A MULTI-AGENCY FORENSIC ANALYSIS OF THE 2004 NIMITZ SENSOR ANOMALIES: COINCIDENT TESTING, SUBMERGED ISR DEPLOYMENTS, AND ATMOSPHERIC CLUTTER

Author: Mike Turber
Methodology: Forensic Scene Isolation and Multi-Source Data Correlation
Affiliation: 5x5 News

ABSTRACT
This paper presents a prosaic, data-driven re-examination of the anomalous radar and visual tracking events recorded by the USS Nimitz Carrier Strike Group (CSG) between November 10 and 16, 2004. By isolating multi-day radar track logs from localized visual intercepts, we demonstrate a structural correlation between the alleged anomalous contacts and the atmospheric data collection matrix for the joint NASA/USAF X-43A hypersonic project.

We outline how a newly upgraded AN/SPY-1B phased-array radar system, operating with unbriefed sensitivity thresholds, failed to filter routine rawinsonde (weather balloon) payloads drifting in high-velocity upper-troposphere wind currents. Furthermore, we examine the visual and sensor intercepts, demonstrating that an uncoordinated, compartmentalized undersea asset deployed an encapsulated DARPA Stealthy Affordable Capsule System (SACS), accounting for the low-altitude kinematics observed by Fast Eagle 01.

Finally, we establish that unlinked, non-tactical aviation assets (NASA F/A-18 chase planes) operating without Link 16 integration account for the distant thermal signatures filmed by the backseat Weapons Systems Officer (WSO) during subsequent Navy sensor intercepts (FLIR1).

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY
1.1 The Conflation Problem
For over two decades, the "Nimitz Tic Tac Event" has been analyzed almost exclusively as a singular, continuous anomalous encounter. This approach has forced researchers to apply the extreme, mathematically impossible flight characteristics reported in brief, isolated moments (such as rapid altitude drops or instantaneous acceleration) across a multi-day timeline. This systemic conflation has introduced severe confirmation bias, where routine atmospheric objects and conventional aircraft are retroactively assigned anomalous origins.

1.2 Forensic Isolation Protocol
To establish a rigorous peer-review baseline, this paper implements a strict Forensic Isolation Protocol. Borrowing methodologies from high-end criminal and accident scene investigations, the broader event timeline is decoupled into three distinct, independent forensic scenes:
* **Scene A (The Multi-Day Radar Tracks):** The tracking of dozens of high-altitude targets over a six-day period by Senior Chief Kevin Day aboard the USS Princeton.
* **Scene B (The Visual Merge Plot Intercept):** Commander David Fravor's close-range visual engagement with a low-altitude object over a localized marine disturbance.

* **Scene C (The Sensor Intercept - FLIR1):** The subsequent long-range infrared tracking and loss-of-lock recorded by the backseat aircrew using the aircraft's targeting pod.

By analyzing each scene within its own spatial, environmental, and technological boundaries, we eliminate variable contamination and map individual mechanics to verifiable multi-agency testing operations occurring in the Southern California (SOCAL) operating area.

SECTION II: SCENE A - ENVIRONMENTAL DATA AND THE RADAR UPGRADE CLUTTER

2.1 Technical Impact of the AN/SPY-1B Phased-Array Upgrade

Immediately prior to the November 2004 COMPTUEX exercises, the USS Princeton received a significant hardware and software modernization upgrade to its Lockheed Martin AN/SPY-1B phased-array radar system. This upgrade drastically increased the sensor's sensitivity, dynamic range, and target processing fidelity.

Crucially, the radar operators—including Senior Chief Kevin Day—were unbriefed on the newly altered sensitivity baselines. In an unmodified or pre-upgrade state, the SPY-1B's Moving Target Indicator (MTI) software automatically rejected slow-moving, low-radar-cross-section (RCS) objects (such as avian targets, civilian weather balloons, and cloud formations) as environmental noise. Post-upgrade, the processing thresholds for clutter rejection were drastically lowered, causing the system to initialize active track files on sub-resolution environmental assets that were previously invisible to the strike group.

