don's Nikon Coolpix P510 is 4608 horizontal by 3456 vertical. So, we get more than 7.5 times as many pixels in photos as we do in video. More pixels translates into more details, and you can see this in *Figure 9, Comparison of Amoeba UFO #2 Photos*, compared to the video.

Look at the video frame image captures in *Figure 10, Amoeba #1 at Five Second Intervals*, later to see the difference.

For Amoeba UFO #2, Don decided to take some photos before he began taking video, and he managed to take five photos (one was not sharp enough to show in *Figure 9, Comparison of Amoeba UFO #2 Photos*). The four good ones are shown for comparison. Note the pinkish tinge in the lower left (6434), lower right (6436), middle left (6437), and middle left (6438) of the images. (Amoeba UFO #1 had a very prominent pinkish area in the interior of the UFO. See *Figure 6, Random Amoeba UFO #1 Images (#1)* through *Figure 8, Random Amoeba UFO #1 Images (#3)*.) Note the highly variable roughish light surface texture and the somewhat prominent larger gray area—possibly concave areas on the surface.



Source: Don Andersberg and Keith Rowell

**Figure 9. Comparison of Amoeba UFO #2 Photos**

## UFO Behavior

The behavior of the UFOs is best seen in examination of the UFO video itself. So, only brief descriptions are given here. See *Figure 10, Amoeba UFO #1 at Five Second Intervals*, *Figure 11, Amoeba UFO #2 at Five Second Intervals (#1)*, and *Figure 12, Amoeba UFO #2 at Five Second Intervals (#2)* to get a sense of the variety of movement in these UFOs.

### Five Second Interval Snap Shots

Individual descriptions along with some comments follow. Note that since the videos for the Amoeba UFO #1 and Amoeba UFO #2 were both shot at the maximum camera magnification and the image captures were both done at 100%, we can directly compare the sizes of the two UFOs. It is evident that either the inherent sizes of the UFOs differed and/or the distances from the camera differed.

### Amoeba UFO #1


To give you an idea of how Amoeba UFO #1 changed over time an interval of five seconds was chosen for frame captures. This is shown in *Figure 10, Amoeba UFO #1 at Five Second Intervals*. The sequence was chosen from a place in the video where Don was fully zoomed in at maximum magnification.

The sizes of the UFOs in the images can be compared with each other to see inherent size and shape changes because Don remained zoomed in at the maximum 20 power magnification extent. The full optical zoom extent on Don's Nikon Coolpix P510 is the equivalent of a 1000 mm lens on an old 35 mm film camera. This is the equivalent of a 20 power telescope.

The images of the UFO in *Figure 10, Amoeba UFO #1 at Five Second Intervals*, were captured as screen images using Apple's Final Cut Pro X to play the video clip. The video was played at the clip magnification of 100%. A Mac screen capture utility (Precise Screenshot) was used to capture the 100 pixel square images.

The entire sequence from *Figure 10, Amoeba UFO #1 at Five Second Intervals*, lasts 1:45 (one minute and 45 seconds) duration. This sequence starts from frame 00:15;00 and goes to 2:00;00. The sequence from the beginning to 00:15;00 consists of Don doing his usual announcement of seeing another UFO and then starting from a wide shot and zooming in and focusing till he stabilizes the shot at maximum zoomed in extent (20 power equivalent).

The images are arranged so that they increase in time from left to right, row by row, and they give a sense of how the UFO changed as the video proceeded. The image names are chosen to reflect the frames from which the images are taken. For example, 01500 means frame 00:15;00, that is 15 seconds from the beginning of the video at frame 00, and so on.



Source: Don Andersberg and Keith Rowell

**Figure 10. Amoeba UFO #1 at Five Second Intervals**

### **Amoeba UFO #2**

To give you an idea of how Amoeba UFO #2 changed over time an interval of five seconds was chosen for frame captures. This is shown in *Figure 11, Amoeba UFO #2 at Five Second Intervals (#1)* and *Figure 12, Amoeba UFO #2 at Five Second Intervals (#2)*. The sequence was chosen where Don was fully zoomed in at maximum magnification.

