

~~SECRET~~

INSCOM
GRILL FLAME
PROGRAM

SESSION REPORT

CLASSIFIED BY:MSG,DAMI-ISH
DATED: 051630ZJUL78

NOT RELEASABLE TO FOREIGN NATIONALS REVIEW ON: Nov 2000

~~SECRET~~

GRILL FLAME

copy 1 of 2 copies

This document is made available through the declassification efforts
and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages released by the U.S. Government & Military.

Discover the Truth at: <http://www.theblackvault.com>

~~SECRET~~

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

REMOTE VIEWING (RV) SESSION D-98

1. (S/NOFORN) This report documents a remote viewing session conducted in compliance with a request for information on a target of interest. The mission was to locate [REDACTED]

SG1A

SG1A

2. (S/NOFORN) The protocol used for this session is detailed in the document Grill Flame Protocol, AMSAA Applied Remote Viewing Protocol (S), undated.

3. (S/NOFORN) At TAB A is a summary of the data presented by the remote viewer during the session. A complete transcript of the session is available upon request. At TAB B are drawings made by the remote viewer reference his impressions of the target site. At TAB C is the map on which the viewer indicated where he thought the target(s) were located. At TAB D is target cuing information provided the remote viewer.

4. (S/NOFORN) The summary at TAB A represents the salient points provided by the remote viewer and as such has not been subjected to any intermediate analysis, evaluation or collation. Interpretation and use of the information provided is the responsibility of the requestor.

NOT RELEASABLE TO FOREIGN NATIONALS

~~SECRET~~

TAB

~~SECRET~~

TRANSCRIPT SUMMARY

REMOTE VIEWING (RV) SESSION D-98

1. (S/NOFORN) The following information was obtained at 1130 hours, 30 October 1980. Source #01.

a. (S/NOFORN) Source reported on two (2) locations (see TAB C) and was not sure if the data was related to an old site and new site [REDACTED]

SG1A

SG1A

b. (S/NOFORN) Source felt that site #1 was near mountain range that split U.S.S.R. He reported that area was in very early stage of construction. He described a major river as running ENE to WSW just south of construction site. Source reported that a good size city was located just to the NE. Source indicated that city was termination point for major rail lines coming from West and South. He reported that no railroads went out easterly from this city. Source stated that city was 120-150 miles from northern border of U.S.S.R.

c. (S/NOFORN) The second possible area was described as being located about 100 miles in from the Polish border (see drawing 2). He was not sure if construction at this site was complete.

d. (S/NOFORN) Source felt that construction of third site would not complete the cycle. That is, he felt that there would be a total of 5 sites when the Soviets were finished construction of this type installation. However, he felt that the Soviets were constructing these installations in a checkable pattern. He explained this pattern as being an orientation of "Great Circle Azimuths", (GCA's).

e. (S/NOFORN) Source reported that site #1 was located near a city that began with the letter "M" and ended in something like "ieske". He felt it was a strange Russian name. Further, he reported that the city was "just coming into age"....the city is very old but just recently has it taken on importance in an industrial/economic sense.

f. (S/NOFORN) Source indicated that all materials used for constructing these sites come from 2 other production plants (in addition to the one he had been briefed on). He felt that all of these plants were located outside of Moscow (see drawing 3).

g. (S/NOFORN) Source felt that water is very important to these sites.

2. (S/NOFORN) Although source indicated on the attached the probable locations of the sites, he felt very concerned about his "best guess" way of trying to relate his data to the map since:

a. The map threw him off.

b. Not used to the way the land forms were projected on the map.

c. Felt that topographic map would be more useful (Note: We could not do anything to overcome this problem since we were limited to resources provided by tasking agency.)


~~SECRET~~


~~SECRET~~


3. (S/NOFORN) Request the above information, once evaluated, be returned with comments to this office (ATTN: IAOPS-H-S). Comments should be in writing. This will permit a full evaluation of the source of information by this office. A detailed transcript can be provided concerning the above project session if necessary.

~~SECRET~~

TAB







TAB

SG1A

Approved For Release 2002/05/17 : CIA-RDP96-00788R000500630001-8

Approved For Release 2002/05/17 : CIA-RDP96-00788R000500630001-8

TAB

~~SECRET~~

TARGET CUING INFORMATION

REMOTE VIEWING (RV) SESSION D-98

1. (S/NOFORN) Prior to the session the viewer was shown several photographs (provided by the tasking agency) of [REDACTED] The photographs depicted the site during various stages of development. The viewer was also shown a photo of a production plant which apparently produces items used in the construction process at the sites. The photographs are not included in this report due to their classification.

SG1A

2. (S/NOFORN) The viewer was told that USI was trying to locate where the [REDACTED]

SG1A

3. (U) Prior to the session, all material relating to this project was stored in the SSO facility with access to the material being limited to the project manager.

NOT RELEASABLE TO FOREIGN NATIONALS

~~SECRET~~
ORCON