2.2 Spatial Dispersal Data vs. Military Formations

A primary pillar of the anomalous narrative relies on early tracking reports describing groups of 5 to 10 targets flying in close "tactical formation". However, direct investigative forensic interviews with Senior Chief Day establish a critical spatial metric previously omitted from public reporting: the tracked targets maintained a consistent physical spacing of 10+ miles from one another. A ten-mile interval is entirely non-viable for a tactical military wing-formation. Instead, this multi-point spatial grid indicates a series of independent, passive objects adrift within a shared macro-environmental current, strongly pointing toward serial balloon launches deployed from geographically distinct coastal and inland staging bases. This critical spatial metric was subsequently verified and publicly corroborated by Senior Chief Day during a joint technical audio broadcast, cementing the validity of the data baseline on the public record.

2.3 The Temporal Lock: "Special" vs. Standard Sounding Matrices

Between November 10 and 16, 2004, NASA and the United States Air Force were preparing for the historic third flight of the X-43A hypersonic research vehicle out of neighboring airspaces. To map upper-level wind shear, jet stream boundary transitions, and micro-barometric fluctuations critical to hypersonic flight envelope calculations, an extensive atmospheric soundings matrix was executed.

This operation deployed numerous "special" rawinsonde launches—balloon deployments staggered outside the standard global 00:00Z and 12:00Z windows from four regional installations: NAS Point Mugu, NAS San Nicolas Island, Vandenberg AFB, and Edwards AFB. The correlation between these launches and Senior Chief Day's tracking history is precise. The sudden, unexplained influx of radar targets began directly on November 10th—matching the escalation of the X-43A wind-mapping ramp-up—and terminated abruptly on November 16th, the exact day the X-43A completed its hypersonic test run. Following the close of the testing window, these anomalous tracks vanished from the Princeton's scopes and were not observed again.

2.4 Aggregated Civilian Contamination
To account for the estimated 60-100 total objects recalled by radar operators during this window, the tactical X-43A data collection must be integrated with local civilian infrastructure. Over 900 locations globally launch standard weather balloons twice daily at 00:00Z and 12:00Z, creating a baseline of 1,800 active balloons in the atmosphere every 24 hours.
By analyzing sounding logs from non-military civilian launch sites across Southern California, this paper establishes that standard meteorological assets were filtering into the exact same high-altitude wind currents. The upgraded SPY-1B radar was capturing a massive, multi-layered mix of both high-frequency military payloads and routine civilian tracking assets. Because the ship's combat system was operating under unbriefed sensitivity parameters, this sudden, aggregate saturation of the airspace was misinterpreted as a cohesive, anomalous intrusion.

2.5 Atmospheric Staging Vectors
Direct analysis of regional sounding data during the event window records the exact mechanical vector responsible for the perceived "raining down" effect reported by radar ballistics operators:
* **At Altitude 7,746 m (~25,413 ft):** Pressure 380.0 hPa | Wind Vector 21 degrees (N-NNE) | True Wind Speed 123 knots
* **At Altitude 7,935 m (~26,033 ft):** Pressure 369.8 hPa | Wind Vector 28 degrees (N-NNE) | True Wind Speed 127 knots
* **At Altitude 9,144 m (~30,000 ft):** Pressure 311.9 hPa | Wind Vector 25 degrees (N-NNE) | True Wind Speed 85 knots

The Physics of the Tracking Illusion:
A high-altitude meteorological balloon ascends rapidly at approximately 1,000 feet per minute until reaching its bursting threshold in the stratosphere (~100,000 feet). Upon bursting, the payload descends rapidly via a compact stabilization parachute through the thin upper atmosphere.

As the payload enters the significantly denser upper troposphere—precisely within the 30,000 to 25,000-foot shelf documented in the data above—its vertical descent slows to a crawl due to atmospheric thickening. Concurrently, the payload strikes a ferocious, highly localized southbound jet stream vector roaring at 123 to 127 knots.
To the upgraded SPY-1B radar, set to Air Intercept Mode, an object dropping vertically out of un-tracked altitudes that suddenly stalls vertically and violently accelerates horizontally to a flat 120 knots moving south mimics an active, high-altitude vehicle entering the airspace. Because the balloons were launched sequentially from multiple bases, they entered this wind shelf at regular intervals, creating a continuous grid of tracking targets drifting south directly into the Princeton's unbriefed surveillance sector.

