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PREFACE

The historian's major objective in preparing this AFIS history was to research and write the narrative using primary source documentation. In particular, the chapters on Grenada and the directorates thoroughly reflect the emphasis upon primary sources — whether the sources were the "traditional" written and printed documents or were the oral statements of key participants in events, obtained through interviews and briefings.

There are 576 supporting documents accompanying this book, and they are bound in 15 separate volumes. As an aid to the reader, footnotes appear at the bottom of the narrative pages, and each supporting document is assigned an "SD" number. If a commander, director, chief, policy-maker, or planning analyst wishes to examine in detail a cited document, the historian can easily retrieve it. Thus, the AFIS CY1983 History is both a "history" and an "archives."

Because some aspects of the AFIS history involved sensitive compartmentalized information (SCI), there is a separate SCI annex to this volume, Annex A. One copy of this is on file in the SCI storage facility used by the Historical Research Office.

The historian wrote the narrative using guidelines in The Chicago Manual of Style, 13th edition. Some general "rules" followed were to 1) use past tense, 2) use lower case spellings, and 3) re-write jargon. Sometimes the historian corrected misspellings and grammatical errors in quoted passages, but otherwise passages were quoted precisely.

Although being new to AFIS and "the intelligence community," and under a summer suspense date, the historian hopes she produced a history useful to some and instructive for many.

Col. William Sherman deserves a special word of thanks for his support in encouraging the AFIS staff to cooperate with the history office, in locating the office in a quiet and pleasant work area, and in providing a word processor and printer.

Diane T. Putney
Chief, Historical Research Office
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AIR FORCE INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

JANUARY

11-12 The Directorate of Targets hosted the Standardized Futuristic Data Base Conference at Bolling AFB.

18 Secretary of the Air Force Verne Orr visited the Directorate of Soviet Affairs.

JANUARY-FEBRUARY A study was conducted of AFIS Civilian Hiring procedures.

FEBRUARY

7-11 The Directorate of Targets hosted the Air Force Target Intelligence Conference at Lowry AFB.


22-27

MARCH

2-16

APRIL


5 The Defense Investigative Service resumed conducting Periodic Reinvestigations of Special Background Investigations.

Col. Webb of the Directorate of Evasion and Escape/Prisoner of War was an Air Force witness to explain SERE matters to members of the Subcommittee on Military Readiness of the House Committee on Armed Services.
Air Force HUMINT Architecture Plan (AFHAP) was published.

The deputy director of HQ USAF Manpower and Organization exempted AFIS from functional reviews.

The First Annual AFSAC Commanders' Conference was held.

The Air Force Audit Agency conducted its annual review of Intelligence Contingency Funds.

The Directorate of Soviet Affairs was informed that the Soviets refused to allow personnel from Soviet Affairs to visit the Soviet Union.

The AFIS Inspector General performed a special inquiry into the management of personnel within the Directorate of Security and Communications Management.

The first meeting was held of the AFIS Military Decorations Board.


The ACS/I accepted responsibility as executive agent for evasion and escape matters.

The Directorate of Security and Communications Management assumed accountability for the SCI billets in the new Space Command.
August - October

- AFIS Operating Location ET became operational.
- An intensive effort was underway to upgrade the WATCH.

September

- The third RIDGE RUNNER Exercise was conducted, according to AFIS EXPLAN 01-83.
- CMSgt Richard S. Gantzier assumed responsibilities as the new AFIS senior enlisted advisor, replacing CMSgt William H. Strickland.

October

- 24-29
- 26
- 27

27 October - 4 November

November

- Col. Sherman became chairman of the AF/IN - AFIS Merit Pay Unit Committee and the AF/IN - AFIS Civilian Incentive Awards Committee.
- Col. Jack Morris retired as the executive officer to the ACS/1, ending thirty-five years of active duty with the Air Force.
The ACS/I directed that quarterly intelligence briefings be provided for the Air Force's chief master sergeant and for those senior enlisted personnel whom the chief recommended.

The reorganization plan was approved for the Directorate of Estimates and the Directorate of Operational Intelligence.

The Directorate of Intelligence Reserve Forces managed 1,341 reservists: 1,287 assigned and 54 attached for training.

DURING 1983:

The attendance was 27,660 at the classified Soviet Military Power Days and Road Shows sponsored by the Directorate of Soviet Affairs.

The Directorate of Attache Affairs nominated 38 officers and 46 enlisted personnel to the Defense Intelligence Agency for service in the Defense Attache System.

The Directorate of Security and Communications Management was reorganized.
APIS Operating Location DL-ET revised AFR 200-3, "The Medical Intelligence Program."
CHAPTER 1

MISSION, ORGANIZATION, AND COMMAND
MISSION:

The National Security Act of 1947, as amended, empowered the departments of the federal government to collect, evaluate, correlate, and disseminate departmental intelligence. Department of Defense Directive 5100.1 and Air Force Regulation 55-43 directed the Air Force to provide an organization capable of furnishing adequate, timely, and reliable intelligence for the Air Force and the Department of Defense. The Air Force Intelligence Service was a major element of the Air Force intelligence organization established to satisfy these responsibilities.1

The overall mission of the Air Force Intelligence Service (AFIS) was to provide specialized intelligence services and intelligence to Headquarters, United States Air Force and United States Air Force commanders, worldwide, by 1) directing and conducting designated intelligence collection activities, 2) processing, and disseminating intelligence information and intelligence, and 3) conducting programs designed to ensure that the Air Force was provided with intelligence systems.2

The Air Force Intelligence Service (AFIS) provided intelligence support within the Air Force according to the following functions:3

1. Conducts programs to insure the adequacy and war readiness capability of AFIS intelligence resources, human and physical, that are furnished to the combatant and support commands during peacetime, wartime, and contingency situations, according to USAF and JCS approved documents.

2. As appropriate, provides direct intelligence support to Air Force major commands in emergency and contingency situations.

3. Prepares and presents coordinated Air Force intelligence positions, as required by HQ USAF, in support of service, interdepartmental, and other agency intelligence issues and actions. Participates as required in these actions.

4. Monitors designated Air Force intelligence collection operations involving signal, electromagnetic, imagery, and sonic systems and other technical disciplines to satisfy assigned Air Force intelligence responsibilities in response to requirements established by DOD.

1AFR 23-45 "Air Force Intelligence Service (AFIS), 10 Jun 74, as amended, SD 1.
2Ibid.
3Ibid.
5. Participates with the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) in management of the human source intelligence (HUMINT) collection requirements program and monitors as required other intelligence collection programs conducted to satisfy Air Force, DOD and national requirements.

6. Manages and conducts HUMINT collection operations in support of Air Force, DOD and national requirements; recommends HUMINT policy as required.

7. Collates, processes, and disseminates as appropriate current operational intelligence, derived from all sources, to apprise HQ USAF and Air Force commanders of intelligence affecting global Air Force missions and resources.

8. Collates, analyzes, and interprets intelligence information associated with the operational effects of the employment of air weapon systems; disseminates such finished intelligence to HQ USAF and Air Force commanders responsible for the employment and evaluation of those systems.

9. Identifies intelligence collection, exploitation and production equipment needs associated with new Air Force weapon systems during the research and development phase of those new systems.

10. Researches, compiles, evaluates, correlates, maintains and disseminates aerospace-related signal intelligence (SIGINT), concerning the activities, capabilities, intentions and trends of foreign aerospace forces; advises concerning SIGINT sources, types of information available, and resultant specialized products to HQ USAF, Air Force major commanders, DOD and interdepartmental/interagency activities as required.

11. Serves as the responsible agency for intelligence matters concerning targeting, weaponization, and target materials.

12. Serves as the responsible agency and point of contact for the Defense Mapping Agency (DMA) on mapping, charting and geodesy activities (excluding aerial surveys).

13. Plans, coordinates and monitors the application of worldwide Air Force intelligence data handling capabilities.

14. Manages the worldwide Air Force Special Security Office (AFSSO) and Special Activities Office (SAO) systems, by insuring compliance with compartmented intelligence security policy, special intelligence telecommunications policy, communications security policy and procedures, AFSSO and SAO administrative procedures and the physical security, billet management and personnel clearance programs to insure the security of such intelligence at all organizational levels.

15. As directed by HQ USAF, develops capabilities for
participation in the Defense Attache System; monitors and supports that participation.

16. Serves as the responsible agency for the intelligence aspects of evasion and escape, and prisoners of war plans and programs.

17. Serves as the responsible agency for soliciting, validating, and satisfying Air Force collateral intelligence document requirements.

18. Provides other specialized intelligence services in support of Air Force missions as directed by the chief of staff.

19. Provides peacetime management of intelligence mobilization augmentee (IMA) positions which have been established by commands and agencies, validated by the Air Staff, and assigned to AFIS for such management.

Special Responsibilities and Instructions:

a. The AFIS consists of a headquarters, and other subordinate organizational elements as authorized by the chief of staff, USAF. The commander, AFIS, exercises command jurisdiction over assigned units, personnel, property, and funds.

b. AFIS provides specialist intelligence representation for HQ USAF, joint, interdepartmental, international activities, and board and committee membership as required by HQ USAF.

c. AFIS is designated as the USAF Automatic Data Processing Systems (ADPS) monitor for the Air Force Intelligence Data Handling System (IDHS) and is delegated ADP authorities and exercises ADP responsibilities under the provisions of AFR 300-2 and AFM 300-11.

ORGANIZATION

The AFIS organization consisted of a 1) command element with an inspector general and a senior enlisted advisor, 2) nine directorates, 3) eight special staff units, 4) the Air Force Special Activities Center (AFSAC), and 5) six operating locations.

There were no major changes within the overall AFIS organization this year. There were, however, two new operating locations established: OL-ET at Fort Detrick, Maryland and OL-S at Suitland, Maryland.1 Also, the Directorate of Evasion and Escape/Prisoner of War (JNR) was renamed the Directorate of Joint Services Support (JSS).2

1For a detailed discussion, see Chapter VIII.
2See Chapter IV.
Of the subordinate AFIS units, the Air Force Special Activities Center continued to be the largest, consisting of three types of subordinate elements: special activities areas, detachments, and operating locations.¹

¹See Chapter VI.

²AFISR 23-1 "Organization and Functions, Air Force Intelligence Service (AFIS)," 15 July 82, SD 2. See also Organizational Chart of Air Force Intelligence Service, AFISA 11-3, 1 Aug 83, SD 3.
AFIS and AF/IN Relationship

AFIS units continued to operate in an interrelated support role to the Headquarters, United States Air Force, Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, which was commanded by a major general who was the assistant chief of staff, intelligence (ACS/I). His office (AF/IN) consisted of a command element, the Directorate of Estimates (DNE), the Directorate of Intelligence Plans and Systems (DNY), and an Assistant for Joint Matters (JNJ).1

The commander of AFIS (AFIS/CC) was a brigadier general who was also the deputy assistant chief of staff, intelligence (DACS/I).2 The AF/IN and AFIS/CC were collocated in the Pentagon and were serviced by the same administrative support personnel and equipment. The vice commander of AFIS was a colonel whose office was located in the AFIS compound at Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Two AFIS directorates were functionally subordinate to the two AF/IN directorates: the AFIS Directorate of Intelligence Data Management to the AF/IN Directorate of Intelligence Plans and Systems, and the AFIS Directorate of Operational Intelligence to the AF/IN Directorate of Estimates. The AFIS Directorates of Personnel, Intelligence Reserve Forces, and Security and Communications Management serviced both AF/IN and AFIS, and did in varying degrees the AFIS Special Staff.2

The relationship between AF/IN and AFIS was clearly seen in the AFIS budget, which was divided into three major force programs (MFPs): 3, 8A, and 9. MFP 3 was the largest segment of the AFIS budget, and 83 percent of the programs were AF/IN special projects. Also, in MFP 9, the NISSET program (National Intelligence System to Support Tactical Requirements) was a project outside the functional control of AFIS.3

PROGRAMS FUNDED IN AFIS
(5 in 000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MFP</th>
<th>PROGRAMS</th>
<th>30 SEP 83</th>
<th>OBLIGATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IDHS</td>
<td>27,938.9</td>
<td>30 SEP 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COBRA JUDY</td>
<td>22,850.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COBRA EAR</td>
<td>7,510.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICF</td>
<td>2,410.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AF/IN SPECIAL PROJECTS = 88%</td>
<td>2,914.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pronounced AFIS.

1Organizational Chart Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence. AFISVA 11-2. 1 Aug 83. SD 4.

2Throughout this history note the interaction between AF/IN and AFIS personnel.

3For documents providing details on the AFIS budget see Chapter VII. Vugraph Print-out. AFIS/AC, "Programs Funded in AFIS" 1983.
Major changes occurred this year within the AF/IN and AFIS command structure.¹

ACS/I Change of Command

On 1 July, Maj. Gen. James C. Pfautz assumed the duties as the assistant chief of staff, intelligence (ACS/I), replacing Maj. Gen. John B. Marks, who assumed command of the Electronic Security Command, San Antonio, Texas. Immediately prior to becoming the ACS/I, General Pfautz was director for intelligence, J-2, Headquarters Pacific Command, Camp H. M. Smith, Hawaii. The general was fifty-three years of age and had been promoted to major general 1 March 1961, with date of rank 1 Aug 1977.²

In 1953, he was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, New York, with a bachelor's degree in military engineering. He received a master's degree in international organization from the American University and was a graduate of the National War College.

After receiving his commission in 1953 from the academy, General Pfautz entered undergraduate pilot training at Malden Air Force Base, Missouri, and received his wings in August 1954 at Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma. Initially assigned in September 1954 to the 313th Troop Carrier Group at Sewart Air Force Base, Tennessee, he transferred in September 1956 to the 322nd Air Division at Evreux-Pauville Air Base, France.

In June 1960 General Pfautz was assigned to the University of Maryland's Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps Detachment 330. In September 1964 he took command of the Flight Operations Section of the Air Force Advisory Group at Tan Son Nhut Air Base, Republic of Vietnam, where he flew 188 combat missions. In January 1966, General Pfautz was assigned to the Air Force Eastern Test Range at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida. His next two assignments were with Headquarters Air Force Systems Command.

¹For key personnel in all AFIS units, see individual chapters of this history.
²Biographical Information Sheet - Major General James C. Pfautz, SAF/PA, Apr 80, SD 5.
Command at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. In September 1966 he became aide-de-camp to the commander and in 1968 was assigned as executive officer.

The general graduated from the National War College in June 1971 and was then assigned to the Directorate of Doctrine, Concepts and Objectives, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C. In September 1974 he was selected by the Council on Foreign Relations for a one-year fellowship at the council's New York City offices. He was assigned as executive officer to the principal deputy assistant secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs in July 1975, later becoming executive officer to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs Ambassador Eugene V. McHuliffe.

From June 1977 to December 1978, he served as U.S. defense attache to Egypt. He then served as deputy assistant, Office of the Chief of Staff, Intelligence, at Air Force headquarters. General Pfautz assumed his duties with J-2, Headquarters Pacific Command, in April 1980.

The general was a command pilot with 6,000 flying hours. His military decorations and awards included the Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit with one oak leaf cluster, Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medal with four oak leaf clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal, and Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with palm.

DACS/i Change of Command

On 15 February, Brig. Gen. Paul H. Martin assumed the positions of deputy chief of staff, intelligence and AFIS commander. He replaced Maj. Gen. (designate) Schuyler Bissell who was assigned to the Defense Intelligence Agency as deputy director. General Martin was forty-seven years of age and had been promoted to brigadier general 1 March 1983, with a date of rank 1 October 1982.

General Martin earned a bachelor of science degree from Western Kentucky State College in 1957 and was commissioned a second lieutenant through the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps program. General Martin completed the Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island, and earned a master's degree in management from Central Michigan University in 1978.

Following pilot training at Moore Air Force Base, Texas, and Greenville Air Force Base, Mississippi, General Martin flew KC-97 tankers with the 2nd Bombardment Wing, Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia. In April 1960 he transferred to the 46th Air

---

Biographical Information Sheet: Brigadier General Paul H. Martin, SAF/PA, Jan 84, SD 6.
Refueling Squadron, K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, where he flew KC-135 jet tankers for the Strategic Air Command.

The general was assigned to the 4152nd Strategic Wing, Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, from July 1962 to June 1963, where he flew RC-135s and participated in "Project Office Boy." He then joined the 55th Strategic Reconnaissance Wing at Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, and in May 1967 moved to Yokota Air Base, Japan, with Detachment 1, 3rd Air Division. Six months later he was assigned to the 62nd Strategic Reconnaissance Squadron at Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, where he served as an aircraft commander in the wing Standardization Division, flying 103 RC-135 combat missions over Southeast Asia.

From September 1969 to November 1970, General Martin was assigned to the 314th Air Division, Osan Air Base, South Korea, as an operations staff officer. Upon his return to the United States, he served at SAC headquarters in the Strategic Reconnaissance Center as chief of the Electronic Warfare Branch, Offutt Air Force Base.

General Martin took command of the 305th Air Refueling Squadron at Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, in April 1974. He later served as deputy base commander and acting base commander at Grissom. In May 1975 he moved to Shemya Air Force Base, Alaska, where he commanded Detachment 1, 6th Strategic Wing until entering the Naval War College. Following graduation in 1977, he was assigned to Camp H. M. Smith, Hawaii, where he served as chief of the Collections Management Division, J-2, for U.S. Pacific Command.