The sizes of the UFO in the images can be compared with each other to see inherent size and shape changes because Don remained zoomed in at the maximum 20 power magnification extent. The full


optical zoom extent on Don's Nikon Coolpix P510 is the equivalent of a 1000 mm lens on an old 35 mm film camera. This is the equivalent of a 20 power telescope.

The images of the UFO in *Figure 11, Amoeba UFO #2 at Five Second Intervals (#1)* through *Figure 12, Amoeba UFO #2 at Five Second Intervals (#2)* were captured as screen images using Apple's Final Cut Pro X to play the video clip. The video was played at a magnification of 100%. A Mac screen capture utility (Precise Screenshot) was used to capture the 100 pixel square images.

The entire sequence from *Figure 11, Amoeba UFO #2 at Five Second Intervals (#1)* to *Figure 12, Amoeba UFO #2 at Five Second Intervals (#2)* lasts 3:35 (three minutes and 35 seconds), which is practically the entire duration of the clip. This sequence starts from frame 00:15;00 and goes to 3:35;00. The sequence from the beginning to 00:15;00 consists of Don stabilizing the shot at maximum zoomed in extent (20 power equivalent) since he had just finished taking the still photos shown in *Figure 9, Comparison of Amoeba UFO #2 Photos*.


The images are arranged so that they increase in time from left to right, row by row, and they give a sense of how the UFO changed as the video proceeded. The image names are chosen to reflect the frames from which the images are taken. For example, 01500 means frame 00:15;00, that is 15 seconds from the beginning of the video at frame 00, and so on.

Note that at frame 02:10;00, the UFO image becomes abruptly smaller. This is because in the five second interval from 02:05;00 to 02:10;00, Don has chosen to zoom back out for some reason. The UFO did not suddenly shrink and/or move rapidly away! Observe that the video ends with a large image, which means that the UFO was still about the same distance away when Don lost track of it in the bushes/trees in his backyard.



Source: Don Andersberg and Keith Rowell

**Figure 11. Amoeba #2 at Five Second Intervals (#1)**



Source: Don Andersberg and Keith Rowell

**Figure 12. Amoeba UFO #2 at Five Second Intervals (#2)**

## Size, Distance, and Speed

In this case, we don't have any directly known sizes, distances, or speeds, but we still know a reasonable number of things that combined with some reasonable assumptions give us some not too implausible sizes, distances, and speeds. Let's work through this.


Let's take just the Amoeba UFO #2 for this exercise since the pertinent data is complete enough. Here's what we know in the Amoeba UFO #2's case:

- The duration of the sighting is at least 3 minutes and 37 seconds, which is the length of Don's video.
- The winds at the ground level that day were at 11.5 mph.
- From weather data for the day, there were three cloud layers at 4500, 5500, and 7000 feet.
- The angle of travel of the UFO from when Don first spotted it till he couldn't see it any more was about  $50^\circ$ .
- The angle of view of Don's camera when he is zoomed all the way in is  $2^\circ$ .
- The angular size of the full Moon is approximately  $0.5^\circ$ .
- We can directly compare the size of the UFO with the moon because Don has video-recorded the moon fully zoomed in just like he has for the UFO. See *Figure 13, Moon and UFO Comparison*.

Let's see what kinds of sizes, distances, and speeds we can derive from this data.

### **Angular Size of Amoeba UFO #2**

First let's derive the angular size for Amoeba UFO #2. We know that the angular size of the full moon is about  $0.5^\circ$ . So, if we compare the UFO size to the full moon's size in video that is at the same full zoomed in extent, then we can measure the UFO's angular size. See *Figure 13, Moon and UFO Comparison*. In this illustration, we have just laid images of the UFO across the diameter of the full moon —here a crescent moon, but we can still tell where the diameter is. We can see that the angular size of the UFO is the angular diameter of the moon divided by 16 since 16 UFOs fit across the diameter of the moon. This is  $0.031^\circ$ . This is not the absolute or real size of the UFO, but we can get that because we are able to know how far away the UFO was from Don when he video'd it. And that is because we know that the UFO passed under some clouds and we can get the weather data on the heights of those clouds.