SECTION III: SCENE B - SPATIAL RANGE DE-CONFLICTION AND SUBSURFACE LAUNCH ASSETS
3.1 Range Geometry and Operational Seclusion
The exact geographic parameters of the November 14, 2004, engagement establish a baseline for uncoordinated, non-cooperative technology testing. According to formal congressional testimony by Pilot Commander David Fravor, the physical visual intercept occurred distinctly *west* of the Strike Group's assigned Combat Air Patrol (CAP) assembly point. The CAP point served as the sterile coordinate marker situated within the designated internal boundary of the active training range—specifically the Southern California Offshore Range (SCORE) complex / Warning Area 291 (W-291).

By vectoring the F/A-18F fighters out of their active training box and into adjacent, non-cooperative range space to investigate the track, the *USS Princeton* demonstrated a standard execution of range segregation. Under the mandatory parameters of Joint Publication 3-52 (Joint Airspace Control) and OPNAVINST 3721.20 (Navy Space and Range Management), any highly classified, unprogrammed developmental test must be strictly sequestered through Water Space Management (WSM) and Prevention of Mutual Interference (PMI) protocols. This geographic isolation ensures safety of flight by preventing catastrophic kinetic collisions with operational Fleet assets, while simultaneously allowing the developmental project to evaluate its low-observable signatures against the Navy's newly integrated cooperative sensor mesh in a realistic, non-permissive environment.
(Note: Future Figure 3.1 will dynamically map the intercept coordinates 31°20' N, 117°10' W relative to the southern boundary vectors of Warning Area W-291 to illustrate this operational segregation).

3.2 Sub-Surface Staging: The DARPA SACS Alternative
To address the low-altitude visual encounter by Fast Eagle 01, the presence of classified naval launch vectors must be evaluated. The technical characteristics of the target align precisely with the testing profile of a DARPA Stealthy Affordable Capsule System (SACS). Designed to launch an encapsulated Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) drone and an inflation-based over-the-horizon (OTH) communication relay balloon from depth, the SACS framework allows non-marinized aerial payloads to breach the surface via a buoyant, hydrodynamic cylinder while the host subsurface platform remains acoustically isolated.

Because DARPA relies on existing Navy infrastructure rather than proprietary fleets, the subsurface order of battle during mid-November must be structured as a conditional spectrum of available test beds:
 * **The USS Georgia (SSBN/SSGN-729) Dynamic Timeline:** While standard public administrative logs list her arrival at Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia, on November 24, 2004, her direct involvement cannot be structurally eliminated. The *Georgia* was officially de-mated from strategic ballistic service on January 1, 2004, meaning her nuclear Trident missile offload at the Strategic Weapons Facility Pacific concluded months prior to her command role in *Exercise Silent Hammer* (October 4–14, 2004). Free from strategic download bottlenecks, the vessel was not logistically mandated to return north immediately. Because standard maritime transit

calculations confirm the roughly 4,700-nautical-mile blue-water transit from San Diego to Norfolk via the Panama Canal requires 11 to 13 days of continuous steaming at 15–18 knots, the *Georgia* could have remained deployed within the deep valleys of the SCORE range executing quiet capsule validations through mid-November before conducting a high-speed transit east to return her crew home by Thanksgiving.

* **USS Pasadena (SSN-752):** Official Command Operations Reports archived by the Naval History and Heritage Command (NHHC) indicate the Los Angeles-class fast-attack *USS Pasadena* returned to Point Loma on November 16, 2004, following an intensive eight-day isolated underway training cycle in the immediate SOCAL operating area. This places her actively submerged in the immediate theater during the exact November 10–14 window when the *USS Princeton* began tracking anomalous objects dropping from the exosphere.

* **USS Topeka (SSN-754):** Official Defense Visual Information Distribution Service (DVIDS) metadata logs verify the *USS Topeka* returned to San Diego on November 24, 2004. Her localized operational availability leading up to mid-November identifies her as an ideal horizontal torpedo-tube surrogate for standard modular 21-inch SACS payload testing.