In July 1980 General Martin joined the Electronic Security Command, Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, where he served as vice commander. The general moved to Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, in September 1981 and became the National Security Agency's chief of tactical systems, research and engineering.

A command pilot with more than 6,000 flying hours, his military decorations and awards included the Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medal with nine oak leaf clusters and Air Force Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters.

New Senior Enlisted Advisor

On 15 September, CMSgt Richard H. Gantzler assumed responsibilities as the new AFIS senior enlisted advisor. He replaced CMSgt William H. Strickland, who attended the Senior Enlisted Intelligence Program at the Defense Intelligence Agency. Since June 1981, Chief Gantzler was the senior enlisted advisor for the 6910th Electronic Security Wing, Lindsey Air Station, Wiesbaden, Germany. The chief was thirty-nine years old, a
graduate of the Air Force Noncommissioned Officer Academy and a graduate of the Senior NCO Academy.1

He enlisted in the Air Force in June 1962 and received basic Russian language training at Indiana University. From November 1963 to January 1965, he was assigned as an intercept operator at the 6986th Security Squadron, Wakanmai Air Station, Japan.

After attending intermediate Russian language school for a year at Syracuse University, New York, he was assigned to the 6916th Security Squadron, Rhein Main Air Base, Germany. From March 1966 to December 1968, he served as an airborne intercept operator, airborne analyst, and flight chief in analysis and reporting. In December 1968 he was assigned to Detachment 1, 6916th Security Squadron, Athenai Air Base, Athens, Greece, as NCOIC of Mission Management.

Chief Gantzler was transferred in August 1971 to the 6949th Security Squadron, Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, where he was NCOIC of advisory support and the airborne mission supervisor. After three months training in the Polish language at the Defense Language Institute, Monterey, California, he was assigned under AFIS to the United States Defense Attache Office in Warsaw, Poland. From September 1973 to June 1975 the chief served as assistant to the Air Attaché.

From August 1975 to June 1976 Chief Gantzler served as Staff NCO in Directorate of Airborne Operations, HQ USAFSS, Kelly Air Force Base, Texas. For the next three years he served as management inspector on the USAFSS (later ESC) inspector general team. In January 1980 the chief was assigned as NCOIC of Operations Production at the 6916th Electronic Security Squadron, Hellenikos Air Base, Athens, Greece.

The chief’s military decorations included the Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal, and ten Air Medals. He had 4,000 hours combat support in the C-130 and KC-135.

Senior Enlisted Advisor as ACS/I’s Representative

General Pfautz viewed the AFIS senior enlisted advisor as a representative of the ACS/I, who was to have access to all information necessary to understand current and projected operations. The chief had “the need to know.” In November, the AFIS supplement to APR 39-20, "The Senior Enlisted Advisor," was revised to include the ACS/I’s view. The revised document stated that the senior enlisted advisor, 1) had unrestricted access to

1Biographical Information Sheet, Chief Master Sergeant Richard H. Gantzler, SAF/PA, Oct 83. SD 7.
the ACS/I and AFIS commander to discuss policies, priorities, and enlisted matters, 1) had unrestricted access to the enlisted force in AF/IN and AFIS, and 3) should make frequent visits to AF/IN, AFIS, and other subordinate and supported organizations both in the CONUS and overseas.

Continuity within the AFIS/CV and AFSAC

Col. William B. Sherman continued as the vice commander (CV) of AFIS. 2 Lt. Terrence E. Giroux was his executive officer. MSGt. Nicholas E. Frasher was the supervisor of office administrative matters, and Mrs. Phyllis J. Pickard continued as secretary to the AFIS/CV.

Col. Nick Yankowski continued to command the Air Force Special Activities Center, a position he held since 1 October 1981. 3 Col. William F. Bale continued as the vice commander, a position he held since 30 September 1981. Maj. Charles F. Pugh assumed responsibilities as executive officer on 1 June 1983.

Retirement of ACS/I’s Executive Officer

On 1 November, Col. Jack Morris retired as the executive officer to the ACS/I, ending thirty-five years of active duty with the Air Force and its intelligence function. On 31 October he stated: 4

I have witnessed our beloved profession grow from a rather weak, hesitant start to the present strong, mature position it now enjoys. This accomplishment did not come easy and many of you can take some measure of pride in the fact that you helped in achieving this progress. Despite the many outstanding improvements and fine tuning that has been done, there are still additional challenges to be met, given the world we live in.

I wish I could be with you, striving to meet the challenges ahead, but since the bell has tolled for me I leave the task to you, confident that in the years to come Air Force Intelligence will enjoy even greater successes as you work and strive together toward that end. And so, my dear colleagues, I bid you goodbye and charge you to keep the faith.

2For a biographical sketch of Col. Sherman see Biographical Information Sheet, SAF/PA, n.d., SD 9.
3For a biographical sketch of Col. Yankowski see SD 10.
Major General James C. Pfantz, Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence
Brigadier General Paul H. Martin, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, and Commander of the Air Force Intelligence Service.
Colonel William B. Sherman, Vice Commander of the Air Force Intelligence Service.
CMSgt Richard E. Gantzler, Senior Enlisted Advisor of the Air Force Intelligence Service.
CHAPTER 11

OPERATION URGENT FURY: DEPLOYMENT TO GRENADA
US OPERATION IN GRENADA

COURTESY OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
It was not a total surprise to anyone that there was to be a deployment to Grenada. On 26 October, the day the deployment message was issued, the front page of the New York Times proclaimed, "1,900 U.S. Troops, with Caribbean Allies, Invade Grenada and Fight Leftist Units." The day before, when the U.S. military intervention began, Maj. Robert H. Roser, Jr., the chief of the Plans and Policy Branch of APSAC, jokingly told some APSACers that he would soon be sending them to the Caribbean. The next morning those APSACers were, indeed, packing their mobility bags.  

On 25 October, President Ronald Reagan had issued the following statement:  

"...Early this morning, forces from six Caribbean democracies and the United States began a landing, or landings, on the island of Grenada in the eastern Caribbean."

*Unless otherwise indicated, time will be given in eastern daylight savings time or eastern standard time.

1Ms: TAC/IN to AF/IN, S/G Martin, "URGENT FURY Support," 261105Z Oct 83, SD 12.


We have taken this decisive action for three reasons:

First, of overriding importance, to protect innocent lives, including up to 1,000 Americans whose personal safety is, of course, my paramount concern.

Second, to forestall further chaos.

And third, to assist in the restoration of conditions of law and order and of governmental institutions to the island of Grenada, where a brutal group of leftist thugs violently seized power, killing the Prime Minister, three Cabinet ministers, two labor leaders and other civilians, including children.

Let there be no misunderstanding. This collective action has been forced on us by events that have no precedent in the eastern Caribbean and no place in any civilized society.

American lives are at stake, so we have been following the situation as closely as possible.

Between 800 and 1,000 Americans, including many medical students and senior citizens, make up the largest single group of foreign residents in Grenada.

From the start, we have consciously sought to calm fears. We were determined not to make an already bad situation worse and increase the risks our citizens faced.

But when I received reports that a large number of our citizens were seeking to escape the island, thereby exposing themselves to great danger, and after receiving a formal request for help, a unanimous request from our neighboring states, I concluded the United States had no choice but to act strongly and decisively.

Let me repeat: The United States objectives are clear—to protect our own citizens, to facilitate the evacuation of those who want to leave and to help in the restoration of democratic institutions in Grenada.

---

Background information on Grenada revealed that Britain had granted the island full independence on 7 February 1974, and Grenada was governed under a parliamentary system, based on the British model. The first prime minister was Sir Eric Gairy. According to the Department of State: ¹

On March 13, 1979, the New Joint Endeavor for Welfare, Education, and Liberation (NEWJEWL) Movement ousted Sir Eric in a nearly bloodless coup d'état, and the People's Revolutionary Government was established, headed by Prime Minister Maurice Bishop. The new government was strongly Marxist-Leninist in orientation

¹"Background Notes: Grenada," US Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Feb 84, SD 13.
and gradually moved to establish close ties to Cuba, the Soviet Union and other communist countries.

As the result of a power struggle within the government, in October 1983 Prime Minister Bishop and several members of his cabinet were arrested and subsequently executed by elements of the People's Revolutionary Army. In the wake of the chaos and breakdown of civil order that followed, a joint U.S.-Caribbean force, acting in response to an appeal from the Governor General and to a request for assistance from the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), landed in Grenada on October 25 to evacuate U.S. citizens whose safety was endangered and to help restore order.

1 Memo ○ AFIS/INO2C to ACS/1 and TNE, "Tipper from TAC/IN on Emergency IPW Requirement," 26 Oct 83, SD 14.

2 Intvw ○ AFIS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, TSgt Newell, AFSC, 5 Jun 84.

3 Ibid.
1Ibid: Ltr ☐ and 1 Atch ☐ AFSAC/CC to USCENTAF/IN, "AFSAC Support for URGENT FURY," 13 Mar 84, SD 15.
2Point Paper ☐ "Major Lessons Learned for the AFSAC from Operation URGENT FURY," APSAC/INXA, 3 Nov 83, SD 16; Intvw ☐ AFIS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, TSgt Newell, AFSAC, 5 June 84.
3Intvw ☐ AFIS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, TSgt Newell, AFSAC, 5 Jun 84; Ltr ☐ AFIS/CF to USAF/XCOTA, "URGENT FURY Lessons Learned" ☐ 15 Dec 83, SD 17.
4Intvw ☐ AFIS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, TSgt Newell, AFSAC, 5 Jun 84.
1Ibid: Conversation, AFIS Historian w. TSgt Parsons, APSC, 12 Jun 84.


'Ibid; Intvw AFIS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, TSgt Newell, AFSAC, 5 Jun 84.'

2The island was not declared "secure" until 2 Nov. For a speech about women military in Grenada, by Maj Ann Wright, USA, the highest ranking woman in the U.S. Forces in Grenada, see "The Roles of U.S. Army Women in Grenada," in MINERVA: Quarterly Report on Women and the Military, Vol. II, No. 2, Summer 84. Although policewomen were the most visible women personnel, there were prisoner interrogators, signal and communications operators, members of MASH units, truck drivers, one helicopter pilot, helicopter crew chiefs and maintenance personnel, psyops specialists, ordnance detonation experts, and one Air Force C141 pilot who flew troops to Grenada on 26 Oct.

1Tbid.
2Intvw AFIS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, TSgt Newell, APSAC, 5 Jun 84; Ltr APSAC/CV to All Personnel Concerned, "Watch Duty," 31 Oct 83.
4Ltr MSgt Schindel to APSAC/INX, "After Action Report - GRENADA Contingency Deployment" 11 Nov 83, SD 23.
2Intvw AFIS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, TSgt Newell, AFSAC, 5 Jun 84. (The brigade may have been the 3rd, according to Maj. D'Aguiar.)
4Intvw AFIS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, TSgt Newell, AFSAC, 5 Jun 84.
1 Ltr AFSAC/DA, MSgt Schindel, to AFSAC/IN/XA, "After Action Report - GRENADA Contingency Deployment" 11 Nov 83, SD 23. This letter report contains a description of the living conditions from the perspective of MSgt Schindel, who performed the duties of an Air Force "first sergeant."


3 Intvw. AFIS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, TSgt Newell, AFSAC, 5 Jun 84.
1 Ltr [redacted] and 2 Atch. URGENT FURY After Action Report and Logistics Annex [redacted] Maj Keefe to AFSAC/INO et al. 6 Dec 83, SD 29.

2 Ibid.

3 For a partial listing of the documents packaged and sent see List [redacted] "Description of Documents." AFSAC/HAT, Oct-Nov 83, SD 30.

"Memo for Record " 2030 Conversation with Maj Alley, 18 Abn Corps G-2 EOC Rep." 5 Nov 83, SD 41.

1Intw APIS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, TSgt Newell, AFSC, 5 Jun 84. See also Pamphlet, PRA List, 22 p, n.d., and Addendum 1, p 22, n.d.; Addendum 2, 10 p (10 of 12) 2 Nov 83; Addendum 3, 2 p (2 of 12), 2 Nov 83, SD 42.

2Srfg Maj Kimmel, USA, to AFSC Personnel, "Operation URGENT FURY," 5 Jun 84

2Excerpt from Draft After Action Rpt, Maj D'Aguiar, AFSAC, "URGENT FURY Support," n.d., SD 27; Ltr and 2 Atch. URGENT FURY After Action Report and Logistics Annex Maj Keeffe to AFSAC/IND et al, 6 Dec 83, SD 29. At one point someone from the White House Situation Room called AFSAC Headquarters and talked with Col Bale about what was happening with the PWA - Intvw AFS Historian w. Maj Roser, Capt Bordas, T Sgt Newall, AFSAC, 5 Jan 84.
1 Ltr atch. URGENT FURY After Action Report and Logistics Annex Maj Rees et al, 6 Dec 83, SD 29.

2 Conversation, AFIS Historian w. AIC Kaczmarski, AFIS, 29 Feb 84.


APSAC/HAT, n.d., Document number 5 of SD 45. See SD 45 for other sets of EIs.
Deleted per 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(1)

For other reports prepared, see documents cited in footnotes throughout this chapter.

2Point Paper [redacted] AFSAC/INX, Major Lessons Learned for the AFSAC from Operation URGENT FURY," 3 Nov 83, SD 16.
First AFSCAC team to deploy to Granada for Operation URGENT FURY. From left to right: Lt. Bruce D. Radloff, MSGt John L. Maldonado, MSGt John R. Hasskamp, Maj. Joseph A. Keefe, TSgt Robert P. Hewitt, and MSGt Alexander Barachanceo. Major Keefe was in command.
At the Document Exploitation Center, Point Salines Airport, Grenada. From left to right: Capt. David Herrill (Reservist), MSgt. James A. Schindel, and SSgt. Daniel Ritter (Reservist).
Prisoner containment area on Grenada during Operation URGENT FURY.
PWs Being Marched Under Guard

Prisoners on Grenada being marched under guard to the Point Salines containment area.
Prisoner containment area during Operation URGENT FURY.
CHAPTER III

INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Directorate of Operational Intelligence
Directorate of Targets
DIRECTORATE OF OPERATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

MISSION

The Directorate of Operational Intelligence (IND) provided the Air Force with all-source intelligence which affected Air Force policies, resources, missions, and force deployment on a worldwide basis. Examples of the type of intelligence the directorate provided were as follows:¹

a. Analysis of indications of potential hostile activities against the United States or its allies.

b. Analysis of current air operations.

c. Trends and implications of current worldwide developments.

d. Evaluation of aerospace related signal intelligence to determine capabilities, vulnerabilities, and trends of foreign aerospace forces.

ORGANIZATION

The directorate consisted of four divisions: Special Studies (INCA), located at Bolling AFB; Intelligence Research (INOR), located in the Friendship Annex of the National Security Agency, near the Baltimore-Washington International Airport; Imagery Research (INOP), located at the Washington Navy Yard; and Aerospace Intelligence (INCO), located at the Pentagon. The Directorate of Operational Intelligence was operationally responsible to the Directorate of Estimates, while the AFIS organization provided the directorate with administrative support.²

PERSONNEL

Key Personnel

Col. Arnold L. Mabile headed the directorate from 1 October 1982 to 30 June 1983 when he was transferred to the Intelligence Center Pacific. Col. Richard J. O'Leary, the head of the Directorate of Estimates, then assumed direct responsibility for the operations of INO. Lt. Col. Christopher N. Maniscalco was chief of the Special Studies Division, a position he held from 29

¹The FY 1983 Histories for INDI and INOP are in Annex A to this history, an SCI annex, which is on file in a sensitive compartmented information facility (SCIF) used by AFIS/BO.

²The detailed mission statement for the Directorate of Operational Intelligence is in AFISR 23-1 15 Jul 82, Section R. SD 2.

²Intvw AFIS Historian w. Maj. Reichenbach, AFIS/INOR, 30 May 84.
April 1981. Lt. Col. Charles T. Check was chief of the Intelligence Research Division since 1 October 1982. Maj. Ashby D. Elmore was chief of the Imagery Research Division from 1 April 1982 to 8 September 1983, when he was transferred to the U.S. European Command. He was replaced by Capt. Sherrill A. Hutchinson on 16 September 1983. Lt. Col. Richard J. L'Heureux became chief of the Aerospace Intelligence Division in November 1983. He replaced Lt. Col. Robert F. Tiernan, who held the position until October 1983, when he was transferred to the Directorate of Estimates.1

Manning Strength

The manning strength of the Directorate was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO. AUTHORIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFIS/TNO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICERS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLISTED</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVILIANS</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REORGANIZATION

There were two structural elements of the Directorate that were both abolished in 1983, and at the end of the calendar year, a major reorganization within the Directorate of Estimates was to affect the Directorate of Operational Intelligence.