Source: Don Andersberg and Keith Rowell

### **Figure 13. Moon and UFO Comparison**


*This photo shows the UFO lined up against the diameter of the full moon. The point is to get an idea of the angular size of the UFO. We know that the moon's angular size is close to one half a degree in size. So the angular size of the UFO is about 16 divided into one half a degree. This is  $0.031^\circ$ . This comparison can be made because the UFO and moon are at the same magnification (zoomed in extent) and video-recorded with the same camera.*



## Amoeba UFO #2 UFO Distance

We were lucky with this UFO. It appeared at the end of the video near some known objects: some clouds. During the 3 minutes and 37 seconds that Don recorded of the UFO, it spent about the last minute of the video passing under the bottom of some drifting clouds. We used METARS weather data for the date, time, and place to determine that there were three layers of clouds at the time: 4500, 5500, and 7000 feet.

Using an average of 4500 and 5500 feet, we get 5000 feet for the approximate altitude that the UFO traveled along at. We can use a little trigonometry to calculate an approximate distance that Don was from the UFO. It turned out to be about 5080 feet from him. See *Figure 14, Distance to UFO*.



Source: Keith Rowell


**Figure 14. Distance to UFO**

*Don estimated that he was looking up at the UFO at an angle of about  $80^\circ$  above the horizon. We took that estimate and the cloud layer bottom from weather data of 5000 feet and calculated the distance Don was from the UFO. It was about 5080 feet away from him.*

## Real UFO Size

Obtaining a real (absolute) size for UFOs is generally difficult because there is so little measurable data available in the typical UFO sighting. Here we got lucky. The UFO passed right under some passing clouds, so we were able using METARS weather data to calculate a distance of about 5080 feet to the UFO in the last minute or so when the UFO passed under some clouds. See *Figure 14, Distance to UFO*.

Now with the distance to the UFO, we can calculate a reasonable size for the UFO. See *Figure 15, Size of UFO*. This figure shows the trigonometry problem to solve for the actual size given the angular size of the UFO, which we derived under *Angular Size of Amoeba UFO #2*. As you can see in *Figure 15, Size of UFO*, we calculated a size of around 2.7 feet. Supposing the actual distance to the UFO was farther away because it was perhaps under the farthest away cloud layer at 7000 feet, we get a UFO size of 3.8 feet. Let's compromise and go with the average which is 3.3 feet. Thus, we are pretty sure this UFO is somewhere between 2 and 4 feet in size.



Source: Keith Rowell

**Figure 15. Size of UFO**

Since we know the calculated distance to the Amoeba UFO #2 (5080'), we can calculate the approximate size of the UFO. It is about 2.7 feet across.

## Amoeba UFO #2 Speed

To get a handle on a ballpark speed, we know that Don first saw the UFO at about 70° up from the horizon to the NW of his house. See *Figure 2, Don's Backyard with Amoeba UFO #2*. In the video, we can see that the UFO becomes obscured by the bushes to the right of where he first saw the UFO. Measuring the angular distance in his backyard from the beginning to the end of the video yields a number of about 40°.

We know that the video lasts 3 minutes and 37 seconds (that is, 217 seconds). We know that the UFO is about 5080 feet away at the beginning of the video since that's where we decided to take the image size from when Don was zoomed in to the maximum extent. See under *Real UFO Size*. Using another simplified trigonometry calculation, we arrive at a distance traveled in 217 seconds of 4260 feet.

To obtain an approximate speed for Amoeba UFO #2, we have distance divided by time (4260 feet / 217 seconds), which is about 19.6 feet/sec, which is 13.4 mph.