* **PCU Jimmy Carter (SSN-23):** As a pre-commissioning unit conducting highly classified deep-water tactical sea trials in late 2004, the vessel operated completely outside standard Fleet Orders of Battle. Outfitted with the proprietary 100-foot Multi-Mission Platform (MMP) hull extension, the ship was explicitly engineered to act as an unlisted, uncoordinated testing vehicle capable of launching experimental autonomous undersea assets and encapsulated atmospheric payloads completely decoupled from local Strike Group knowledge.

3.3 Canister Release and the Contemporary "Missile-Like" Sighting
To isolate the raw technical characteristics of the platform before decades of civilian media attention altered witness syntax, researchers must look to the earliest documented interviews captured in the unclassified 2009 AATIP Executive Summary. The initial reports from Lieutenant Commander Alex (Dietrich) and Commander Fravor provide a critical link to standard aerospace hardware.
The contemporaneous technical log records that while Fravor engaged the low-observable "Tic Tac" object near the sea surface, Dietrich—holding high-altitude cover—visually isolated a specific, high-velocity metric. The 2009 summary documents her tracking a "missile-like object" or a rapid, stabilized atmospheric ascent profile that behaved with the kinetic trajectory of a solid-fueled or canister-propelled asset. This "missile-like" description matches the expected aerodynamic transition profile of an encapsulated DARPA ISR drone breaching the surface and clearing the marine boundary layer via a vertical capsule ejection sequence, further solidifying that the pilots were witnessing an active, multi-domain cross-section validation.

* **The Tethered Phase:** While held by the initial deployment tether, the inflated helium envelope is subjected to intense, competing aerodynamic and hydrodynamic forces over the churning canister venting site. The physical restriction of the underwater line forces the

pressurized cylinder to bank, pitch, and skip violently along the marine boundary layer—creating the exact "omni-directional, non-inertial bobbing" described by the pilots.

 * **The Release Timeline:** This asset was released into a free-floating, meandering vertical ascent profile at nearly the exact moment Fast Eagle 01 separated from Fast Eagle 02 and began his high-altitude overhead descent.

 * **The Closure Illusion:** As the lightweight ISR balloon drifted upward, Fravor initiated a standard tactical circle-cut, pitching his nose down and aiming his aircraft's flight vector directly at the ascending target. In high-speed aviation, closing on a slowly ascending object from a steep overhead angle creates a massive rate of closure. This specific geometric convergence gave the pilot the distinct sensation that the object was actively accelerating up toward his position.

3.4 Wake Vortex Collision and Structural Disintegration
Fravor's initial tactical statement indicates that he lost visual tracking of the object in the marine haze, later stating it vanished completely "over his wing". This sudden visual termination is directly explained by the fluid dynamics of a close-proximity jet intercept: an F/A-18F Super Hornet aggressively pulling G-forces in a descending turn generates massive, tightly bound wingtip vortices—rotating tubes of high-velocity, low-pressure air that trail behind the aircraft. When Fravor sliced through the balloon's immediate airspace, the immense pressure differential and violent turbulence of his aircraft's wake vortex directly collided with the thin, highly pressurized rubber or polymer envelope of the free-floating ISR balloon. This micro-environmental impact caused an instantaneous, catastrophic structural failure, bursting the envelope. To the aircrews looking back over their wings through the atmospheric haze, the sudden disintegration of a featureless, non-combustive target left behind zero debris signature, creating the optical illusion that the craft had either dematerialized or accelerated away at a phenomenal rate of speed.

SECTION IV: SCENE C - NON-COOPERATIVE TACTICAL ASSETS (THE FLIR1 RECORDING)
4.1 Aircrew Roles, Link 16 Architecture, and the NASA Network Blindspot
Hours after the initial visual intercept, a second sortie was dispatched from the USS Nimitz to intercept the persistent tracking anomalies. This aircraft was an F/A-18F Super Hornet crewed by a front-seat pilot and back-seat Weapons Systems Officer (WSO) Chad Underwood. Under tactical direction from the Princeton, Underwood operated the aircraft's multi-sensor target array to successfully track and capture the declassified "FLIR1" video. To resolve what the crew actually filmed, we must map the architectural boundaries of Naval tactical data networks.
The Navy utilizes the Link 16 tactical data link framework to construct a real-time, shared Common Operational Picture (COP). Every active asset within the Carrier Strike Group—ships, E-2C Hawkeyes, and tactical fighters—constantly cross-broadcasts cryptographic position, velocity vectors, and secure IFF (Identification Friend or Foe) squawks.
However, during this exact window, NASA was operating its own independent F/A-18 research aircraft out of the Armstrong Flight Research Center to monitor telemetry, chase data, and