Elements Abolished

On 29 January the analytical element designated INOX, which had been established in February 1982 to focus on the problem of international terrorism, was disestablished. Its two officer manpower authorizations were assumed by the Regional Estimates Division of the Directorate of Estimates.2

---

1Intvw APIS Historian w. Maj Reichenbach, APIS/INCA, 30 May 84; Historical Data Rpt AFIS/INCA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 57.
2Ltr APIS/MO to AP/IN, "UMD Position Realignment," 28 Jan 83, SD 58; AFIS History 1 Jan-31 Dec 83, p 41; Ltr and 1 Atch AP/IN to APIS/MO, "Reorganization," 29 Dec 83, SD 59.
On 29 December, Col. Charles C. Shankland, who was the deputy director of the Directorate of Estimates (INE), approved a billet restructure for INE, which also involved a billet restructure for INO. For the Operations Directorate, the reorganization basically involved the following changes:

1. The Strategic Studies Division of INE was eliminated, and this enabled the Special Studies Division of INO to function more independently from INE. Prior to the reorganization, the division was operationally subordinate to the Strategic Studies Division, and after the reorganization, the division was responsible to the director of Estimates.\(^3\)

2. The Special Studies Division (INOA) was to absorb the functions and manpower of the Imagery Research Division (INOP). This action brought together the photo interpreters from the two divisions, and in 1964, INOA was scheduled to relocate to the National Photographic Interpretation Center at the Washington Navy Yard, where INOP was already located.\(^4\)

3. The Intelligence Research Division (INOR) was to be reduced by five billets.\(^5\)

4. The Aerospace Intelligence Division (INOZ) was to gain an additional briefer and three graphics billets. This was in accord with the new ACS/I's initiatives to strengthen and improve current intelligence briefings and the WATCH.\(^6\)

**SPECIAL STUDIES**

The Special Studies Division acted as the ACS/I's designated representative for all-source analysis and reporting and intelligence production on foreign concealment, camouflage, and deception (CCaD). It represented the Air Force and the ACS/I, as appropriate, on all national interagency intelligence panels.

---

1. AFIS History 1 Jan-31 Dec 82, pp 42, 49-52. For additional information on the abolition of INOR, see Annex B to this history.
2. Memos and 2 Attachments, Col Shankland, AP/INE to ACS/I, "INE Reorganization Information Memorandum," 6 Jan 84, SD 60.
3. Ibid., Intvw AFIS Historian w. Maj Reichembach, AFIS/INOA, 30 May 84.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
and groups which dealt with foreign CC&D employment, strategy, doctrine, and methodology, and it maintained the Air Force's all-source CC&D data base.¹

**CC&D Briefings**

In response to a request from the Strategic Air Command Intelligence, the division provided an SA-10 Surface-to-Air (SAM) CC&D briefing, complete with script, annotated prints, and positives. The materials were to be incorporated into a command intelligence briefing.⁵ In part, the script stated the following:

¹For a detailed mission statement of the division, see APISR 23-1 dated 15 Jul 82, Section R, SD 2.
³Ltr 15 Feb 83, SD 62.
⁴AFIS/INO to AF/INES et al., "White House Briefing." 15 Feb 83, SD 62.
⁵AFIS/INO to AF/INES et al., "Briefing Request." 21 Apr 83, SD 63.
⁶Historical Data Rpt AFIS/INO, Jan-Dec 83, SD 57.
Key Briefing Topics

- Three briefing topics stood out this year for their importance or currency.

Sites

- A briefing paper by the Special Studies Division described the deception as follows:

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
Camouflage

The third topic concerned camouflage paint schemes or aircraft in response to a variety of questions from Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, and other combatants. The study was significant because it addressed the use of infrared reflecting camouflage patterns and future developments in camouflage paint.
1Historical Data Rprt AFIS/INDA, Jan-Dec 81, SD
CCsD Status Reports

---

Ibid.
Ibid.
Ibid.

For the report for December 1982 and the valuable 12 monthly reports for 1983 see SD 70. Historical Data Rprt AFIS/INCA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 57.
The topic "forgeries" was also discussed in the April report.

\[1\text{Msg} \quad \text{AP/INE to AIG 10418, "CC&I Intelligence Status Report B3-02" 251930Z Apr B3, SD 70.}\]

\[2\text{Msg} \quad \text{AP/INE to AIG 10418, "CC&I Intelligence Status Report B3-03" 051205Z Jul B3, SD 70.}\]

\[3\text{Msg} \quad \text{AP/INE to AIG 10418, "CC&I Intelligence Status Report B3-04" 051221Z Jul B3, SD 70.}\]
Users Poll

In November, the division polled the recipients and users of the CC&D Status Reports inquiring about usefulness, format, need for executive summary, additions/deletions, and other comments. Results of the poll were compared and recommendations were to be incorporated into the January 1984 edition.  

USAF INTEL 500-3

In November, the division completed the writing of "USAF INTEL 500-3, Airfield CC&D." It was to be published and widely distributed in 1984. The sixty-six page document examined various techniques used by many nations to enhance survivability of their air bases and warfighting capabilities. Not surprisingly, the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies were treated at length.

1Msg AF/INE to AIG 10418, "CC&D Intelligence Status Report 83-85" [Illegible] Jul 83, SD 70.
2For a report on the poll's results see Memo AF/INE to D/INE, "CC&D Status Report Survey - Information Memorandum," n.d., SD 71. Msg AF/INE to AIG 10418, "HQ USAF Monthly Camouflage, Concealment and Deception (CC&D) Status Reports," 0811003 Nov 83, SD 72: Historical Data Rprt AFIS/INOA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 57.
4Ibid.
The chief continued by stating:

It is equally important to understand that CC&I is practiced not just by the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Many countries, friend and foe, have come to realize the importance of CC&I for their relatively small air forces. This is evident with nations in conflict, threat, or conflict, or which perceive themselves in danger. Hence, we also address airfield CC&I on a worldwide basis.  

With many nations exhibiting growing interest in CC&I—from the operational to the intelligence perspective—this begs the question, "What is the U.S. doing?" Within USAF, the Survivability Program seeks to reduce the effects of enemy forces on our installations. It is viewed as a potentially low cost, high return asset to help achieve that goal. If a $15,000 device enemy ordnance and saves a $15 million aircraft, it is a good return on investment.

Requests for Data from Other Agencies

Periodically during the year, the Special Division requested information from other agencies, needed to complete reports or studies or to expand the Force's CC&I data base. In these cases, the division had to have sufficient numbers of personnel to perform character CC&I research, or other organizations were better equipped to perform certain types of research.

Strongbox Search Request

In April, one such request was to the National Agency for a search of the STRONG product file for Iran and Iraq in 1980.  

Agreement with FRD

In May, the division entered into a working relationship with the Federal Research Division (FRD) of the Library of Congress, whereby the FRD would, over a two year period, perform the following: 1) perform historical research on INOA-managed CC&I activity which occurred between 1968 and 1969 and 2) perform the information in a format which would allow it to be placed in the INOA-managed CC&I database.  

1Ibid.  
2Ibid.  
3In AFIS/INOA to AFIS/INCI et al., "STRONG Request," 27 Apr 83, SM 74.  
4Staff Summary Sheet and Atch AFIS/INOA to AFIS/INCI et al., "USAF CC&I Data Base Research," 27 May 83, SM 75.
The first year of the agreement (FY83 and FY84) was to be primarily devoted to the development and completion of the historical position of the Soviet/Warsaw Pact segment of the human intelligence (HUMINT) document file and the imagery intelligence (IMINT) file of the Air Force's CC&D data base. Also, FRD was to begin the development of the Communist Asia, Middle East and Latin American portions of the data base.¹

In the second year (FY85), FRD was to develop and complete historical portions of the Communist Asian, Middle Eastern, and Latin American segments of the HUMINT document file and the IMINT file of the Air Force's CC&D data base. The development of the Soviet/Warsaw Pact portion would continue. FRD was to analyze selected sources of foreign CC&D information which involved CC&D material produced from 1968-1980. It was also to catalog the following information devised from the sources: specific CC&D events, doctrine, organization, tactics, and strategy.²

¹Ibid.
²Ibid. See also Ltr AFIS/INQA to Library of Congress, "Continuation of Contract," 16 Aug 83, and 2 Atch SD 76.
³Ltr with 1 Atch AFIS/INQA to AFIS/AC, "AFSC Research Contract," 16 Jul 83, SD 77.
DTS 8 Research Project

In December, the division requested that Detached Training Site (DTS) 8 of the Air Force Intelligence Service conduct research on Soviet disinformation programs. The project was long-term with the initial reporting period being in September 1984. The project involved two major tasks. The first was to review Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) reports concerning Central and South America. The DTS was to investigate and describe Soviet/Warsaw Pact and Cuban disinformation campaigns which affected directly or indirectly U.S. interests in the region. 2

The second task was to review Southwest Asian FBIS reporting concerning Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, Turkey, Soviet Central Asia (Kazakh, Turkmen, Kirghiz, Uzbek, and Tadzhik SSRs), and Transcaucasia (especially Azerbaijan). The DTS was to investigate and describe Soviet disinformation campaigns which affected directly or indirectly U.S. interests in the region. 3

Accessing Access to Data Bases

1 Ltr AFIS/INO to AFIS/AC, "Request for Contract Funding," 1 Dec 83, SD 78. See also Ltr Rprt AEDC-83-8 Contract No. P40560-81-C-0004, Sep 83, SD 79; Ltr Rprt AEDC-83-11 Contract No. P40560-81-C-0004, Oct 83, SD 80; Ltr Rprt AEDC-83-10 Contract No. 81-C-0004, Dec 83, SD 81.

2 Ltr AFIS/INO to AFIS/RECO, "Soviet Disinformation Program in Latin America and Southwest Asia," 7 Dec 83, SD 82.

3 Ibid.

4 See for example, Ltr AFIS/INO to AFIS/DAY, "Word Processing (WPE) Upgrade Procedures," 5 Jul 83, SD 83 and 5 Attach; Ltr AFIS/INO to AFIS/INS, 23 Mar 83, SD 84; Ltr AFIS/INO to 1045CG/XRF, 12 Sep 83, SD 85; Ltr AFIS/INO to NP 12 SC/LD, 29 Sep 83, SD 86.
CAMCON-DIAOLS-SAFE

In discovering the ease of using CAMCON, a camouflage, concealment and deception computer file at the DIA, which was originally designed for the division to input data, the division requested that the DIA redesign CAMCON to include more intelligence data. The request was approved and implemented. Since CAMCON was part of the DIA’s On-Line System (DIAOLS), and DIAOLS was to be followed by the Support for Analyst File Environment (SAFE), the division requested conversion of its CAMCON file from DIAOLS to SAFE. It too was approved. ¹

COINS TAS

AIRES

The division was able to have the DIA’s Advanced Imagery Requirements and Exploitation System (AIRES) terminal and printer delivered at the division’s location at the National Photographic Interpretation Center. ²

AEROSPACE INTELLIGENCE

The Aerospace Intelligence Division was responsible for 1) current intelligence briefing support to the Air Force chief of

¹Ltr (and 3 Atchs) APIS/INE to Deputy Assistant Director for Defense Intelligence Systems, DIA. "Conversion and Support for CAMCON File." 24 Aug 83, SD 87 and 4 Atchs (and 3 Atchs)

²Ltr (and 1 Atch) APIS/INE to AP/IDOC, "Request for Preparation of Statement of Requirement." 22 March 83, SD 83 and 8 Atch (and 2 Atch), AP/INES to AP/PRFB, "Coins TAS Force Activity Designator Rating Upgrade" n.d., SD 89; CWG TEM Notes (and 2 Atch) 19 Oct 83, SD 90; Intw (and 2) AFIS Historian W. Maj. Reichenbach, APIS/INOA, 30 May 84.

³Ltr (and 1 Atch) Chief, Communications Management Division, DIA to APIS/INOA, "Proposed AIRES Terminal Relocation," 30 Dec 83, SD 91 and 1 Atch (and 1 Atch)
staff. 2) maintenance of a 24-hour Alert Branch on behalf of the ACS/I and the AFIS commander, and 3) providing graphics support to the ACS/I, Air Staff, and AFIS. Editors and briefers from the division provided current intelligence briefings and updates to senior-ranking Air Staff members, and support was rendered to Air Force analysts for both current intelligence and long-term estimates.\(^1\)

Transfer of Administrative Responsibility

\(^1\) Effective 12 January, administrative responsibility for command post exercises, contingency support staff, and the Continuity of Operations Plan, Department of the Air Force, was transferred to the division from the Command Support Branch of the Directorate of Intelligence Plans and Systems.\(^2\)

WATCH Upgrade

\(^2\) The new ACS/I, Maj. Gen. James C. Pfautz, directed that the WATCH have an improved current intelligence production capability, a solution to some long-standing personnel Manning problems, and an upgrade of the physical appearance of the WATCH facility. By mid-October, there was progress toward establishing a two-officer WATCH with the phasing out of NCOs. All company grade officers in the Directorate of Estimates were to work as WATCH officers on a rotational five-week cycle, and a new training program was initiated to ensure required continuity. As part of the physical upgrade, the WATCH received carpeting and drapes, furniture was rearranged, portable maps were ordered, and the Xerox color machine contract was terminated.\(^3\)

\(^3\) As of October, major plans for the WATCH included Manning by five more company grade officers who were to be assigned for a period of twelve months. Also, the facility was to be painted, receive an INDICOM circuit, GEOCHRON clock, and digital clocks, and a dropped ceiling and recessed lighting. In FY85, an automated message handling system was to be installed to provide functional distribution support, which was then provided by the WATCH, thus freeing the WATCH officers to concentrate on current intelligence concerns.\(^4\)

\(^4\) From August through December, efforts were underway to have Cable News Network (CNN) broadcasting within the WATCH. CNN

\(^1\) Historical Data Rpt AFIS/INCL, Jan-Dec 83, SD 57. For a detailed mission statement see AFISR 23-1 15 Jul 82, Section R, SD 2.
\(^2\) Ltr AF/IN to AF/TN, Jan 83, SD 92.
\(^3\) Memo AF/IN, Col Shankland, to ACS/I, "WATCH Improvements - Information Memorandum," 12 Oct 83, SD 93.
\(^4\) Ibid. For details see Request for Services AFHQ Form 73, AFIS/INCL to 1947AS/DAO, 17-12, JNO83-102, 26 Aug 83, SD 94 and 4 Atchs.
was to fill a critical void in late breaking information flowing
to the facility. The Directorate of Security and Communications
Management approved the use of a television in the WATCH, which
was a sensitive security facility, under the following
conditions:

1. The television be connected only to the Cable News
   Network.
2. Ability to receive other stations be inhibited.
3. Discussion of sensitive compartmented information
   (SCI) in the vicinity of the television be kept to a minimum.
4. No discussion of SCI be permitted when the video
   cassette recorder was being used.

Current Intelligence Briefings

In addition to upgrading the WATCH, the new ACS/I placed
great emphasis upon expanding and improving daily current
intelligence briefings.

Use of Video Tape

To accomplish this, one change involved the use of video
tapes from network news broadcasts. To implement the practice of
incorporating appropriate tapes into the briefing, the chief of
the division requested assistance from personnel in the
Directorate of Estimates and the branches of his division. He
stated:

If you see a television newscast or are aware
of a scheduled TV program which could be used to support
the briefing, we can capture it on video tape and then
present it as part of our briefing. The WMCC's Visual
Recording Facility (a 24-hour a day operation) and the
Army's Audiovisual Center (a day shift operation) both
tape nightly network news broadcasts. Arrangements can
also be made with the Air Force TV Center to tape other
scheduled programs. Since TDNC will soon be monitoring
CNN, the Watch will be responsible for taping any
pertinent material presented on this network.

One of the first uses of video tape in a briefing
concerned the terrorist bombing on 9 October 1983, in Rangoon,
Burma, which killed seventeen South Koreans, including four
members of President Chun Doo-hwan's cabinet. The tapes were from

---

\(^7\) Lt. \(\) AP/INE to 1947 AS/DOC, "CCTV Drop for Intelligence
Watch," 9 Aug 83, SD 95 and 4 Atchs

\(^2\) Ibid.