In fact, this speed agrees well with the nominal wind ground speeds at the time, which were at the day, time, and place 11.5 mph. Additionally, this UFO is seen on a portion of the video to be apparently blowing around on some gusty winds. We know the winds at the ground were gusty somewhat because we can see the bushes moving around gently toward the end of the video.

The basic direction of flight of the UFO was from the NW to the SE. This was the general direction of the winds at the time. Thus, we can conclude that the UFO was more or less windborne.

## Lazy(?) UFOs

Actually, we feel that most of Don's "balloon mimic" UFOs do travel at close to the wind speed and direction of the prevailing winds much of the time—but not all of the time. The trouble with identifying these UFOs as balloon-type UFOs generally comes from their look and behavior, not from wind speed and direction. So, was this UFO actually a balloon?

The idea that Don's UFOs might be traveling a bit too slow for what prevailing winds are likely to be at the altitude we know that it was at arises again and again as we observe, document, and analyze the balloon mimic UFOs. (Winds speeds generally increase as you go up in altitude. And Amoeba UFO #2 was around a mile to possibly a mile and third in altitude.) See *oregonmufon.com* for further cases documenting this "lazy" balloon mimic UFO behavior.

## A Possible ID: Oddly Shaped Balloons?

A search of the photos on the Internet with terms such as, "gray balloons," "pink balloons," "mylar balloons," etc., yielded no matches close enough in our opinion to be either the Amoeba UFOs #1 or #2. See *Figure 16, Ordinary Mylar Balloon*.

So, it appears to us that Don's UFOs might only be similar to a concocted, DIY balloon as an outside possibility. However, it is difficult to imagine that two quite similar yet somewhat different grayish/whitish roughly textured aerial objects, both with pinkish parts—one UFO with a definite, interior pinkish transforming spot and the other with a pinkish tinge coming and going—would show up ten months apart traveling over the small patch of ground that Don calls home. As always, difficult to imagine, but certainly not impossible or even highly unlikely, especially if there is a "mad" DIY artist/inventor in the area of Don's neighborhood, who likes to experiment with all kinds of crazy and exotic looking aerial, balloon-type contraptions.

We can imagine a few of these strange aerial contraptions, but not over 20 or 30 now over a three years and more time span. When Don's many, many videos of similar—sometimes truly oddball looking—UFOs are considered, it becomes well nigh impossible to think that any terrestrial human-made or natural object or effect could account for all the UFOs that he video-records almost routinely.



Source: <http://www.cafepress.com/mysweettater.691227823>

### **Figure 16. Ordinary Mylar Balloon**

*Is this 18" mylar balloon with some dark areas, a pink/red heart, and gray background, half-inflated, perhaps, the Amoeba UFO #2? Can it be the Amoeba UFO #1? Of course it could be, but in view of the evidence presented, is it?*

## **A Probable ID: Light-weight Plastic Bags**

This case is a good example of how UFO investigators can be wrong sometimes despite their best efforts. The reality of citizen-based UFO identification is that we have little time, money, and expertise. We are all volunteers and have varying degrees of experience, competence, etc. This is what happens when the elites in our society abandon a subject such as the UFO. It gets left to those who have an interest in filling the very real need of the public for knowledge and understanding when they have a UFO experience. But without adequate time, money, and expertise only so much can be done, especially on a problem so intractable as the UFO phenomenon.

The elites that constitute the academic establishment have studiously avoided UFO (and paranormal world) research during most of the 20th and, so far, 21st centuries. We depend as a society on the academic establishment to tell us what is real and what is not. And they have failed us here. But thank heavens for those few but brave academics who *have* studied UFOs such as J. Allen Hynek, Allen Hendry, Jacques Vallee, Ivan Sanderson, John Mack, David E. Pritchard, Peter Sturrock, Frank Salisbury, David Jacobs, Don Donderi, et al. Thanks, of course, is due too to all the many fine UFO researchers who don't have academic standing.