conduct atmospheric staging flights for the impending X-43A hypersonic run. NASA research aircraft are entirely civilian-administered assets; they do not carry military Link 16 hardware, nor do they possess active military cryptographic IFF transponders.
Consequently, when the Princeton's radar or the fighter's onboard radar painted a NASA F/A-18 operating adjacent to the warning areas, the automated combat systems could not verify its identity. This caused the asset to register on Underwood's displays as an uncooperative, administrative "unknown target".

4.2 Distance Distortion and Thermal Blooming

Underwood's ATFLIR pod acquired its track at an extreme range, looking down through miles of dense, moisture-laden marine boundary layer air. At these distances, infrared sensors are subject to severe resolution limits and atmospheric scattering:
Thermal Blooming: The intense heat radiating from the twin General Electric F404 engines and the fuselage skin of the NASA F/A-18 bleeds together on the mid-wave infrared sensor array. This thermal bloom strips away sharp structural definitions, completely masking the aircraft's wings, tail fins, and trailing edge geometry.
The Stabilized Oval: Because the ATFLIR's internal software implements aggressive horizontal and vertical digital stabilization to keep a distant target centered, the natural banking, pitching, and yawing motions of the conventional aircraft are flattened out relative to the viewer. The result on the cockpit display is a featureless, elongated hot spot—a visual profile that perfectly mimics a smooth "Tic Tac".

4.3 Kinematic Analysis of the FLIR1 "Velocity Breakout"

The most widely cited piece of "evidence" for anomalous propulsion within the FLIR1 video occurs in the final seconds, where the target appears to accelerate violently to the left, slipping out of the tracking gate instantly. A meticulous mechanical review of the ATFLIR pod's engineering overlay disproves physical acceleration:
Throughout the tracking sequence, the ATFLIR is operating in a tight centroid track lock, meaning the gimbaled lens is actively steering to keep the target's thermal center dead center in the field of view.
At the precise timestamp of the alleged acceleration, the cockpit telemetry displays an optical mode change executed by Underwood: the sensor zoom factor is switched from 1x (Wide/Medium) to 2x (Narrow).
This instantaneous shift in the optical focal lens creates a momentary geometric displacement across the sensor array. The contrast-tracking software experiences a momentary processing lag and drops its lock.
The moment the software lock drops, the physical gimbal system releases its active steering counterweight. Because the host aircraft is moving at several hundred knots relative to the target, the camera lens instantly snaps back to its physical forward baseline index.
This mechanical camera reset changes the field of view across the frame in a fraction of a second, creating the profound optical illusion that the target exited the screen at hypersonic speed. In reality, the camera snapped to a halt; the target simply continued flying a straight, conventional path.

SECTION V: INSTITUTIONAL DATA RETRIEVAL AND AARO VERIFICATIONS

The highly controversial, uncoordinated post-incident extraction of data bricks and tactical recording tapes from the USS Princeton’s secure automated data spaces and the USS Nimitz's visual decks remains a primary focal point for the strike group's technical staff. This long-standing procedural mystery is fundamentally resolved by the official admissions of former AARO Acting Director Tim Phillips during his formal institutional data recovery briefing.

Phillips revealed that an official investigative branch directly questioned the former Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)—confirming the leadership tenure of Dr. Anthony J. Tether (DARPA Director, 2001–2009)—during an executive defense gathering regarding the current classification and whereabouts of the missing 2004 radar and tactical systems telemetry. The former DARPA Director openly validated the technical staff's historical accounts, explicitly stating:

"Yeah, we took them. We had a program running out there, it was ours, and we pulled the data."

This high-level administrative admission confirms that the data erasure was an authorized, closed-loop proprietary asset recovery protocol. Because the experimental tracking frequencies, low-observable waveforms, and drone sensor metrics captured by the Princeton's advanced SPY-1B radar belonged to a classified DARPA cross-domain program, the agency legally exercised its compartmentalized authority to pull the physical media from general Navy channels to prevent technical compromise. This explains why the raw, multi-sensor telemetry remains restricted from public military repositories to this day.