\(^3\) For a detailed look at the division's manpower and budget
initiatives for FY86-90, see Memo \(\) and 8 Atchs
APIS/CY to

\(^4\) Lt. \(\) APIS/INE to INOE Branches et al., "Video Tape
Support of the ACS/I Brief," n.d., SD 97 and 2 Atch

\(^5\) Ibid.
the 10 November NIGHTLINE presentation on the American Broadcast-
ing Corporation (ABC). 1

Increased Use of Viewgraphs

A second change in the briefing involved an increase in
the number of viewgraphs used to illustrate the commentary: the
average number prepared each day increased from approximately 25
to 100. Managerial and production emphasis was focused on
providing the briefing recipient with a sense of movement and
immediacy. Briefing times were increased using double screen
projection, and emphasis was placed upon the currency of the
current intelligence briefing. Thus, WATCH officers and briefer
were required to perform some of their own analysis for the
briefings. Use of information from intelligence sources was
increased.2

Earlier Access to Newspapers

In December, the division requested from the chief of
the Air Force's News Clipping and Analysis Service that briefer
be allowed to visit the service's work area at 0300 hrs each
morning to review the contents of the Washington Post and other
available newspapers, in lieu of scanning papers obtained at the
Pentagon's concourse newstand at 0530 hrs.3

Revised Intelligence Summaries

With the increase in the complexity and number of
briefings requested by the new ACS/I, the division placed greater
emphasis on current intelligence rather than on expanded background
briefings. The WATCH's current intelligence report, "Executive
Summary," created in 1982, was terminated, replaced by "Morning
Highlights." The new report was a concise executive summary of
current intelligence developments and was incorporated in a new
product of the same name by the Directorate of Estimates, which
received extensive distribution at the Air Staff level. The
product resulting from the morning briefing was used in a daily
message from the ACS/I, and it too was converted to a new format
and published as the "Air Force Intelligence Daily Message." Because the ACS/I emphasized the WATCH's role in providing time
sensitive, analytic, and current intelligence support to his
office, the WATCH's level of current intelligence production was
higher in 1983 than it had ever been.4

1Lt. Maj L. Henreux, AFIS/IN12, to Donald Martin, ABC
News/Legal, 28 Dec 82, SD 96.
2Historical Data Rprt. AFIS/IN12, Jan-Dec 83, SD 87.
3Lt. AFIS/IN to SAF/AR, Mr. Rubkoff, "Support for the
Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence," 19 Dec 83, SD 99.
4Historical Data Rprt. AFIS/IN12, Jan-Dec 83, SD 57.
Quarterly Briefings for AF/CMS

On 16 December, the ACS/I directed that quarterly intelligence briefings be provided for the Air Force's chief master sergeant and for those senior enlisted personnel whom the chief recommended. At a later date, the ACS/I told the chief:

Air Force Intelligence produces Intelligence briefings covering a wide range of topics, from descriptions of the latest activity in world "hot spots" to in-depth analyses of foreign weapons development. The briefings are designed to provide Air Force personnel the background required to understand, carry out, and help formulate national security policies and programs.

It is my firm belief that senior Air Force enlisted personnel form an integral part of our national security system and consequently "need to know" current intelligence information. I feel this need can best be satisfied by providing these individuals with recurring Intelligence briefings.¹

The briefings were to begin in 1984.²

¹Ltr ACS/I to AF/CMS, "Intelligence Briefings for Senior Enlisted Personnel," 9 Jan 84, SD 100 and 2 Atchs.
²Ibid.
DIRECTORATE OF TARGET INTELLIGENCE

MISSION

The Directorate of Target Intelligence (INT) provided target intelligence and weaponeering, mapping, charting, and geodesy (MC&G) support to the chief of staff of the Air Force and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The directorate was the Air Force point of contact with the Defense Mapping Agency and maintained liaison with Air Force targeting elements worldwide, the Air Staff, and the Defense Intelligence Agency. It collaborated with the Air Force research, development, testing, and evaluation community on applying targeting and MC&G considerations to advanced weapons systems, and it validated and monitored the MC&G and geophysical data requirements of major commands and separate operating agencies.

ORGANIZATION

The directorate was organized into two major divisions: Concepts and Applications (INTA) and Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy (INTB).

The Concepts and Applications Division performed the classical targeting function and was the Air Force point of contact for the Defense Nuclear Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency for nuclear weaponeering and target intelligence. It also served as the functional manager for officer and enlisted career fields in targeting and was the office of primary responsibility for several targeting publications. The division consisted of four branches: Concepts; Systems and Resources; Policy and Plans; and Weaponeering.

The Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy Division was the focal point for MC&G matters for the Air Staff and was the functional manager for Air Force cartographic/geodetic career fields. It was the principal Air Force point of contact for the Defense Mapping Agency and the program element monitor for Air Force service support to that agency. There was no formal branch structure within the small division, but informally there were three subdivisions: Geodesy, Advanced Systems and Resources, and Maps and Charts.

---

1 Ltr  and Atch  AFIS/INT to AFIS/XP, "AFIS Exercise Plan for Pressure Point 84 (AFIS EXPLAN 0024)" 9 Sep 83, SD 101. For a detailed mission statement see AFISR 23-1, "Organization and Functions Air Force Intelligence Service," 15 Jul 82, SD 2.

2 Information Sheet  HQ AFIS/INT Directorate of Targets," Oct 83, SD 102.

3 Ibid; Intvw  AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder andLt Col Vincent et al. AFIS/INT 10 May 84.
PERSONNEL

Key Personnel

On 30 September, the director of Targets, Col. John S. McKenney, retired from the Air Force. He had been head of the directorate since 21 September 1981. The day before the retirement, the colonel reflected upon his tenure with Targets and wrote:

When I assumed this position, two things concerned me. First, and foremost, the targeting function as a whole lacked direction, caused by the absence of clear goals and effective, dynamic leadership. Second, the targeteers were not doing the job of a higher headquarters with respect to formulation of policy, doctrine, and leadership of the Air Force's targeting community. This was, in my view, the result of its subordination to INO [Directorate of Operational Intelligence] with operational control exercised by INE [Directorate of Estimates]. What I had was a shop involved in many make work projects with little, if any, impact on the way the Air Force accomplishes its warplanning/warfighting mission—the main function of targeteers.

Given my concerns, I established three goals. First, the targeting function had to get back into the mainstream of the Air Force targeting policy business. This included such things as providing guidance to the Air Staff on matters affecting warfighting doctrine, munitions and systems (both weapon systems and M&C collection systems), training of targeteers and M&C personnel, and effective support to the MAJCOMS. Second, I needed to breathe a breath of life into the targeting/M&C skill throughout the Air Force. Since the end of Vietnam, targeteer strength declined by over 200% and the M&C career field has failed to keep pace. Many felt the need to get out of their field since they viewed it as a dying art form—and, more importantly, one which did not offer promotion opportunity.

Goal three was to elevate targets to a three letter Air Staff element. The reason was (and is) targeting is an intelligence function with responsibilities in its own right. Under INE, targeteers became analysts devoted to producing intelligence. My view is that targeting is, in fact, principally a user of finished intelligence from whatever source and

---

1 Ltr 230, Col McKenney, AFIS/INT, to ACS/I, "End of Tour Report," 29 Sep 83, SD 103.
targeteer/MC&G responsibilities are in reality more closely related in mission function to the operational community. I believe the AFAITC course reflects this. At the school, entry into the targeting course requires a fully trained and experienced intelligence officer. The course teaches the new targeteer to be an operator. The MC&G officer is similarly dedicated to the Ops side of the house, supplying, not true intelligence, but the MC&G tools to plan for and hit the target.

I felt the need to become an Air Staff element, as opposed to an AFIS element, in order to do two things. One was to provide the formal position of policy formulator for targets. The other was to enhance our ability to work with our principal non-intelligence staff counter-parts, XO and RD, as well as evaluate the status of targets with the commands and equally important, the targeteers in the field.

The colonel stated that he had not fully accomplished each of the goals, but had made considerable headway with them. Among other things, he cited the participation of the directorate in several joint action groups such as the Joint Technical Coordinating Group for Munitions Effectiveness; a series of informal briefings and discussions with Air Staff elements; the hosting of the first worldwide Air Force targets conference; and the establishment of Targets as a separate three-letter directorate.


The directorate was headquartered in Building 5681 on Bolling AFB and was manned at its authorized strength:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>NUMBER ASSIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFICERS</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLISTED</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVILIANS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Ibid.
2Intvw AFIS Historian W. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent, et al., AFIS/INT, 10 May 84; Historical Data Rprt AFIS/INT, Jan-Dec 83. For biographical information on Col McKenney see SD 104 and for Lt Col Wilder see SD 105.
3Ibid.
TARGETING MATTERS

Conferences

The directorate co-hosted the Standardized Futuristic Data Base Conference at Bolling AFB on 11-12 January and hosted the Air Force Target Intelligence Conference at Lowry AFB on 7-11 February.

Standardized Futuristic Data Base Conference

This data base conference was the result of meetings and discussions between personnel from the Strategic Air Command (SAC) and AF/IN and AFIS about the lack of a standardized data base for weapons development, planning, and acquisition. In addition to SAC, other commands in attendance were Tactical Air Command, Military Airlift Command, Air Force Systems Command, Electronic Security Command, Pacific Air Forces, Central Command Air Forces, and Electronic Systems Division.¹

The conferees were in full agreement about the need for a national futuristic data base, and both working groups concluded that current and proposed documents on installation and order of battle (OB) data lacked the detailed data and geographic coverage required for force planning across the spectrum of Air Force major commands and the Air Staff. Each working group defined its requirements for these types of data. Also, the conferees established priorities for country coverage.²

The targets working group stated that future documentation should define the methodology and discipline to be applied to making installation projections. This would allow standardization in installation projections regardless of the region of the world. Additionally, the conferees identified functional classification codes and the minimum essential data elements necessary to make the essential data base useful. For these installations related to OB, unit name and beddown would be

¹Ltr AFIS/INTA to SAC/INA et al. "Standardized Futuristic Data Base Conference" 4 Feb 83, SD 106.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
included to allow integration with the order of battle data bases.¹

The group agreed that to effectively respond to consumer OB requirements, an automated data base, capable of sorting and finding numerous key words, was required. They defined in detail data elements for all forces and systems of interest and specific table formats for documents about defense intelligence projections for planning.²

The conferees agreed, that as a primary course of action to follow-up on the conference's efforts, a draft intelligence production requirement was to be drawn up and forwarded to command action officers for review and comment. Upon receipt of the comments, Maj. Samuel M. Taylor of the Concepts and Applications Division and a representative from the Directorate of Estimates prepared a revised document for the ACS/I, who did approve, sign, and send it to the director of the Defense Intelligence Agency.³

In the interim, the SAC/IN provided each major command with an extract from the SAC Strategic Intelligence Forecast File for its respective area of responsibility. The commands reviewed the extracts to determine their ability to support the need for futuristic data. Comments were forwarded to the conference hosts for consolidation and coordination with SAC action offices.⁴

Air Force Target Intelligence Conference

From 7-11 February, the directorate hosted the second annual Air Force Target Intelligence Conference at the Armed Forces Air Intelligence Training Center, Lowry AFB, Colorado. Conferees included forty-four representatives from twenty-seven different elements of the worldwide targeting community. The conference was convened as a forum to review current and forthcoming developments affecting both the theory and practice of targeting and to exchange views on functional issues facing the Air Force targeting community.⁵

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
³Ibid; Intvw AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent et al, AFIS/INT, 10 May 74; Ltr ACS/I to Director, DIA, "Standardized Futuristic Data Base" 9 Jul 83, on file in AFIS/INTA.
⁴Ltr AFIS/INTA to SAC/INA et al, "Standardized Futuristic Data Base Conference" 4 Feb 83, SD 106.
Maj. Gen. Robert L. Bechel of the Directorate of Operations Office delivered the opening address at the conference and noted how operators and intelligence personnel must closely cooperate.¹

As an operator, I am a consumer of intelligence produced by the "classical" intelligence cycle of planning, collection, analysis, and dissemination. I see this cycle as a pure intelligence function with operator interfaces occurring at the beginning of the cycle in the form of requirements, and at the end of the cycle when the product is disseminated. This operations and intelligence interface which occurs during dissemination is a complex and "closely knit" one. The product of the classical intelligence cycle in the form of databases containing targets, various orders of battle, etc., are utilized by both operators and intelligence personnel in a very closely integrated planning effort to accomplish our goal of weapons on the target.

The distinction between operations and intelligence blurs when we look at the functions required to plan an aircraft strike mission which must penetrate enemy defenses. As a commander, I must allocate sorties and weapons to those targets which will provide the greatest contribution to the success of the operation. I cannot do this unless targeteers tell me what targets are available and which ones are the most important. Targeteers must determine the vulnerability of the target to the weapons available. Route and penetration planning to reach the selected target requires an integrated effort between threat analysts and route planners. The result of this integrated and interactive process (a fragmentary order, etc.) assures generation of an aircraft at the right time, with the right weapons to execute the planned strike on the target.

¹Intvw AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent, et al, AFIS/INT, 10 May 84.
Within the overall theme of "warfighting," the conference examined the following four topics:

a. Changing defense and aerospace doctrinal guidance and initiatives in both tactical and strategic warfighting strategy and their potential effects on targeting.

b. The impact of current and developing warfighting concepts and evolving Air Force missions on the targeting process.

c. Current and forthcoming weapons systems that Air Force targeters must be prepared to target, existing and planned intelligence systems which support the targeting effort, and command organizational and procedural responses to common targeting problems.

d. The status of and outlook for critical targeting resources! experienced targets personnel, equipment, data bases, and other essentials.

The conference formulated seven major targeting action items and highlighted a number of issues for further consideration. The major action items were:

a. Investigate the need for and feasibility of developing a targeting architecture to be included as part of the Air Force Intelligence Plan (AFIP).

b. Examine the impact of new or changing maritime and space mission environments on targeting.

c. Highlight the impact of the forthcoming Global Positioning System and WGS-84 datum on intelligence data bases and targeting procedures.

d. Continue development and implementation of the Proposal for Improved Targeting Applications (PITA).

e. Review command comments on the Intelligence Targeting Officer Course Training Standard to determine the need for a follow-up utilization and training conference.

f. Determine the possibility of sending Reserve targeters for formal targeting training prior to their arrival at new duty stations.

g. Explore the need for joint targeting doctrine and examine the means to derive it.

As of August, six months after the conference, the directorate had accomplished the following, with regard to the action items:

Item 1. Drafted an outline for the targeting architecture for inclusion in the Air Force Intelligence Plan.

2Ibid.
3This is a partial listing. For a complete list see Msg AFIS/INT to SAC/INT et al., "Status of 1983 Targeting Conference Action Items," 232215Z Aug 83, SD 108.
The office of primary responsibility for the plan reviewed it, and it was then sent to command targeting offices for review.

- Item 2. Provided advice about the space intelligence plan, participated in a working group for space intelligence, and defined maritime objectives and key targets.

- Item 3. Requested that the Defense Mapping Agency provide its World Geodetic System-84 implementation plan for review.

- Item 4. Held the first steering group meeting for the Proposal for Improved Targeting Applications (PITA). The group reviewed twenty-eight issues submitted by senior intelligence officers and found that they were command oriented or under the purview of the Air Staff. It was decided not to pursue the establishment of the PITA structure at that time.

- Item 5. Included the AFIS Functional Intelligence Augmentation Team (FIAT) into AFIS MOBPLAN 28-5.

- Item 6. Completed action.

- Item 7. Worked the issue in many forums: discussions with Air doctrine office of primary responsibility; participation in annual Air Force doctrine conference; and discussion of targeting concerns in Joint Chiefs of Staff arena.

Interdiction and Standoff Study

\[1\text{Memo and Atches} \] AFIS/INTA to AF/INEG for Coordination. "Project Air Interdiction, 27 May 83, SB 109."
On 9 May, a working group was formed by the Air Force Plans and Research and Development Offices, under Col. Ben Nelson, Jr., Chief, Tactical Forces Division. Its task was to prepare the briefing requested by Dr. DeLauer, to include offensive counter-air and maritime operations. By 12 May, it was apparent that intelligence had to be involved with the group, and the Directorate of Estimates and the Directorate of Targets were requested to and did send representatives.  

The group worked according to Major General Smith's recommendation:  

If we are going to recapture the initiative in the interdiction area and the weapons needed to do this mission, we must present a very thoughtful briefing which includes: a concept of operations for interdiction, lessons learned from previous interdiction campaigns, target identification and prioritization, weapons systems and munitions needed, and at least some discussion of the guidance systems needed. Although it might be somewhat easier if we avoided addressing attacking air bases and ships, because of Dr. DeLauer's memo, we must fold these two areas into our briefing.  

Although it will not be possible to do a total and complete interdiction analysis by 15 June, we must develop the best possible concept of ops for interdiction prior to 15 June, and then continue our efforts beyond the 15th of June until the analysis is complete.  

It would be a mistake if we just outlined our positions on standoff weapons without doing as thorough a job as possible. We can make a strong case for our position only if it is based on a thorough analysis of the interdiction campaign.  

Finally, we must insure that we include all the relevant commands in the development of our briefing so that we not only provide the best product that we can within the time constraints, but also build the greatest possible institutional support through the Air Staff and the MAJCOM.

---

1 Ibid.  
2 Ibid.  
3 Ibid.
The briefing was given to Dr. DeLauer on 15 June, and after a second briefing in July to persons within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the directorate's participation in the ad hoc working groups ceased.¹

¹Intvw AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent, AFIS/INT, 10 May 94.
Providing Technical Advice

The directorate regularly provided Air Staff and targeting elements worldwide with technical advice about targeting, weaponising, and MC&G matters.

Conventional Weapons Convention

In April, the directorate advised the Arms Control and International Negotiations Division about the "Certain Conventional Weapons Convention," which was in the process of being drafted.¹

¹ Ltr APIS/INTA to AF/XOOX, "Certain Conventional Weapons Convention (Your letter, undated), 14 Apr 81," SD 110.

² Ibid.
Deleted per 5 U.S.C. 352(b)(1)
Chemical Weaponery

On 29-31 August, Colonel McKenzie and the chiefs of the branches provided a targeting overview briefing for the personnel at the Armament Division of the Air Force Systems Command at Eglin AFB, Florida. Some of the topics discussed were command, control, and communication (C^3) studies, development of conventional weapons, and viability of incendiary weapons. Also in attendance were personnel from the Armed Forces Air Intelligence Training Center and participants in the BLUE FLAG Exercise.  