### **Identification Candidates**

At Oregon MUFON, we train our investigators to work up their best guesses as to probable identifications for the UFO evidence in their cases. (See the *Oregon MUFON Investigator's Guide* on [oregonmufon.com](http://oregonmufon.com).) We tell them to develop a specific list of possible and probable IDs and then go through them one by one to see how well they think the available evidence fits the characteristics of their known identification candidates. If they eliminate them all with at least a preponderance of the evidence level of confidence, then they can conclude they have an "unknown." And we leave it at that. Depending on how strange and how strong we think the evidence is, we can then entertain the idea that this

unknown may be part of the genuine UFO phenomenon. But this extra “leap” is optional. It might be the case that a particular unknown is *not* part of the UFO phenomenon. It might be a new unknown physical effect or some high-tech machine unknown to us.

### **A Missing Identification Candidate**

In this case, I had not thought of high altitude, light-weight plastic bags as possible ID candidates. After completion and publication of this case, some helpful suggestions came from an Internet *oregonmufon.com* reader, the Oregon MUFON State Director himself, Tom Bowden, and some other people. It should be noted that the video in this case was shown briefly to at least 20 people without any of them suggesting the specific ID considered here.

But I think that this case is now identified to a level of confidence of clear and convincing evidence, which is to say perhaps 70% convinced, that this ID is correct. This is my conclusion after I decided to test the hypothesis of a light-weight plastic bag.

As always, see what you think. The real reason I do my long and involved UFO investigation write ups and put them on the web is to get people thinking about the many ways the genuine UFO phenomenon just might be manifesting itself in the early part of the 21st century.

### **A Safeway Bag Test**

UFO investigators love to have a specific ID against which to test the evidence gathered in a case. An Internet reader of *oregonmufon.com* suggested that the Amoeba UFO #1 might actually be a Safeway bag, and he added that he was a pilot and had seen high-altitude bags floating around while he was flying. After this suggestion and others of a similar nature, Don Andersberg and I decided to do some tests.

We needed to get a suitable light-weight bag up to the 3800 foot or so calculated height of the Amoeba UFO #2, and we needed to get it free floating if possible. The free floating idea proved just to complex so we settled for a balloon-tethered plastic bag rig as a good halfway or more solution. See *Figure 17, The Balloons Rig with Plastic Bags Payload*.



Source: Don Andersberg

### **Figure 17. The Balloons Rig with Plastic Bags Payload**

*This image is from Don's video of the balloon-launched Safeway bags test rig shortly after launch. Don used the same camera and techniques to record this test launch as he does to record his UFOs. The plastic bags test solution is tied to the party balloons by a ten foot piece of string. We tried to keep the plastic bag handles open by fastening a rigid drinking straws assembly between the handles. This can be seen in a few of the Figure 20, Images of Safeway Bag Rig for Comparison, images.*

### **Simple Safeway Bag Fails**

We first tried to figure a way to arrange a white, translucent Safeway bag so that it would appear the most similar to the Amoeba UFO #1. Turning the bag inside out dulls the red logo to pink, which is the distinct color in the Amoeba UFO #1, and also the dark black writing on the Safeway bag somewhat gray. That's a good thing. But the problem with this is that the bag does not look the same from both sides, and it is clear from the video that the Amoeba UFO #1 looks similar on both sides as it tumbles through the air. The solution to this problem might just be a white translucent bag with pink logo on both sides. We haven't found that bag yet, but there are many red logo'd bags on the Internet, so we believe that we, with enough searching, could probably find a white, translucent, pink logo'd, two-sided, light-weight bag. See *Figure 18, Close Up of Doubled and Reversed Safeway Bags.*



Source: Don Andersberg

**Figure 18. Close Up of Doubled and Reversed Safeway Bags**

*This shows the best arrangement we could think of to simulate the look of the Amoeba UFO #1 with its distinct pink center area with some dark spots. It is a definite "maybe" for a correct identification. But there are still some problems with a really good fit, we think. We now believe that perhaps a single, reversed plastic bag with pink, and not red, logos plus some darkish spots or writing could very possibly be a good fit for the Amoeba UFO #1.*

We decided to go with a solution of two white translucent, light-weight, plastic bags, one inside the other, to dull the red logo'd to pink and the black Safeway writing to gray. We believe this two bag solution is actually too heavy to be caught up to high altitude by thermal air currents, but it is possible. (Or maybe a small plane pilot litterbug could be the culprit!! But we hope not.)