SECTION VI: CONCLUSION AND MULTI-AGENCY IMPLICATIONS

When subjected to independent forensic analysis, the "house of cards" comprising the anomalous Nimitz narrative resolves into a highly logical, un-deconflicted multi-agency testing cross-over.

The investigation establishes a clear chain of events: an unbriefed, highly sensitive naval radar upgrade inadvertently began tracking high-altitude NASA and USAF meteorological staging assets launched for an impending hypersonic launch. The resulting influx of unrecognized tracking targets caused radar operators to perceive an airspace intrusion, leading them to vector tactical Navy fighters directly into the operating zones of unbriefed DARPA submarine-launched ISR testing platforms and unlinked NASA research aircraft.

While the DARPA platform section offers multiple potential launch hulls—ranging from a dynamic late-November transit model for the USS Georgia to localized Point Loma fast-attack surrogates like the Topeka or Pasadena—the underlying DARPA connection itself remains the most solid explanation to date for what Fravor, Dietrich, and the technical operators witnessed. By treating these data sets as separate forensic scenes, we eliminate the need for exotic, speculative physics and successfully map every recorded anomaly to known, verifiable milestones in American defense and aerospace testing.

SECTION VII: CHRONOLOGICAL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To provide clear scannability for peer-review evaluation, the newly uncovered, unredacted historical facts and operational interactions established in this paper are summarized below:

October 2004: Operation Silent Hammer concludes in the SOCAL operating area, establishing baseline infrastructure for classified, submerged SSGN-launched ISR drone and balloon relay testing under DARPA and AFRL management.
Early November 2004: A non-strike-group SSGN or local SUBRON 11 submarine platform remains on-station in the warning areas to execute extended developmental testing of canister-launched OTH data-link balloon assemblies.
November 10, 2004: NASA and the USAF ramp up high-frequency "Special" rawinsonde launches across four regional bases to secure atmospheric profiling for the upcoming X-43A hypersonic run. Concurrently, the USS Princeton's newly modernized AN/SPY-1B radar system begins painting these sub-resolution objects, causing operators to initialize anomalous track logs.
November 14, 2004 (Visual Intercept): An active subsurface platform inflates and releases an encapsulated, pressurized helium ISR balloon relay envelope outside the high-traffic training box boundaries. Fast Eagle 01 closes on the slowly ascending asset from an overhead tactical approach, creating a high rate of closure, while Dietrich tracks its "missile-like" vertical ejection velocity. Slicing through the target's immediate airspace, the fighter's powerful wingtip wake vortex violently ruptures the balloon's skin, causing instantaneous structural disintegration.
November 14, 2004 (Sensor Intercept): Handed an uncooperative track coordinate by the Princeton, WSO Chad Underwood captures infrared targeting footage of an independent, unlinked NASA F/A-18 chase aircraft monitoring regional testing airspace. Long-range thermal blooming and extreme digital stabilization turn the distant conventional jet into a featureless oval shape.
November 16, 2004: The X-43A completes its historic hypersonic test run. The special meteorological tracking operations immediately close down, and the anomalous high-altitude radar contacts vanish from the strike group's displays permanently.

SECTION VIII: REFERENCES

[1] NASA, "Hyper-X Project: X-43A Flight 3 Post-Flight Trajectory Reconstruction and Hypersonic Flight Results," NASA/TM-2005-21371.

[2] Turber, M. (2025). NASA Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request Record: Hyper-X Flight 3 Regional Atmospheric Sounding Logs, Rawinsonde Datasets, and Visual Radiosonde Staging Imagery (Reference ID: NASA-FOIA-2025-X43A). National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Freedom of Information Act Office.

[3] US Navy / DARPA, "Operation Silent Hammer Joint Experimentation Technical Summary: Submerged Staging and Autonomous ISR Deployments," (October 2004). Official Project Archives.

[4] US Navy / Raytheon, "AN/ASQ-228 Advanced Targeting Forward-Looking Infrared (ATFLIR) Systems Operations Manual," NAVAIR Technical Briefing Documents.