C^3 GATES

Subsequent to the review, the directorate advised Air Force targeters to take an active interest in the development of C^3 GATES and to meet with appropriate command systems officers to

1 Memo  AFIS/INTA to AF/INSE, “Hardened C^3 Weaponery Support,” (Yr 1tr, 5 Apr 83), 7 Apr 83, SD 112.

2 Intvw  AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent, AFIS/INT, 10 May 84; Msg  AFIS/INTA to AD/IN, “Target Briefings for AD Personnel,” 092230Z Aug 83, SD 114.

discuss it. According to the chief of the MC&G Division: "Examination of C3 GATES documentation indicates it has tremendous potential as an automated decision aid for conducting C3 and electronic combat/electronic warfare (EC/ EW) target analysis. However, to accomplish this expanded mission will require additional data bases and hardware added to the system. These additional capabilities are in existence and will not require new technology. Examples are data bases and software for terrain masking analysis and defense penetration analysis."  

Information Update to JMEN/AS

In November, the directorate communicated with the organization for the Joint Munitions Effectiveness Manual/Air-to-Surface (JMEN/AS)* and provided members updated information on a variety of topics: cluster weapons and runways; a revised WANG 2000 automated weapons optimization program (AWOP); optical wands for HP-41 programs; A-10 30mm gun effectiveness; a WANG 2200 complex target program; guided weapons methodologies; and compatible nuclear programs.  

Nuclear Weaponing Software

In October the directorate sent an information update to Air Force targeteers regarding software and publications for nuclear weaponing. Much of the information mentioned activity of the Defense Nuclear Agency, which had contracted for the production of a variety of nuclear weaponing software in response to Air Force requests for the development of nuclear planning programs for handheld calculators and small computers, compatible with HP-41 and WANG 2200 equipment, which was used for conventional weaponing.  

Target Director's Update

In December, Lt. Col. Wilder sent a comprehensive information update to all Air Force targeteers worldwide, which addressed some of the following topics: annual targeting conference; revision of targeting course 8085; combined effects munitions in the USAF inventory; concrete penetrator bomb; target officers' society, and professional readings. "We are sensitive to the crying need for better communications on a continuous basis," Lt. Col. Wilder told the targeteers. "As the Air Force focal point for targeting, mapping, charting, and geodesy, we intend to foster the development of the professional targeteer.

---

*JMEN/AS was a major study panel of the Joint Logistics Commanders.
1Ibid.
2Ltr APIS/INTA to "JMEN/AS User Information," 21 Nov 83, SD 116.
and the targeting community in turn, though sharing information items during the year. By our updates, we hope to alert each other to new developments, build networking and cohesiveness, and promote the career field through greater unity.

Revision of Manuals, Handbooks, and Plans

**FM 101-31-1**

During the year, the directorate reviewed and suggested revisions to manuals, handbooks, or plans, which were published both within and outside the Air Force. In January, in conjunction with the U.S. Army Nuclear and Chemical Agency, it revised the first volume of FM 101-31, a manual which provided unclassified guidance to commanders and staff about the operational aspects of tactical nuclear weapons employment in combat operations. The directorate's input made FM 101-31 a joint service document. Once coordinated, it was to be published as AAF 200-31-1. As of December, the draft was being edited at Fort Huachuca, Arizona.

Air Commander and Staff Warfighting Manual

In September, directorate personnel traveled to Hurlburt Field, Florida, to meet with personnel from the Air/Ground Operations School and to advise on the "Air Commander and Staff Warfighting Manual." They discussed the impact of targeting on warfighting and the various Air Force missions vis-à-vis a variety of targets. They attempted to change perceptions that 1) unconventional warfare targets and 2) command, control, and communications targets were separate targeting campaigns; they emphasized the necessity for a single target list. The draft was to be completed in 1984 and discussed at the Target Intelligence Conference at Kelly AFB, Texas.

Communist-world Weaponneering Handbook

The directorate advised the Defense Intelligence Agency in April about changes in its Communist-world Weapons Effectiveness, Selection, and Requirements Handbook in order to

---

1 Ltr and 1 Atch to All Targeteers, "Target Director's Update," AFIS/INT to All Targeteers, "Target Director's Update," 27 Dec 83, SD 119.

2 For those not mentioned in the text see Ltr and 1 Atch to AFIS/XP, "AFIS Objective Plan (Your ltr, 24 Aug 83)," Sep 83, SD 119; Ltr and 1 Atch to AFIS/XP, "AFIS Exercise Plan for PRESSURE POINT 84 (AFIS EXPLAN 0024) Leb," 9 Sep 83, SD 101; Ltr to AFIS/XP, "AFIS/INT to AFIS/XP, "USAF War and Mobilization Plan (WMP-1)," 9 Dec 83, SD 146.

3 Ltr to AFIS/INT to AFIS/XOF et al, "Revision of FM 101-31-1," 6 Jan 83, SD 120.

4 Trip Rprt to Capt Polifka, "AGOS," 3 Oct 83, SD 121.
make that publication more comprehensive. Four suggestions were offered, each with its own rationale. 1

Tasking Other Agencies

When in need of data and information to prepare briefings, answer questions, review publications, and so forth, the directorate tasked other units to provide the needed information.

Imprecisely-located Targets

The ACS/I designated his office of primary responsibility for the problem of defining the term, "imprecisely-located targets" (ILTs). The directorate wrote a "strawman" definition, which the ACS/I sent to a number of major commands asking for comments. The draft definition was the following:

"An imprecisely-located target (ILT) is a known force or function for which a fixed wartime location cannot be determined with sufficient time and accuracy to permit effective force application." 2

As a result of the coordination effort, the "strawman" definition became the Air Force's official definition. 3

Seminar for Weaponeering Instructors

In April, Colonel McKenney requested that the organization for the Joint Munitions Effectiveness Manual/Air to Surface (JMEM/AS) and the Operational Users Working Group sponsor a one-week seminar in June for selected weaponeering instructors. The purpose of the symposium was to 1) establish a detailed understanding of recently released WANG 2200/HP-41 CV weaponeering methodologies, 2) review new complex weaponeering methodologies (stick bomb targeting, complex target, and Monte Carlo runway methods), 3) address the impact of data changes in the JMEM/AS basic manual and delivery accuracy manual, 4) consider special problems of interest and 5) exchange information on instructional methods, sample problem sets, and other material. 4

1Lttr, AFIS/INT to DIA/DB-4C, "Recommend Changes in DIA Communist-world Weapons Effectiveness, Selection, and Requirements Handbook (DDB-2662-21-82)" 14 Apr 83, SD 122.
2Lttr and Atch Msg ACS/I to AF/CVSB, "Imprecisely-Located Targets (ILTs)" (My Ltr, 28 Dec 82), 26 Mar 83, SD 123.
3Intvw, AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent et al, AFIS/INT, 10 May 84.
The seminar was held in China Lake, California, the week of 27 June. Ten instructors from around the world attended.¹

**Airfield Critical Nodes**

For over a year the directorate was working on the problem of identifying the critical parts of airfields and airfield operations that must be destroyed to neutralize enemy air power and to then compose a list of priority fields. Based on command inputs, the directorate developed a consolidated list of airfield "critical nodes." A request was made to revise Defense Intelligence Agency Manual 57-24 to include this new information. Additionally, a continuing intelligence requirement was submitted for human intelligence collection for command specified airfields. In September, the directorate requested that certain command targeters discuss the list with representatives to the Defense Intelligence Agency's conference and to solicit support for the item's incorporation into DIAM 57-24.²

**Incendiary Effects of Weapons**

1. Corrugated sheet metal roofing over one inch wood planking supported by steel trusses.
2. One-half inch corrugated composite concrete/asbestos roofing supported by wood crossmembers and trusses.
3. Composite roof-gravel over tar on three inch compressed fiber panels supported by flat steel trusses.
4. Four inch reinforced concrete.

¹Ibid.
³Intvw AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent et al. AFIS/INT, 10 May 84; Ltr AFIS/INT to TAC/INAT et al, "Incendiary Effects of Combined Effects Weapons," 2 Nov 83, SD 126.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Ibid.
GATOR Mine Planning Information

In December, Lt. Col. Wilder made a request for information about the GATOR mine system from the Anti-Armor Program Office at the Systems Command's Armament Division at Eglin AFB, Florida. The request was made because the CBU-89 GATOR mine was soon to be added to the Air Force's munitions inventory, and targeteers were starting to receive requests to perform application analyses for the weapon. The weaponers lacked some of the essential planning data needed to utilize the small computer mine methods from the Joint Munitions Effectiveness Manual. The colonel asked that the response be sent by 4 January 1984. ¹

PACOM Staff Assistance Visit

From 3-16 August, Maj. Stewart Davey and Capt. Lois Polifka made a visit to the Pacific theater to discuss MC&G and targeting issues with Pacific Command offices and to provide targeting personnel with theater MC&G and targeting orientation.²

Regarding personnel issues, they noted three problems: undermanning, inexperience, and lack of continuity due to short tours in Korea. With the support area, they learned that many units were having difficulties obtaining handheld calculators (HP-41CV). The base supply system seemed to be the source of the problem.³

Some of the directorate's actions to correct the problems were to work with the Air Force Manpower Personnel Center and the Directorate of Intelligence Plans and Systems to have only trained targeteers sent to the Pacific. The lack of continuity was to be corrected in part by insuring that at least one accompanied billet remain in the 6 TIG target branch. The suggestion was made to 6 TIG to replace one military billet with a civilian targeteer billet. Through appropriate channels, a message was sent to the units requesting that they report their particular problems with obtaining calculators, and the directorate was going to make a bulk purchase of the items.⁴

Funding for the JTCG/ME

In May, the ACS/I's request was approved for a letter from the principal deputy assistant secretary for Research, Development and Logistics to the secretary's counterpart in the

¹Lttr ⁴, AFIS/INT to AD/YAM, "CBU-89/B GATOR Mine Planning Information," 8 Dec 83, SD 127.
²For a detailed discussion of their findings see Trip Rpts ⁴, Capt Polifka, AFIS/INT, 26 Aug 83 and 2 Sep 83, SD 121. These reports include comments by the ACS/I.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
Army, which called for funding assistance for the Joint Technical Coordinating Group for Munitions Effectiveness (JTAC/ME). Maj. Russell P. Lecklider of the Concepts and Applications Division was the Air Force's point of contact on this matter.  

The JTAC/ME produced physical vulnerability estimates for threat systems and potential targets, determined weapon effectiveness, and developed methodologies for planners to select employment options. The program was originally funded by the Department of Defense, but was subsequently funded through the Army's budget. The secretary told his counterpart:

The effort has been essentially flat funded for the past 10 years. While inflation has greatly reduced the value of the funds allocated, the need for effectiveness data for new weapons and vulnerability data for new adversary weapons has increased dramatically. Additionally, I understand the Army has further reduced this funding to supplement high priority Army programs. Consequently, some valuable ongoing and planned projects have been reduced or will be deleted.

Major General Marks, AF/IN, has written to the Commanders of the Air Force Systems Command and the Air Force Logistics Command requesting support in restoring funding through the Joint Logistics Commanders. However, given the vital contribution this effort makes to effective force employment, I believe we must become personally involved to assure funding is restored and perhaps increased. I solicit your strong support.

As a result, the Army restored a budget cut and sustained the same level of funding. The directorate would continue to work this issue to obtain increased funding for the group.

MAPPING, CHARTING, AND GEODESY

Coordination of MC&G Requirements and Products

The coordination of activity, both within and outside the Air Force, which involved mapping, charting, and geodesy matters, was the thrust of much of the year's activity for the directorate and the MC&G Division. The directorate's involvement with the MC&G community included contact with the Air Force Systems Command, the Department of the Interior, the Defense Mapping Agency, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

---

1Staff Summary Sheet, and Atchs ACS/I to SAF/AL et al. "JTAC/ME Funding Support," 6 May 83, SD 128.
2Ibid.
3Ibid.
4Intvw , AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent, et al. AFIS/INT, 10 May 84.
Lt. Col. Wilder formally interviewed thirty individuals from twenty-four organizations and was the principal author of the task force's highly classified final document, "Report to ADUSD(I) on Defense Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy System Requirements (U)" issued 29 October 1982. In 1983, the colonel briefed the House committee on the results of the study.²

The task force recommended three things: 1) modifications to the new product requirements development process, and 3) a change in acquisition regulations of the Department of Defense and the military services.³

The unclassified executive summary was as follows:⁴

Congress has always suspected the impreciseness of the Service/Command Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy (MC&E) requirements process. The Dr. Hermann Study Group was satisfied that the MC&E area requirements from the commands did not cause the problems, but still suspected the requirements translation process.

The joint task force reviewed the MC&E product requirements process. Its objective was to ensure user...

¹Intvw  [ ], APIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent et al., APIS/INT, 10 May 84; Memo [ ], Asst Dep Under Sec of Defense (Intell) to Task Force Members, "Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy (MC&E) Support [ ]." 7 Jul 82, SD 129.
²Ibid. The report is on file in APIS/INT.
³Executive Summary [ ], "Report to ADUSD(I) on Defense Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy System Requirement [ ]." 29 Oct 82, SD 143.
⁴Ibid.
requirements were translated effectively by the Defense Mapping Agency and integrated properly into product/production specifications. Imagery source requirements could possibly change if requirements were misinterpreted.

The task force interviewed engineers, operators, developers and program managers. Cross-checking and information exchanges occurred throughout the data collecting period with planners, the DMA System Office Joint Study Group, the DMA Special Program Office for Exploitation Modernization, and the DMA production centers.

Guidelines were to consider requirements through 1992; to consider alternatives whenever possible; and to rationalize unique user desires versus DMA Service support.

The DMA produces a wide range of information in many forms. The generic problems facing DOD are navigation/targeting positioning and feature descriptors. Position accuracies, both point to point relative and World Geodetic System (WCS) absolute, are inherent considerations with almost any DMA product. Features are shown on conventional maps and electronically stored as Digital Feature Analysis Data. Digital Terrain Elevation Data is comparable to electronically stored map contour information. The task force focused its attention on weapon systems requirements and products which would impact on imagery collection.

From its review of a subset of DMA products which are imagery dependent, the task force concluded that DMA over time accurately translated user requirements into product/production specifications. The task force affirms DMA's diligence and care to produce MC&G products comprising an optimized tradeoff between minimum essential data elements and those intended for unbounded flexibility. Standard products, like the 1:50,000 scale topographic map specification, exemplify DMA's good stewardship.

Unlike the DMA product development process, the task force represented an integrating group of users rather than producers. The task force was well aware the Services/Commands want the best possible product. Without presuming the production process consideration of the results of other study groups, the task force could not quantify deficiencies in current products.

Inconsistencies exist in the manner in which new product development occurs. The Services and commands begin the breakdown through their own faulty requirements development process. DMA, in an effort to provide the best possible support, attempts to anticipate future requirements. History supports their view that requirements become more demanding before accommodation is made to production realities and defendable needs.
The task force in the report forecasts its view of the 1992 MC&S data requirement in relation to proposed new weapon systems. It documents a need to include a joint service caucus with the DMA before a new product requirement is levied upon DMA by any one user.

Throughout the impending gap period, the user concern lies primarily with currency and first time coverage of certain products. After the gap period, imagery source of higher quality will be needed for high resolution feature data of installations, airfields and harbors.

The task force recommends modifications to the new product requirements development process, a more active role for the MC&S Working Group of the COMINTX, and a change to DOD and Service acquisition regulations.

Agreement with AFSC

In an effort to bring mapping, charting, and geodesy requirements more into perspective as related to advanced weapons systems, the ACS/I requested that the Air Force Systems Command involve the Defense Mapping Agency (DMA) with the weapons development process — early in the process. The ACS/I suggested that cartographic and geodetic experts be placed in key positions in the command. He stated, "I firmly believe increased emphasis on cartographic expertise can save millions of dollars in duplicative programs and incompatible systems, and help assure operational capability. Too often, System Program Offices presume DMA support or accept hardware designs which generate huge, hidden DMA support costs. MC&S Officers placed within the development community could plan for supportable computer geographics, a critical factor affecting operational success."¹

The ACS/I's request was in accord with a memorandum to the military service assistant secretaries from the undersecretary of defense for Research and Engineering, which stated that individuals designated by Department of Defense components as being responsible for planning new major programs should coordinate with the Defense Mapping Agency. Plans and Requirements, to identify MC&S implications of any new program.²

The ACS/I also mentioned a problem noted by many current high-level managers: the inability to keep abreast of rapidly developing and proliferating computerized requirements. He stated, "Despite close and cooperative working efforts of my MC&S staff (AFIS/INTB) and their cartographic/geodetic (specialty code 57XX) point of contact at AFSC/TETUX, their efforts to stay abreast

¹Ltr and 1 Atch, ACS/I to Lt Gen Bond, AFSC/CV, n.s., 15 Feb 83, SD 130.
²Memo, R. D. DeLauer to Ass't Secretary of the Army (RDA) et al, "Defense Mapping Agency (DMA) Participation in the Development Cycle of Weapon Systems," 9 Nov 82, SD 131.
of the MC&G needs of future weapons systems have been overcome by the current strides in weapons technology. This deficiency can only be attributed to a shortage of MC&G expertise and the lack of visibility in this area."\(^1\)

On 14 March, Lt. Gen. Robert M. Bond, the vice commander of the Air Force Systems Command, answered the ACS/I by stating that the command was studying positions to identify those requiring personnel with cartographic and geodetic expertise and in specialty codes 57XX. The findings would be coordinated with the directorate's MC&G Division. He cited other actions to include MC&G considerations in the development process, but by the end of 1983, AFSC had not brought more cartographic/geodetic experts into the command.\(^2\)

Federal Digital Cartographic Programs

On 4 April, a memorandum from the director of the Office of Management and Budget established the Federal Interagency Coordinating Committee on Digital Cartography, to be chaired by the Department of the Interior. The committee was formed to 1) improve the use of digital cartographic base data within the federal government, 2) provide a framework for its proper management, and 3) consider the needs of data producers, as well as those of users of end products built on the base data. The United States Geological Survey within the Department of the Interior invited all agencies with activities or interest in digital cartographic base data to participate in an organizational meeting on 27 May 1983. Mr. Constantine N. Pappas and Mr. Neil C. Sunderland of the directorate's MC&G Division were the Air Force representatives at the meetings. Other Department of Defense organizations represented were the Defense Mapping Agency and the Naval Research Laboratory.\(^3\)

At the meeting held at the U.S. Geological Survey, a consensus was reached to form a steering committee with membership at the department level. The committee formed working groups, through which interested bureaus would make contributions. The working groups were: reports, requirements, standards, technology exchange, and user application. Two people from the MC&G Division were on the groups: Capt. John Fredericks, requirements, and Mr. Neil Sunderland, user applications.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Ltr \(\#\#\) and 1 Atch \(\#\#\), ACS/I to Lt Gen Bond, AFSC/CV, n.s., 15 Feb 83, SD 130.