**Getting the Bags Up to Altitude**

Our solution to getting the two bag test rig up in the sky was simply a bunch of party balloons. See *Figure 17, The Balloons Rig with Plastic Bags Payload*. We spent an afternoon creating the two-bag test solution, buying the party balloons, assembling the test bag to the balloons, and launching and video-recording and photographing the resultant test rig as it drifted higher and higher into the sky. The test rig was in sight about 15 minutes till it disappeared behind some distant trees.

We feel that the two bags were at least a mile away when they disappeared from view. The wind direction and speed at 4 PM on June 1, 2012, when we launched the test rig were WSW and 5.8 mph. So the test rig was about a mile to 1.5 miles away when we lost sight of it.

**What Did the Test Video Reveal?**

Examination of the video reveals that the test rig bag twists and turns in the wind somewhat and did reveal both sides for us to show that this test solution does not seem similar enough to us to the Amoeba

UFO #1 images to be the exact bag matching what we see in Don's Amoeba UFO #1 video. See *Figure 19, Images of Amoeba UFO #1 for Comparison* and *Figure 20, Images of Safeway Bag Rig for Comparison*. However, it does show many similarities to the Amoeba UFO #1, so we are inclined to be persuaded as stated before that some sort of single, light-weight, plastic bag at high altitude is the probable solution to the Amoeba UFO #1's identity.

### **Some Residual Reservations**

However, I am only convinced to a level of clear and convincing evidence, which is only about around 70% convinced let's say. Saying that I am 70% convinced still means I am perhaps 30% unconvinced. So, I still have some confidence that the Amoeba UFO #1 might be another instance of the "balloon mimic" UFO phenomenon.

I have two reservations about the plastic bag solution to the Amoeba UFO #1's identity:


- In the video, the body of the Amoeba UFO #1 seems too rigid for a plastic bag as it travels along in the sky.
- The variability of the pink inner portion plus dark spots of the Amoeba UFO #1 seems too great for it to be some combination of logo and lettering, even if it were actually a pink-logo'd (and lettered) translucent bag printed on both sides, whether reversed inside out or not.

But I could certainly be wrong about this, and that is why I have now changed my mind to clear and convincing evidence confidence that we have some kind of plastic bag solution for this UFO.

### **Amoeba UFO #2 Identity Determined Now**

Now, after thoroughly examining the characteristics of light-weight plastic bags and considering their great abundance in the last few years in our culture, I am convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that Amoeba UFO #2 is in fact a plastic bag. It does, indeed, have the characteristics of a plastic bag including being buffeted on variable winds and changing shape as it moves along in the sky.






Source: Don Andersberg

**Figure 19. Images of Amoeba UFO #1 for Comparison**

*These images are in chronological order from top to bottom and left to right as the Amoeba UFO #1 moved along over Don as he video-recorded it. See Figure 20, Images of Safeway Bag for Comparison, so you can compare the two sets of images. The Amoeba UFO #1 was overhead more and moved along more or less parallel to Don's position and it was more backlit by the sun than our Safeway bag solution ended up being unfortunately. The images in both Figure 19 and Figure 20 were taken with the same camera and captured at 100% for both in Final Cut Pro X software.*



Source: Don Andersberg

**Figure 20. Images of Safeway Bag for Comparison**

*These images are in chronological order from top to bottom and left to right as the balloons with the Safeway bag test solution suspended drifted away from us on the winds. See Figure 19, Video Images of the Amoeba UFO #1, for a comparison. The Amoeba UFO #1 was overhead more and moved along more or less parallel to Don's position and it was more backlit by the sun than our Safeway bag test solution ended up being, unfortunately. The images in both Figure 19 and Figure 20 were taken with the same camera and captured at 100% for both in Final Cut Pro X software.*