[5] To The Stars Academy (TTSA), "2004 USS Nimitz Carrier Strike Group Executive Summary and Operational Context," (2017). Reference Archive: https://coi.tothestarsacademy.com/nimitz-report

[6] US Navy, "Official Pilot and Aircrew Interview Transcripts: CSG-11 Training Range Intercepts (November 14, 2004)," Declassified Records Archive.

[7] Lockheed Martin / US Navy, "AN/SPY-1 Radar System Capabilities, Sensitivity Baselines, and Aegis Modernization Baseline 7," Technical Engineering Digest.

[8] Weather Underground, "Historical Sounding & Upper-Air Meteorological Datasets: Ensenada / Southern California Border Region (November 10-16, 2004)." Historical Database: https://www.wunderground.com/history/daily/MMTJ/date/2004-11-14

[9] Fighter Sweep Media, "X-Files Edition: Aviation Safety and Proximity Wake Vortex Disruption in the SOCAL Complex," (2015). Reference Archive: https://fightersweep.com/1460/x-files-edition/

[10] Commanding Officer, USS Pasadena (SSN-752). (2005). 2004 Command Operations Report (OPNAV Report 5750-1). Washington, DC: Naval History and Heritage Command.

[11] Defense Visual Information Distribution Service. (2004). USS Topeka (SSN 754) San Diego Return Transit Logs (VIRIN: 041124-N-8977L-001). Department of the Navy.

[12] Naval Undersea Warfare Center. (2004). Southern California Offshore Range (SCORE) Complex Operating Manual. San Diego, CA: Department of the Navy.

[13] Joint Chiefs of Staff. (2004). Joint Airspace Control, Joint Publication 3-52. Washington, DC: Department of Defense.

[14] Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. (2003). Navy Space and Range Management Instructions, OPNAVINST 3721.20B. Washington, DC: Department of the Navy.

[15] U.S. Atlantic Fleet Public Affairs. (2004, November 24). USS Georgia (SSBN 729) Homeport Shift Photographic Record (Image ID: 041124-N-2820Z-004). Internal Metadata Verification: Nikon D70, 15:15:22 EST. Norfolk, VA: Department of the Navy.

[16] Commander, Submarine Force Pacific. (2004). Strategic Missile Offload Logs: SWFPAC Bangor. Kitsap, WA: Naval Base Kitsap.

[17] Naval Sea Systems Command. (2005). Multi-Mission Platform (MMP) Structural Configuration and Sea Trial Authorization for Seawolf Class Platforms. Washington, DC: Department of the Navy.

[18] Day, K. (2019). Tactical Air Control Operations and Radar Spatial Dispersal Metrics. Personal Communication / Direct Interview via Messenger with M. Turber.

[19] Turber, M. & Day, K. (2025). Nimitz Encounters: Final Cut (2025 Revision). 5x5 News Technical Audio Analysis Series, Public Multimedia Repository Broadcast. Available at: https://music.youtube.com/watch?v=cF0issaC7Co&si=vYLgBnWJyq3RUTlu

[20] Phillips, T. (2024). AARO Tactical Data Collection and Historical Incident Review. Official Interview Transcript Profile, Segment: "DARPA Took The Tapes" (Timestamp ref: 00:29:27). Department of Defense Office of Anomalous Resolution Archive / Technical Analysis Series.

[21] Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. (2009). Directorate Tenure and Administrative Records: Dr. Anthony J. Tether (2001-2009). Arlington, VA: DARPA Historical Office.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Mike Turber is an Investigative Journalist, filmmaker, and the owner of 5x5 News. He is a former intelligence analyst with nearly 40 years of elite experience across diverse forensic disciplines—specializing in high-fidelity audio/video forensics, cyber-security, satellite imagery analysis, and crime scene investigations & reconstructions. He has served as a primary technical consultant and investigator on multiple ultra-high-profile national cases, including the independent forensic investigation of the 2017 Las Vegas Route 91 Mass Shooting Event (the largest in United States History) and the high-end field forensics underlying the Tiger King legal matters. As a professional Director of Photography, his trained visual expertise centers heavily on the exploitation of image sensor artifacts, lens geometries, and technical optical tracking mechanics within complex aerospace environments. His work has been featured on various main stream news media organizations such as CNN, FOX NEWS, Discovery ID etc. as well as numerous podcasts and articles.