\(^2\) Ltr \(\#\#\), AFSC/CV to ACS/I, n.s., 14 Mar 83, SD 147; Intvw AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent, AFIS/INT, 10 May 84.

\(^3\) Memo \(\#\#\), AFIS/INTB, and Atch \(\#\#\), N. C. Sunderland, "Coordination of Federal Digital Cartographic Data Programs," 16 Aug 83, SD 132.

\(^4\) Ibid.
By the end of the year, the groups had composed charters and designed user survey questions. The only military representatives who continued to work with the program were members of the Directorate.\textsuperscript{1}

**Policy Statement on Digital Data Support**

To foster better cooperation among the military services and the Defense Mapping Agency, representatives from the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marines signed a proposed policy statement about digital data support for research and development and recommended that the Defense Mapping Agency adopt it. The agreement stated:\textsuperscript{2}

1. The Services recognize an increasing requirement for digital cartographic data for research and development (R&D) efforts. To satisfy these requirements, we propose limited areas within the continental United States (CONUS) be identified specifically for R&D support. These areas (attach 1) contain representative samples and prototypes of Defense Mapping Agency (DMA) digital data bases. They also encompass various terrain types and are being used for many present R&D efforts. Data within these areas will be current and meet data base specifications. DMA will concentrate prototype development within these areas, including densification and enhancement of data. The Services will endeavor to have contractor study reports shared with their respective laboratories and DMA. The Services' mapping, charting, and geodesy representatives, in joint cooperation with DMA, agree to maximize the use of this policy.

2. This policy applies only to the CONUS. While it is recognized that R&D efforts cannot be totally excluded from European and other non-CONUS data, justification for such requests will undergo close scrutiny. Delineation of these areas will have to be flexible and adaptable to changes in the data bases and service or contractor needs. Validation will be directed toward using data already available. Only new start R&D projects will fall under this guidance.

3. This policy will reduce and/or help prevent large amounts of data duplication, provide consistent support to R&D contractors, provide a measure of comparison between competing contracts, allow DMA to concentrate prototype development in established areas, and allow better evaluation and comparison of DMA data bases.

\textsuperscript{1}Intvw \textit{Lt Col} Wilder and \textit{Lt Col} Vincent et al, AFIS/INT, 10 May 84.

\textsuperscript{2}Ltr \textit{Lt Col} to DMA (Requirements Division), "Policy on Digital Data Support to Research and Development," 2 Sep 83, SD 133 and Attach.
The DMA acknowledged receipt of the policy statement and suggested some revisions. In principle it accepted the concept, but disagreed over some specifics, which were not yet ironed out by the end of the year.¹

Geographic Information Systems Working Group

On 25 July, the first meeting of the Geographic Information Systems Working Group of the Geographic Information Systems Subcommittee of the Intelligence Handling Committee of the Central Intelligence Agency was convened with representatives from agencies and organizations involved in geographic and cartographic data handling and utilization. Air Force primary and alternate representatives on the group were, Mr. Neil C. Sunderland and Capt. John R. Fredericks of the targeting directorate. The overall purpose of the group was to develop a community approach to geographic data handling with an initial focus on the use of video-disk technology. A proposed charter for the group was distributed to attending agencies and organizations for comment. By the end of the year, the Intelligence Handling Committee had approved the charter and the group was working on a needs assessment study.²

Geodetic and Geophysical Requirements

On 15 July, Deputy Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Brig. Gen. Paul H. Martin submitted to the Defense Mapping Agency the directorate’s geodetic and geophysical (G&G) requirements for fiscal year 1986-1993.³ He also raised several requirements issues which he requested that the director of the DMA consider, discuss, and act upon. The general stated:⁴

a.  Non survey G&G support such as projects provided to the Ballistic Missile Office of Air Force Systems Command (i.e., Peacekeeper targeting software, Missile Launch Site Data Tapes, Targeting Gravity Disturbance Model Data Tapes, etc.) should be included in your quarterly Geodetic and Geophysical Support Automated Listing (GGSAL) report. The GGSAL should contain all G&G requirements submitted through the requirements process.

b. Our geodetic data base survey has indicated command support for DMA to establish and

¹IntvwAFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent, AFIS/INT, 10 May 84.
²MemoAFIS Historian, Intelligence Information Handling Committee, to GISS/GIS WGs Members, “Joint GISS/GISNG Members,” IHC/M32-58, 22 Dec 83, SD 133 and 10 AtchsIntvwAFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent et al, AFIS/INT, 10 May 84.
⁴Itr, DACS/I to Director DMA, “Geodetic and Geophysical (G&G) Requirements FY84-91,” 15 Jul 83, SD 135 and 1 Atch.
maintain a computer-oriented geodetic data base. We suggest a meeting of DMA, command representative, our staff to discuss such a product prior to submitting a formal requirement.

c. Does DMA have requirements to provide geodetic survey support under wartime scenario, that requires Air Force enlisted surveyors assigned to DMA is the resource? If so, is this reflected in any joint planning document? At issue is whether the career field can remain viable serving primarily as a peacetime resource to DMA.

As of the end of 1983, the issues were still open items.

ARAPS Terminal Installation

As of the end of December, the Targets Directorate had not received a response to its letter of 15 November 1983 to the Security and Communications Management Directorate regarding the installation of a 2400 BPS digital circuit between the Targets Directorate at Boeing AB and the Defense Mapping Agency, Hydrographic/Topographic Center, Brookmont, Maryland. The requested start time was 2 January 1984. Since the spring of 1980, Targets had been coordinating with numerous offices and agencies about this project, which necessitated the installation of an ABC Requirements and Products Status (ARAPS) UTS-40 Terminal.¹

Lt. Col. Wilder as division chief was project officer for ARAPS, and had been working with developing the system since 1975, when he was stationed at the Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center in St. Louis, Missouri. He could probably be called "Mr. ARAPS" and was eager to get the terminal functioning to enable the directorate to tap into the Defense Mapping Agency's data bases on 1) requirements and 2) production management, which in turn would enable the directorate to better know which Air Force units were on the DMA requirements lists, for which type of information, and when the information was requested and scheduled for output. "ARAPS can help us broker on behalf of the Air Force," the colonel stated.²

MCIG Conference

On 17 October, the Defense Mapping Agency hosted a Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy Conference, and in attendance were the ACS/I and members of the directorate. Prior to the conference, Lt. Col. Wilder had thought deeply about issues that required close cooperation between the Air Force and the Defense Mapping Agency. He identified seven areas and problems which in

¹Lttr [damaged], AFIS/INT to AFIS/INS, "Area Requirements and Product Status (ARAPS) Terminal Installation," 27 Dec 83, SD 136 and 29 Atch 136.

²Intw [damaged], AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent. AFIS/INT, 10 May 84.
his view needed attention to meet Air Force operational requirements: 1) developing digital data policy, 2) streamlining requirements processing, 3) revamping the basic MC&G officer’s course, 4) developing a data element dictionary, 5) using co-producer products directly, 6) adopting the World Geodetic System-84, and 7) continuing to improve the service-DMA partnership.¹

Some of these issues were discussed at the conference, but not resolved. They were complex topics, discussed before at other conferences. For example, the World Geodetic System-84 was a datum, a reference that all geographic locations could be measured against. Its adoption in place of WGS-72 involved agreement by international allies, treaty revisions, and changes in foreign military equipment sales, and so forth.² The colonel’s seven points were issues the directorate would be addressing for years to come.²

PERSONNEL MATTERS

When the directorate was established in 1982, it assumed responsibility as the office of collateral responsibility for the 80EX/201X1 targeting career fields, and it reviewed and monitored the utilization, classification, and training of Air Force active duty and reserve personnel in those fields. The directorate also served as functional manager for the Air Force’s 5716 and 5734 cartographic/geodetic career fields.

Director’s Assessment

Before he retired, Colonel McKenney considered the state of the targeting and MC&G career fields, and his assessment of them was pessimistic— for the present and immediate future. He stated:

I do not believe the Air Force-wide picture is... rosy. With the possible exception of SAC (and I think the exception is temporary) all commands face, in my view, an acute shortage of qualified targeters and MC&G officers. World-wide, there are about 250 targeteer slots with 200 or so filled. The MC&G field has but 67 officers. That does not however, reflect the true picture. There is a real shortage of experience with many of the officers not even qualifying for the fully qualified AFSC due to lack of grade or experience. Also I believe many shops are misplaced in the command structure. As I alluded to earlier, targets is often a


²Intvw ☁️, AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent, AFIS/INT, 10 May 84.
step-child of intelligence with the targets and MC&G officer being neither an intelligence officer nor an operator. Somehow, the perception must change. Too, in peacetime the targets/MC&G profession is not a highly visible one as is the estimates/current intelligence profession. Therefore, we have trouble recruiting good personnel. Some senior officers actually advise the younger troops to stay out of targets because it is hard (the targets course at Lowry is considered to be one of the most difficult non-technical courses in the Air Force) and it is not visible, thus, does not offer very good promotion potential. Similarly, the MC&G field is highly technical and requires significant training beyond that normally found in the civilian education community. Like the targeteer, MC&G officers, except those assigned to DMA, tend to be buried in the organizational structure of most commands. That attitude has to change if the Air Force is to have a quality targeting function.

The future is even more bleak. Based on my discussions with senior officers familiar with targeting and in conversations with several senior operators, I think the picture will worsen and probably rapidly. The advent of new systems, many still in the black world, new collection and data handling systems, improved munitions requiring even more finite target data, and the changing nature of warfighting doctrine means the requirement for qualified targets officers will increase within 4-5 years by an order of magnitude. Some suggest numbers like 500-600 8085s by 1990. My question is, "Where will they come from and how will we train them?" Right now, our personnel management system cannot cope and our training program is ill-equipped to turn out that number of graduates who can do the job with the tools they will have available.

In sum, I believe the targets and MC&G career fields have been neglected in favor of the peacetime niceties. The hiatus of the past ten years is reaching alarming proportions. I think the initiatives we have taken in INT have started a turnaround but, it is just the beginning of a long, and probably hard road toward recovery. 1

In contrast with the field conditions, the colonel thought the state of the Directorate of Targets was "good." There were adequate personnel who were highly trained, motivated, and experienced. 2

1 Ltr , AFIS/INT, Col McKenney, to ACS/I, "End of Tour Report," 29 Sep 81, SD 103.
2 Ibid.
On 31 October, the revised edition of AFR 36-1 "Officer Classifications," was published. The directorate had submitted and had had approved extensive revised specialty descriptions for the cartographic geodetic officer (AFSC 5734) and cartographic geodetic staff officer (AFSC 5716). The changes imposed mandatory educational requirements on officers to ensure that they keep pace with rapid technical advances in cartography, geodesy, and supporting specialities.1

Regarding the revision of AFR 36-1 and the AFSCs 80XX, the directorate was quite displeased with changes recommended by the Air Force Manpower and Personnel Center (AFMPC). Mr. William C. Vogt, the acting chief of the Concepts and Applications Division, stated the following about the AFMPC's revision:

This office is somewhat dismayed by AFMPC's rewrite of the 80XX restructure of AFR 36-1. As it was announced and generally accepted at the U&T Conferences, representatives were supposed to be empowered to speak for their commands. The intent of this action was to enable conferees to develop a product their parent commands would coordinate. However, the extensive changes AFMPC has made gives question as to the utility of having held U&T Conferences when the conferences' findings/determinations were so arbitrarily ignored. This is even more disappointing when one considers the full cooperation of AFMPC representatives in providing guidance to the conferees on how to achieve many of the changes. Changes, which were agreed upon only after much negotiation and compromise by the conferees. This is especially true in the consolidation of the 8054/8076 AFSCs into a single AFSC. It should be noted to AFMPC, that many intelligence personnel already feel alienated toward the command because they think it is totally indifferent toward the individual and capricious in applying AF regulations and manuals to the personnel system. This re-write will only re-enforce this negative attitude AF wide while AFMPC defends its action, under the guise "good of the Air Force."

If we accept the structure as written by AFMPC, all CTSs validated at the U&T conferences become null and void. AFIS/INT would not endorse any new 8055 or 8076 CTS without carefully examining it to assure no conflict with the 8056 training program. It would be erroneous to assume we could simply divide the 8076 CTS written at the U&T Conference just to satisfy AFMPCs action. Thus, acceptance of this package would cause

1Ltr ( ), AFMPC/RPQ3 to ATC/TTSA, "Proposed Change to AFR 36-1, AFSCs 5734 and 5716," 7 Apr 81, SD 138 and 2 Atchs ( ).
the whole modernization of the training program to come to a halt. Equally, failure to approve means extended negotiations with AFMPC to find resolution—again bringing the modernization process to a halt. One must therefore question what AFMPCs objective was in their restructure.1

AFMPC did heed some of the recommendations, and the directorate considered this action to be a satisfactory compromise.2

Consideration of USAFA Graduates as C&G Officers

On 7 June, the ACS/I requested that Air Force Manpower and Personnel approve the assignment of Air Force Academy graduates as cartographic geodetic officers. He recommended that the number of graduates allowed to enter the field each year be limited to two, since there were only 75 cartographic geodetic officers authorized within the Air Force.3 In justifying the request, he stated:4

The critical nature of cartographic and geodetic support to sophisticated weapons systems is rapidly being recognized. As a result, the career field is growing. The Defense Mapping Agency is proposing an increase of approximately 20 positions, tied to new production supporting Air Force weapons systems now under development. At least four commands are preparing justifications for additional manpower at the MAJCOM and numbered Air Force level. Air Force Systems Command is conducting a review of the need for additional cartographic and geodetic expertise in systems development organizations. We can reasonably expect a 45 percent growth accompanied by enhanced visibility of these officers over the next few years.

The ACS/I also justified his request by explaining that the cartographic geodetic officer performed direct combat support and was in a technical Air Force specialty code, 57XX. He said, "The direct combat support and technical nature of the Cartographic Geodetic Officer career field, combined with the high level of most of the positions and their importance to the future of the Air Force's warfighting capability, warrants opening the field to USAFA graduates. Conversely, the education and military

1Lttr 47, APIS/INTA to AF/INXY, "AFRIS 36-1 Revision (80XX Restructure) (Your Ltr, 22 Apr 83)," 26 Apr 83, SD 139.
2Intvw 46, APIS Historian w/ Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent et al, APIS/INT, 10 May 94.
3ACS/I to AF/MP, "Initial Assignment of USAFA Graduates as Cartographic Geodetic Officers," 7 Jun 83, SD 140 and 2 Atchs 42.
4Ibid.
skills of Academy graduates will provide valuable leavening to this small but vital group of officers."

On 29 August, the assistant deputy chief of staff for Manpower and Personnel, disapproved the ACS/T's request. Maj. Gen. Keith D. McCartney provided three reasons for the denial:

1. The 57XX was not a "pure" technical field, but one requiring an academic background, which included some emphasis in the physical sciences. He was concerned with diluting the "pure" engineering and scientific/technical line career fields.

2. Based on retention of USAFA graduates in support specialities, eventually 43 percent or 32 officers of the 75 officers in the 57XX career field would be USAFA graduates. The Air Force average for academy graduates in all support fields was 6.5 percent. The predicted 45 percent growth in 57XX manning would not prevent a disproportionate share of USAFA graduates in the field.

3. There appeared to be no serious present or future problems in manning the 57XX specialty.

The major general's nonconcurvance did not preclude graduates from transferring into the career field at later career points. He recommended crossflow into 57XX as the best way to provide a controlled flow of USAFA graduates into the cartographic geodetic career field.

The directorate was disappointed with the response and thought that the 43 percent calculation figure was unrealistic.