**A Subway Bag**

*Figure 21, Ordinary Subway Sandwich Bag, shows a low-level Subway bag caught up in air currents. Ironically, this kind of low-level, readily identifiable, light-weight plastic bag had not shown up over Don's house till after we published this case. Light-weight shopping bags are now one more identification candidate we can consider for our UFO cases in the future.*



Keith Rowell and Don Andersberg

**Figure 21. Ordinary Subway Sandwich Bag**

*Ironically, this bag appeared at low-level over Don's house after the first version of this case study was published. This was easily identifiable for what it is.*

## CONCLUSION

The UFO observation in this case was made by one person, Don Andersberg, in his backyard. He used his Nikon Coolpix P510 to capture two different videos about ten months apart of two similar looking UFOs.

The Amoeba UFO #1 object was an irregularly-shaped, whitish object with a distinct, internal-looking, prominent pinkish part that traveled around somewhat within the UFO as it moved along in the sky. It also showed some small dark spots that also moved around on or inside the UFO. There was some highlighting that might have been generated from within rather than being merely reflection from the sun. Some very odd arm-shaped protuberances, one of which seemed to split in two on its extremity a couple of different times, were also in evidence.

The Amoeba UFO #2 object was a whitish/grayish object of rough texture and generally ovoid shape with a pinkish tinge that seemed to travel around the object sometimes during the course of the video.

The UFOs moved along in the sky with Don continuously video-recording the UFOs till they disappeared behind the bushes around his yard.

## Identification Candidates

The candidates for identification for this UFO are the following:

- **Secret U.S. military or foreign power aircraft.** This explanation, of course, can never be completely ruled out by anyone except for the very few within the bowels of our deep black military and corporate contractor world who would also have access to all the on-going projects. This list of people is exceedingly small (perhaps only 100?!) because of the “need to know” and compartmentation of military secrets. However, verified reports of this kind of object over populated areas in the U.S. are far fewer than “standard” UFOs. It strains credulity that human-designed, “conventional” secret aircraft would be tested at only a few thousand feet or so altitude inside a small metropolitan area. (We assume that secret military aircraft buffs could adequately “verify” this kind of report, but the documented record of reports of secret military aircraft appearing over populated areas—which are always only at very high altitudes!—is very scant, indeed.) The objects video-recorded in this case are both probably around three feet across and look like no military objects of terrestrial operation that we know of. Also, Don reported no sound coming from the objects. *Thus, this identification candidate is rejected.*
- **Police surveillance UAV.** No city police or county sheriff’s departments in the Portland metro area have any operational police surveillance UAVs, much less any that fit the description of these UFOs. *Thus, this identification candidate is rejected.*
- **Aircraft.** No conventional aircraft, military or civilian, looks like these UFOs. *Thus, this identification candidate is rejected.*
- **Helicopter.** No helicopter, military or civilian, looks like these UFOs. *Thus, this identification candidate is rejected.*
- **Blimp.** No blimp, military or civilian, looks like these UFOs. Also, we think the UFOs are around three feet in size. *Thus, this identification candidate is rejected.*
- **Ultralight.** No ultralight looks like these UFOs. *Thus, this identification candidate is rejected.*
- **Remote-controlled model aircraft.** No RC model aircraft looks like these UFOs. *Thus, this identification candidate is rejected.*
- **Kite.** These UFOs do not resemble normal, store-bought kites nor were they tethered by any kind of string, rope, cord, etc. Additionally, if these were unmoored kites, their behavior of being aloft and in view for almost more than two minutes (Amoeba UFO #1) and more than three minutes (Amoeba UFO #2) without apparently drifting downward makes a kite identification unlikely. It is entirely implausible that these UFO are some kind of store-bought kites no matter how exotic. *Thus, this identification candidate is rejected.*
- **Ball Lightning.** These UFOs do not resemble or behave like ball lightning. This well-known phenomenon based on anecdotal accounts is generally spherical and fuzzy in shape and originates usually in association with lightning storms. There were no lightning storms in the Portland metro area at the times. Ball lightning also moves around erratically and lasts from one second to perhaps at most a minute or so. *Thus, this identification candidate is rejected.*
- **Balloon.** This is the second most viable ID candidate of them all. Here are the pros and cons.
 