Assessment of Intelligence Air Reserve Forces

In October, the directorate made its annual assessment of intelligence reservists and concluded that they made "outstanding contributions" to the mission. Ten officers and one enlisted person were the reservists for the directorate in 1983. The officers were in specialty codes 8085 (eight) and 5734 (two). The NCO was in 20670. Some of the activity performed by the reservists were the following:

1. Formulated an in-depth bomb damage assessment program to be integrated into the target intelligence training program.

---

1Ibid.

2Lt Col Walter, AF/WP to AF/IN, "Initial Assignment of USAFA Graduates as Cartographic Geodetic Officers (Your Ltr, 7 Jun 83)," 29 Aug 83, SD 141.

3INTW, APIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent, APIS/INT, 10 May 84.

4Ibid.

5Lt Col, APIS/INT to AF/IN, "Annual Assessment of the Intelligence Air Reserve Forces." 24 Oct 83, SD 142.
2. Developed target graphics in support of AF/IN's analysis of offensive and industrial capabilities of "third world" countries.

3. Assessed inadequacies of a Defense Mapping Agency (DMA) prototype review 8205 chart and organized an Air Force command series of it to revise specifications and make corrections.

4. Performed liaison duties between the Rome Air Development Center and the directorate to ensure that the latter was involved in new weapon systems development and acquisition.

5. Provided guidance to the Air Force Academy with acquisition of maps and charts to support survival, evasion, resistance and escape training.

6. Provided target analysis and nuclear weaponeering of sensitive enemy hard targets in support of flag officer directed projects.

Revision of Training Courses

By October, the Armed Forces Air Intelligence Training Center had completed the revision of the Intelligence Target Officers Course 8085, effective 4 January 1984. The revision resulted from a Utilization and Training Workshop called by the Air Force Manpower Personnel Center. It was held at Lowry AFB, Colorado, 31 August - 1 September 1982, at which the 8085 course was evaluated and determined to be in need of revision. The course was lengthened from 24.4 academic days to 85 days, 21 of which were to be spent on weaponeering. Student use of the WANG 2200 and the main frame computer AWCF was included.¹

In November, the directorate provided advice about the proposed Electronic Combat Support Officers course, to be taught at the Armed Forces Air Intelligence Training Center. According to the thinking of personnel in the Concepts and Applications Division, it was important that the course emphasize that electronic warfare/electronic combat (EW/EC) targeting was the responsibility of the targeteer. Use of EW/EC and attacking C² countermeasures were not new concepts. Targeteers for years had sought ways to attack C³CM targets, with varying results. They had also used EW/EC to support mission survivability. The only difference was that in 1983 both concepts had attained greater visibility in operations and planning staffs. Further, the application of EW/EC had become more sophisticated. Two things remained basic: C³CM was not a new war winning target system, and EW/EC was just another weapon option to be applied to overall strategy. The targeteers, the directorate suggested, must be taught to look at the complete picture and not focus on any one

¹Msg ☐, AFIS/INT to TAC/INAT et al. "Target Intelligence Officers Course," 212230Z 2 Oct 83, SD 143, and 1 Atch ☐.
element in satisfying mission objectives. Some of the directorate’s suggestions were adopted, not all of them.

"MC&G Flyer" Newsletter

In November, the directorate printed the first edition of a mapping, charting, and geodesy newsletter and titled it "MC&G Flyer." It was sent to MC&G personnel throughout the Air Force. The director of Targets took the opportunity in the first edition to introduce Lt. Col. Chuck Rose as the new head of the MC&G Division, and to share his thoughts about the MC&G career field.

I am going to be blunt with all of you. Most of the Air Force has little appreciation for what we do, and we have done little to help them understand the critical importance of our work. MC&G products are the toilet paper of war—noticed only when not available. What that means, if we are to continue our career field reforms, make new weapons operationally effective, and advance the state-of-the-art, is that we must persistently and consistently do two things. First, we must work much more cohesively in support of each other. I call on each of you to make up your minds to support each other, and particularly to support your new leader. Support him by sharing the things he ought to know to better represent you in Washington. Make sure your senior officers know who he is, and put in a plug if you can. Second, those of you in DMA need to remember your greatest contribution to DMA comes from your input of Air Force concepts and doctrine. The Air Force users, whom you represent, need you to speak up for their requirements at every opportunity. The measure is "what are you doing for the Air Force." These two things together add up to networking, cooperating, sharing and caring, combined with a much greater sense of the blue of our uniforms. We are not a segment of the work force that isn't paid for overtime. We are the front line of our key element of national power—air power.

The directorate planned to publish the newsletter on a regular basis.

---

1 Msg AFIS/INTA to ESC/INW et al. "Target Intelligence Officer's Course," 231730Z Nov 83, SD 144 and 1 Atch; Intvw AFIS Historian w. Lt Col Wilder and Lt Col Vincent, AFIS/INT, 10 May 84.

2 Newsletter "MC&G Flyer," AFIS/INTE, Nov 83, SD 145.
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CHAPTER IV

INTELLIGENCE EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Directorate of Joint Services Support
Directorate of Soviet Affairs
Directorate of Attaché Affairs
PIVOTAL YEAR

In 1983, the Joint Services Support Directorate had a pivotal year, resulting in greater responsibilities, new authority, and organizational changes. Members of Congress, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the secretary of the Air Force, and the chief of staff of the Air Force were interested in the activity of the directorate and supportive of its efforts to carry out its Department of Defense responsibilities. The directorate's name was changed from Evasion and Escape/Prisoner of War to Joint Services Support Directorate; its functional address symbol was changed from INR to INU; its organizational structure and mission were scrutinized and reorganized in a plan submitted to the ACS/I; it received new responsibilities for evasion and escape matters and received more authority through revised directives to carry out its Code of Conduct responsibilities; and it assumed responsibility for maintaining the Department of Defense historian/librarian function for the Code of Conduct.

REVISED MISSION STATEMENT

In response to the changes, the directorate prepared a revised mission statement, which was submitted to the AFIS Manpower and Organization Division for publication in the revised AFIS Regulation 23-1, "Organization and Functions Air Force Intelligence Service." The revised statement was as follows:

a. AFIS/INU is the responsible Air Force activity for intelligence aspects of the DOD Combat Survival program, including analysis and production of intelligence information related to US Prisoners of War/detained personnel.

b. Serves as the Chief of Staff, Air Force (CSAF) designated executive agent for Combat Survival and related matters.

c. Determines AF/IN positions on Combat Survival and Prisoner of War (PW) matters and serves as the OPR for coordinating these matters with the Directorate of Plans and Operations (AF/XO) and other Air Staff elements.

d. Provides intelligence support in developing Combat Survival operational tactics, techniques, procedures, publications, equipment, and training programs.

1AFISR 23-1, 15 Feb 84, Section R, SD 1B2. The detailed mission statement for the Directorate of Evasion and Escape/Prisoner of War (INU) is found in AFISR 23-1, 15 Jul 82, Section Q, SD 2.
e. Has primary responsibility for debriefing repatriated US Air Force PW/detainees and for coordinating these debriefings with other Air Staff offices to insure proper coverage of all areas of interest.

f. Selects and trains personnel to conduct debriefings of US PW/detainees as required.

g. Responsible for all operational aspects of Air Force participation in resistance training programs, including guidance, and coordination with all branches of the Armed Forces.

h. Responsible for the production of worldwide Combat Survival related Intelligence Contingency Guides.

i. Serves as the Executive Agent’s action office for the DOD Code of Conduct training program.

j. Represents the Air Force on joint services and interagency committees and working groups that deal with Combat Survival and PW policies and issues.

k. Responsible for providing hostage survival training to selected AF personnel.

l. Responsible for all DOD Code of Conduct historian and librarian functions.

BACKGROUND

Much of the directorate’s activity within the Air Force and within the Department of Defense stemmed from events of 1980 when the directorate was established and when its primary governing directive was issued. The events of 1983 require some understanding of why and how the young directorate performed its mission for 1980 to 1983.

DoDD 1300.7

Department of Defense Directive (DoDD) 1300.7, "Training and Education Measures Necessary to Support the Code of Conduct," was issued 23 May 1980 and designated the Secretary of the Air Force as the Department of Defense executive agent for standardization of Code of Conduct training. Subsequent to the issuance of the directive, on 29 October 1980, Secretary of the Air Force Hans Mark sent a memorandum to the other service secretaries designating the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence (ACS/I) as the office of primary responsibility for the directive and designating the HQ AFIS Directorate of Evasion and Escape/Prisoner of War as the action office."

1 Ltr , AF/INYS to INU. "FY 1984 Congressional Action Item/Report (XXXP Ltr, 21 Sep 82)," J6 Sep 83, SD 149. Memo Secretary of the AF Hans Mark to Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, "Assignment of Responsibilities for Code of Conduct Training — Action Memorandum," 29 Oct 80, SD 150.
DODD 1300.7 specifically stated that the secretary of the Air Force shall do the following:

a. Develop, in coordination with the other Military Departments, and distribute multimedia training materials to support Code of Conduct-related training throughout the Armed Forces. Materials will include guidance concerning the application of realistic, well-monitored training.

b. Conduct research and develop appropriate training programs, or modify existing programs, on a continuing basis, to prepare personnel to resist newly discovered captor handling techniques, including abuses of captives while in confinement and other exploitive practices. Provide newly developed or modified training programs to the Military Services for their use.

c. Establish clear, expeditious lines of communication between the executive agent and training facilities throughout the Armed Forces.

d. Ensure that:

   (1) Training materials conform to this Directive and the report of the 1976 Defense Review Committee for the Code of Conduct (reference (c)) and clearly identify Service-unique training requirements.

   (2) Doctrinal material allows sufficient flexibility in its level of interpretation and implementation to meet Service-unique training needs.

e. Perform the function of historian or librarian in all matters related to the Code of Conduct and provide for the identification, collection, and control of a copy or copies of all documentation extant or produced in the future concerning the Code of Conduct and related topics.

Directorate Established

In early 1980 it was apparent that DODD 1300.7 would soon be signed and published, and that the Intelligence Services Division of the 7602d Air Intelligence Group would begin to officially function as action office for the joint-service implementation of the directive. Several meetings were held and

1DODD 1300.7, "Training and Education Measures Necessary to Support the Code of Conduct," 23 May 80, as Atch 2 of Staff Summary Sheet, Col Webb, AFIS/INU, to AF/IN et al, "Air Force Intelligence Service's Joint Service Support Directorate Manning," 5 Dec 83, 80 151.
tentative plans were made to reorganize the division into three branches: Technical Applications, Evasion and Escape, and Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape (SERE) Guides.¹

In May 1980, the deputy secretary of defense did sign the directive, and in line with the recommendations from Project STREAMLINE and from a Management Effectiveness Inspection of the 7602d Air Intelligence Group (AIG), the division was moved from the 7602d AIG and established as an AFIS directorate on 1 July 1980. The resulting internal reorganization was based on a good prediction at the time of the directorate’s future requirements. It was organized into two divisions according to their physical location, not according to their functions.²

After 1980, the directorate began an effort to promulgate Code of Conduct guidance to the survival schools of the Air Force and Navy and to assist the Marine Corps and Army in developing Code of Conduct training laboratories appropriate to their special needs. The directorate experienced resistance to standardization from people within the military training community who were themselves trained according to a different interpretation of the Code or who were unqualified to assess current needs. The directorate realized that it was not an easy task to standardize Code training. Although the directorate was not tasked to train all members of other services, it was supposed to “train the trainers.” To this end, old misunderstandings and misinterpretations had to be rectified. Training material appropriate to each service and level of training had to be designed, and service efforts had to be monitored for compliance with the standard.³

Other Authorities

In 1981, the directorate was instrumental in having Air Force Regulation 50-16 published, 7 July 1981, titled “Code of Conduct Training.” The regulation provided guidance for the development and execution of training in advancing the aims and objectives of the Code of Conduct, announced by Executive Order

¹"Proposed AFIS/INR Reorganization" [X], Atch 4 of Staff Summary Sheet [X], Col Webb, AFIS/INR, to ACS/1 et al, "Code of Conduct Program Manning/Reorganization," 12 Apr 83, SD 152.

²Ibid; Ltr [X], and 1 Atch [X] AFISC/IGAI to 7602d AINTELG/CC, "Report of Management Effectiveness Inspection (MEI) of Headquarters 7602d Air Intelligence Group (7602d AINTELG) (PN 79-9011) [X], 10 Mar 80, SD 153; Ltr [X], 7602d AIG/CC to AFISC/IGAI, "Report of Management Effectiveness Inspection – PN 79-9011 [X] (Your Ltr, [X], 10 Mar 80), 18 Jul 80, SD 154.

³Atch [X], Revision of Annex R to AFIS Objective Plan, "Joint Services Support Directorate (INU)" [X], with Ltr [X], INU to KP, "AFIS Objective Plan (AFIS/INR Ltr, 24 Aug 83)" [X], 20 Sep 83, SD 155.
10631, "Code of Conduct for Members of the Armed Forces of the United States," as amended. It assigned responsibilities for the establishment and operation of training programs, and prescribed different levels of training for USAF personnel depending upon their individual circumstances.¹

**Hostage and Anti-Terrorism Training**

Under the authority of HQ USAF Operating Instruction 21-5, the directorate conducted the official Air Force debriefings of the three Air Force personnel held hostage in Iran for fourteen months, published the debriefing results and produced a videotaped account of experiences of the senior Air Force detainee. The directorate also developed and widely presented briefings on hostage behavior in peacetime captivity situations. Following the rescue of kidnapped Brig. Gen. James Dozier, USA, in February 1982, the directorate participated in the detailed intelligence debriefing which ensued. Lessons Learned were applied to the directorate's hostage behavior briefings.²

¹APR 50-16, "Code of Conduct Training," 7 July 81, as Tab 1 of Staff Summary Sheet 00, Col Webb, AFIS/INR to ACS/I et al, "Code of Conduct Program Manning/Reorganization," 12 Apr 83, SD 156.

²Atch 00, Revision of Annex R to AFIS Objective Plan, "Joint Services Support Directorate (INU)" 00, with Ltr 00, INU to XP, "AFIS Objective Plan (AFIS/CV Ltr, 24 Aug 83)" 00, 20 Sep 83, SD 155.
EVENTS OF 1983

From 1980 to 1983, the directorate had thus begun to make its impact felt among the military services in the area of Code of Conduct and SERE training and had been assigned additional responsibilities for antiterrorism training. Events of 1983 would be pivotal in giving the directorate even more responsibilities and authority.

Request from the Chairman, JCS

On 1 April 1983, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. John W. Vessey, Jr., USA, asked Gen. Charles A. Gabriel, the chief of staff of the Air Force, the question, "Could Air Force in the role of DOD Executive Agent for Code of Conduct matters, review appropriate policies and their implementation in coordination with other Services?" General Vessey explained why he was concerned with Code of Conduct training. He stated that at a January luncheon of the National League of POW/MIA Families, Cdr. Ralph Gaither (USN), former prisoner of war and a member of the league's board of directors, had mentioned that the military services lacked uniformity in training associated with the Code of Conduct. In a later conversation with the Joint Staff, Gaither had suggested that DOD and other directives, while adequate, were not being implemented as effectively as they might in all cases. He expressed special concern over training for those individuals subject to moderate or higher risk of capture.

General Gabriel's Response

On 26 June 1983, General Gabriel answered General Vessey by stating that in response to Vessey's inquiry, a rather extensive review was done of policies and training programs associated with the Code of Conduct. There was, indeed, a lack of uniformity in the training programs by the services. The reasons

---

1Ibid.
2Intvw ( ), AFIS Historian w. Col Webb et al, AFIS/INU, 17 Apr 84. Memo ( ), Gen J. Vessey, Jr., USA to Gen Gabriel, "Code of Conduct Training." 1 Apr 83, as Tab 2 of Staff Summary Sheet, AFIS/INR to AFIS/CV et al, "DOD Directive 1300.7 Changes." 10 Nov 84, SD 158.
3Ibid.
from the Air Force perspective were the wording and implementation of the governing directives.¹

General Gabriel explained that service policies essentially derived from Department of Defense Directive 1300.7, which was the overall governing directive for Code of Conduct policies. Individual service interpretations of the policy were very broad — some reading it in its narrowest scope, while others inputting much broader guidance than was explicit in the directive. While the secretary of the Air Force was designated as the executive agent for the Code of Conduct by DODD 1300.7, little or no authority was conveyed with that responsibility. The combination of these two factors — broad interpretation by the services and lack of authority to monitor and coordinate service implementation — severely limited the cohesiveness and effectiveness of the Code of Conduct training activities.²

In the general's judgment, fairly sweeping changes were necessary to correct the situation. He suggested that the changes be oriented toward providing authority for the program to those agencies having the resources to carry out the program. Also, a clear definition of policy objectives was needed. He concluded by stating, "We are, therefore, initiating corrective action which we intend to bring through the JCS. We will keep you posted on the progress."³

**Briefing for AF Chief of Staff**

On 22 August, Colonel Webb and Major Dussault briefed General Gabriel on the topic, "Code of Conduct—Captivity Related Training." On 29 August they delivered a talking paper to the executive officer to General Gabriel, based on the briefing. The officer advised them to keep the general informed about programs of strengthening and revising DODD 1300.7 and the directorate's involvement with the Code training programs of the other services. The JCS/I was apprised of this.⁴

The talking paper and briefing specifically addressed the differences in the military services' prisoner of war training programs. According to DODD 1300.7, training was to be funded on three levels.⁵


2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

4 Memo for Record, AFIS/INU, 29 Aug 83, SD 159.

5 DODD 1300.7, 23 May 80, SD 158.
2. Level B for personnel whose military roles entailed moderate risk of capture.

3. Level C for personnel whose roles entailed a relatively high risk of capture or made them vulnerable to greater-than-average exploitation by a captor.