On the evidential side for this candidate are the following:

  - The UFOs could possibly be some kind of exotic balloons, perhaps. However, these are almost certainly one-of-a-kind concocted, DIY balloon type contraptions if they are to be identified at all as a human-made or natural object or effect.
  - The UFOs generally moved along in the sky like balloons.
  - The UFOs traveled more or less in the correct direction and speed for the prevailing winds at the time.

On the evidential side for genuine, “balloon mimic” UFO are the following:

  - There is no evidence or even hint of typical balloon strings or cords in these UFOs.
  - The movements of these UFOs seems too variable for any kind of balloon. The surface texture and sometimes somewhat deeper transformations, though not pronounced in these UFOs, was reminiscent of organic, living things and not ordinary mechanical or physical things.

- The appearance and behavior of the Amoeba UFO #1 with its odd arm-like protuberances, *one of which split apart at least a couple of times during its flight*, seems hard to reconcile with a human-made or natural object.
  - The odd pinkish tinge on Amoeba UFO #2 and the very odd pinkish spot in the interior of the Amoeba UFO #1 make these two UFOs similar enough to compare them in this case study. Especially, Amoeba UFO #1's definite and prominent pinkish spot that moves around inside the object is very odd.
  - Both objects had some gray areas that moved around inside as definite spots in Amoeba UFO #1 and on the surface possibly of Amoeba UFO #2.
  - A number of other balloon mimic UFOs somewhat similar to this case have been documented in Oregon in the 2000s. (See *oregonmufon.com*.)
- **Light-weight plastic bag at altitude.** This is the most viable ID candidate of them all. Here are the pros and cons.

On the evidential side for this candidate are the following:

- The UFOs generally moved along in the sky like ordinary light-weight plastic bags would.
- The UFOs could possibly be ordinary light-weight plastic bags since these bags are very numerous in our culture today.
- The Amoeba UFO #1 might be identified as a white, translucent, plastic Safeway grocery bag, or something quite similar.
- The mobile pink spot on Amoeba UFO #1 might be a red or pink logo of some sort.
- The handles on a Safeway bag and the many similar bags could easily be the projecting "arms" of the Amoeba UFO #1.
- The Amoeba UFO #2 is almost certainly a simple transparent plastic bag although the pinkish tinge is a little odd, perhaps.
- The UFOs traveled more or less in the correct direction and speed for the prevailing winds at the time.

On the evidential side for genuine, "balloon mimic" UFO are the following:

- In the video, the body of the Amoeba UFO #1 seems too rigid for a plastic bag as it travels along in the sky.
- The variability of the pink inner portion of the Amoeba UFO #1 seems too great for it to be some combination of logo and lettering, even if it were actually a pink-logo'd (and lettered?) translucent bag printed on both sides, whether reversed inside out or not.
- A number of other "balloon mimic" UFOs somewhat similar to this case have been documented in Oregon in the 2000s. (See *oregonmufon.com*.)

*So, since the relevant evidence favors something ordinary and identified, we suggest that these UFOs are instances of ordinary plastic bags at high altitude.*

**Since the identification candidates do NOT all fail in this case for the reasons stated, these UFO observations are classified as probable identified human-made objects, specifically, ordinary plastic, light-weight shopping bags. We believe that the overall evidence in this case rises to the level of between preponderance of the evidence and clear and convincing evidence, that is, around 70% or so convinced, which makes this case reasonably strong.**