The Air Force and Navy had training programs at all three levels. The Army had no level C program, but one was being developed. It did have Level A and B training, with the latter having just begun in 1982. Navy instructors and Army instructors all visited Air Force level C schools.¹

Action Initiated to Revise DODD 1300.7

Prior to General Gabriel’s responding to General Vessey, the INR directorate, as the action office for the executive agent, discussed with the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics (ASD/MRA&L) the problem of the ambiguity of DODD 1300.7. Steps were initiated to clarify the directive and to give the Air Force 1) the responsibility to monitor and coordinate service training programs and 2) the authority to ensure greater improvements in training uniformity and adequacy.²

By 10 November, the directorate and the assistant secretary’s office had made considerable progress in working out the revisions of DODD 1300.7. Eleven sections were drawn up, one of which specifically provided guidance for peacetime conduct of U.S. military personnel.³

Subcommittee on Military Readiness Hearing

While the extensive review of Code of Conduct policies and training was underway at the request of General Vessey, the Subcommittee on Military Readiness of the House Committee on Armed Services, chaired by Congressman W.C. Daniels (D-VA) was also interested in readiness, training, doctrine, and equipment for survival, evasion, resistance, and escape (SERE). Congressman Daniels requested that the secretary of the Air Force arrange for

³Draft Revisions of DOD Directive 1300.7 C, Unnumbered Tab of Ibid.
an Air Force witness to appear before his subcommittee to discuss SERE matters. ¹

On 5 April, two Air Force officers appeared before the readiness subcommittee: Col. Dale E. Stovall, the assistant director for Special Plans, HQ, USAF, and Col. Ronald J. Webb, the director of the Directorate of Evasion and Escape, Prisoner of War, HQ, APIS.

Their unclassified statement presented an overall view of how the SERE program worked within the Air Force, and what the Air Force was doing to promote SERE training throughout the services. They also explained that the Air Force was designated “executive agent” for two separate functions. They stated:²

We believe that our long term interest in SERE is largely responsible for our selection as Executive Agent to the Secretary of Defense for training in support of the Code of Conduct. Because of unique service requirements, survival and combat rescue have always been service responsibilities. The Air Force, therefore, is not the Executive Agent for survival or combat rescue and there are no formal overall joint or DOD SERE programs.

The statement that the Air Force was not the executive agent for "survival and combat rescue" was appropriate because Congressman Daniels was also holding hearings on the subject of the services' capabilities with regard to "CSAR," Combat, Search and Rescue.³

Reorganization Plan

On 12 April, a week after Congressman Daniels' hearing, Colonel Webb submitted to the ACS/I a proposed plan for reorganizing the directorate. According to the plan, the changes were to do the following:

Assign a title to the directorate that conforms to USAF standards, and more nearly enunciates the directorate functions.¹

¹ Ltr Rep "Dan" Daniels to Sec Verne Orr, n.s., 22 Mar 83, as Tab 3 of Staff Summary Sheet, AFIS/INR to AFIS/ME et al, "Code of Conduct Program Manning/Reorganization," 12 Apr 83, SD 152.
b. Provide a functional alignment in the directorate to facilitate management.2

c. Enable Mr. Watkins' historical and current knowledge of the directorate functions to be more thoroughly utilized.3

d. Rename the divisions and some of the branches to more accurately identify their functions.4

e. Remove any obvious connections between the reorganized directorate and the former by changing the directorate symbol from INR to INU.5

f. Improve manning in the Code of Conduct area, employing joint service representation and set up a structure to deal with hostage survival issues/training requirements of the future.6

On 6 September, the ACS/I approved the directorate's reorganization plan which basically established two new branches, one for each division. The Library and Archives (INUAC) Branch was established within the Code of Conduct Division (INU), which had its name changed from Code of Conduct/Survival, Evasion Resistance, Escape Division. The antiterrorism branch (INUDB) was established within the Defense Support Programs Division (INUDB).

AF Secretary's Request for Tri-Service Manning

A key point in the directorate's reorganization plan was for tri-service manning of the directorate in accordance with tri-service responsibilities as outlined in DODD 1300.7. Late in the year, on 27 December, Secretary of the Air Force Verne Orr, acting as the Department of Defense executive agent for Code of Conduct training programs, requested assistance from the assistant secretary of defense for Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics to acquire joint service manning of the INU directorate. He requested the authorization of one commissioned officer and one noncommissioned officer from each of the Army and Navy Departments. He stated that one of the personnel from the Navy Department must be from the Marine Corps.8


8Memo Sec AF Verne Orr to AD/MTRAL, "DOD Code of Conduct Training Programs," 27 Dec 83, as Tab 1 of Staff Summary Sheet [4]. AFIS/CV to AF/IN et al. "Air Force Intelligence Service's Joint Services Support Directorate Manning," 5 Dec 83, SD 151.
The secretary explained the need for the manpower by stating, "Increasing high level emphasis on Code of Conduct related readiness and service unique mission in achieving adequate, uniform and consistent training programs throughout the DOD has significantly increased the complexity of the workload of the EA CBR. To expeditiously achieve the goal, the EA action office, currently manned by Air Force personnel only, must develop a full understanding of each military department's unique requirements and related procedures, and a credibility which would foster the other service's complete support and cooperation. I suggest that representation from the other two military departments in the EA action office would strengthen the service coordination desired by Congress and the DOD, improve the understanding of service-unique training programs, and build the necessary EA credibility."

The secretary's request for two personnel from the Army and Navy each was in accordance with a recommendation in 1979 by the acting assistant secretary of the Air Force for Manpower Reserve Affairs and Installations to the same office to which Secretary Orr was then directing his request. As of the closing period for this history, that office had sent no response to the secretary.

Directorate's Name Changed

Prior to the approval from the ACS/I of the directorate's proposed reorganization plan, Colonel Webb requested in June that the ACS/I approve two things: 1) the change in the functional address symbol of the directorate from INR to INU, and 2) the change in the name of the directorate to one of the following: "Joint Services Support Directorate," "Intelligence Unit Support Directorate," or "Intelligence Support and Resources Unit Readiness."

In justifying the changes, the colonel stated:

In accordance with APR 10-5, HQ USAF/DA develops, manages, and administers the Functional Address System and assigns standard two and three-position Functional Address Symbols. Once approved and assigned, these symbols identify basic functions of the Air Force organization at all levels...no matter where they are placed in an organization.

---

1Memo dated Acting Assistant Secretary of the AF, Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Installations, to ASD/MR&E, "DOD Directive 1100.7, Training and Education Measures Necessary to Support the Code of Conduct," 30 Jul 79, as Tab 3 of Ibid.
3Ibid.
The symbol INR presently assigned to this directorate has been approved by HQ USAF/DA, but it attaches to this directorate a connotation of "Reconnaissance/Surveillance." Additionally, according to AFR 10-6, a symbol identifying the functions of E&E/PW within Intelligence has not been approved.1

The ACS/I did approve the new name, Joint Services Support Directorate, and the new functional address symbol, INU, and they were effective 23 September 1983.2

ACS/I as Executive Agent for E&E

One of the most significant events of the year was the ACS/I's acceptance of responsibility as executive agent for evasion and escape matters. On 23 July, he informed Maj. Gen. Perry M. Smith of the Air Force Plans and Operations Office that AF/IN would accept the responsibility and explained why:

The humanitarian, budgetary, and military considerations associated with US combat personnel being isolated in hostile territory during a conflict require the Department of Defense to take all reasonable steps to expedite their safe return to US control. A wartime capability in this regard demands peacetime preparation. If Americans are being held prisoner, we have the added responsibility to assist them in their situation if it is at all possible.

Not to develop these capabilities now, during peacetime, could mean high American casualties during the next conflict, a scramble among the services to reinvent or recreate these capabilities at the most inopportune time, or an unnecessary waste of time and resources in the process.3

1Ibid.
2AFIS Weekly Bulletin 41, No. 38, Item 1, 23 Sep 83, SD 162.
3Memo [REDACTED], ACS/I to AF/KOX (Maj Gen Smith), "Evasion and Escape (ExE) Executive Agent (EA, ) - Information Memorandum," 23 Jul 83, SD 163.
4Ibid. 5Ibid.
On 15 August Maj. Gen. John A. Shaub, the director of Plans, answered the ACS/I by stating, "We welcome your willingness to accept EA responsibility for E&E on behalf of CC/AF. We are confident that AF/IN can provide the expertise and manpower the program truly deserves. XO will retain policy oversight responsibility and we will give you our full support." 2

On 6 September the ACS/I accepted the executive agent responsibility, assigned his assistant for joint matters as the Air Staff point of contact for E&E related matters, and designated as his action office the AFIS Directorate of Evasion and Escape/Prisoner of War. 3 On 7 October 1983, the AFIS commander, Brig. Gen. Paul H. Martin, informed the directorate that the new Air Staff point of contact for E&E matters was the Intelligence Systems Division (AF/INU). 4

PERSONNEL

The reorganization and activity of the directorate did not result in a major transfer of personnel within or out of the directorate. Thus, there were no major personnel changes in 1983.

Key Personnel

Col. Ronald J. Webb continued as director of the Joint Services Support Directorate; he had also been director of the Evasion and Escape/Prisoner of War directorate since 1 December 1982. Lt. Col. Larry L. Ledbetter was head of the Code of Conduct Division; on 12 September 1983 he had signed in as chief of the Code of Conduct/SEER Division. Maj. Robert G. Dussault headed the Defense Support Programs Division, a position he held in the old directorate since 1 May 1982. CMSgt Richard E. Shear was chief of Administration within the directorate. Mr. Claude Watkins was a special assistant to the director and had been with the directorate since its establishment in 1980. 5

---

1Ibid.
2Memo [ ], Maj Gen Shaub, Director of Plans, DCS/P&O, to AF/IN (MGEN Pfautz), "Evasion and Escape (E&E) Executive Agent (EA)," 15 Aug 83, SD 164.
3Memo [ ], ACS/I to AF/XO (Maj Gen Shaub), "Evasion and Escape (E&E) Executive Agent (EA) - Information Memorandum, 6 Sep 83, SD 165.
4Ltr [ ], AFIS/CC to AFIS/INU, "Air Staff Focal Point for Evasion and Escape (E&E) Matters," 7 Oct 83, SD 151.
5Intvw [ ], AFIS Historian w. Col Webb et al, AFIS/INU, 17 Apr 84.
Manning Strength

In December, the directorate was manned at the following authorized strength:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Authorized</th>
<th>Number Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colonel Webb - Speaker in Demand

Colonel Webb was a speaker about Code of Conduct and prisoner of war matters much in demand in 1983, because he was an excellent lecturer, offered a thoughtful and thought-provoking presentation, and was a former POW in North Vietnam for six years. Included in some of his activity during the year were the graduation dining-in address at the Senior Marine Corps NCO Academy at Quantico; a speech at the American ex-POW convention in Cleveland, Ohio, and a television interview; a filming of a public service television spot at the Pentagon about MIA matters; and participation in the Combat Survival lecture tour to the United Kingdom. The Bolling Beam newspaper of the 1100 ABW presented a feature article on him, as did The Intelligencer, the AFIS monthly newspaper. On 23 February, Brig. Gen. Paul H. Martin presented Colonel Webb with the Defense Superior Service Medal.2

CODE OF CONDUCT AND SERE ACTIVITY

Mission

Within the directorate, the Code of Conduct Division, with its three branches, Training, Production, and Library/Archives, developed, monitored, and evaluated Code of Conduct related training and education programs, policies, and procedures for all branches of the Armed Forces.3 According to the division's mission statement, it also was involved with the following:

Development and production of multiple media Code of Conduct-related training materials for the military services.4

---

1Ibid.
2Historical Data Rpt, AFIS/INU, Jan-Dec 83, SD 165; The Intelligencer, AFIS/PA, Apr 83, SD 167; Biographical Sketch. "Colonel Ronald J. Webb," 18 Jan 84, SD 183.
3AFISR 23-18, 15 Feb 84, SD 182.
4Ibid.
Management of the research, drafting, and publication of worldwide Combat Survival Contingency Guides.\(^1\) (Prior to the directorate and division name changes, these guides were called the Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape (SERE) Contingency Guides.)\(^2\)

Management responsibility over the acquisition of data bases needed to support the Combat Survival Contingency Guide program.\(^3\)

Management of the Department of Defense Library/Archives.\(^4\)

**Code of Conduct**

The Code of Conduct consisted of six articles, which set forth guidelines for military behavior, embodying time-honored concepts and traditions that dated back to the days of the American Revolution. All U.S. military personnel in combat were guided by the standards of the Code of Conduct. In essence the Code stated that all military forces were to resist capture to the best of their ability while means were at hand to do so. When personnel were captured, the Code provided guidelines for individual behavior within which prisoners of war could faithfully continue to support their country and retain their personal integrity, even in the face of enemy mistreatment.\(^5\)

Unfortunately, measures suggested by the original Code of Conduct Committee in 1955 to insure that Code training guidance was standardized among the services were not implemented. The consequence of this failure was that personnel trained at different times, in different places, and by different military services received varying interpretations and amounts of training. A re-examination of the Code of Conduct in the aftermath of the Southeast Asia conflict revealed the depth of misunderstanding which had evolved in the 20-year life of the Code among those it was intended to help. Thus, a key recommendation of the committee which re-examined the Code after the Vietnam War was that a focal point be established to insure that uniform Code training

---

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)AFISR 23-1 , 15 Jul 82, Section Q, SD 2.

\(^3\)AFISR 23-1 , 15 Feb 84, Section R, SD 182.

\(^4\)Ibid.

took place among all the services. The Air Force was designated the focal point.  

Code of Conduct Film Project

Work began this year on a new film about the Code of Conduct, which was to be a level A introductory film for all individuals initially entering military service. Mr. John A. Mitchell represented the INU directorate, which was the "technical advisor" for the film. The producer was the Defense Audio Visual Agency, Norton AFB, California, in conjunction with the Armed Forces Information Service.  

In June, Mr. Mitchell attended a "concept" conference about the film. At the time, it was agreed that the objective of the film was the following: "To introduce the fighting man's Code of Conduct to a broad, general audience within the Department of Defense. In doing so, the film will explain what the code is, relative to the conditions of being a prisoner of war. It should motivate the viewer to seek more information regarding the specifics of the code and to embrace its moral principles while pursuing a career within the U.S. Armed Forces." As technical advisor, Mitchell agreed to assist in scheduling and providing individuals for research interviews for the scriptwriters use.  

The script plan discussed at the conference addressed the issue of the "content" of the film and the following statement was agreed upon: "This 25-minute film should incorporate statements from former POWs which will lend credibility to the code as a standard which a fighting man may use to cope with the hostile POW environment and return home with his head held high. Research will develop statements from POWs which will underscore each of the six elements of the Code. Stock footage will be researched and identified by the writer as prescribed in DAVA-N-SOP 95-3. Live action scenes will be incorporated where stock is not available or appropriate."  

Mitchell attended other conferences in November and December and was optimistic about the film's quality and progress. The film was to be printed and ready for distribution by early June 1984.

Production of Contingency Guides

Background

1Ibid.

2Intw Mr. AFIS Historian w. Col Webb et al, AFIS/INU, 17 Apr 84; "Memo for Record" and Atch J. Mitchell, AFIS/INU,


3Ibid.

4Ibid.
Establishment of Library/Archives

Efforts were underway this year to establish a library and archives within the directorate to fulfill action office and executive agent responsibilities for the establishment of a Code of Conduct historian/librarian function, according to Department of Defense Directive 1300.7, 20 May 80, Section F, Paragraph 3.e., which stated:

3. The Secretary of the Air Force, as executive agent, shall:

   e. Perform the function of historian or librarian in all matters related to the Code of Conduct and provide for the identification, collection, and control of a copy or copies of all documentation extant or produced in the future concerning Code of Conduct and related topics.

   (1) Documentation will include, but not be limited to, the reports of the 1955 Defense Advisory Committee on Prisoners of War and the 1976 Defense Review Committee for the Code of Conduct (reference (c)), Code of Conduct training materials (manuals, pamphlets, audio-visual presentations), reports, scholarly papers, and other publications or manuscripts.

   (2) These materials will be available for use, review, and research by the Military Services, and other agencies, and personnel.

Within the Air Force, the Code of Conduct historian/librarian function was being performed at the Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape (SERE) School of the Air Training Command (ATC) at Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington. Within the directorate in the AFIS compound, the Library/Archives Branch (INAUC) had custody of the papers of the Prisoner of War Experience and Analysis Program and performed a variety of research and acquisition tasks in support of the Training Branch (INURA). Upon effective date of change to paragraph 4b.(4) of Air Force Regulation 50-16, the function of historian and librarian.

---


2DODD 1300.7 "Training and Education Measures Necessary to Support the Code of Conduct," 20 May 80, as Tab 2 of Staff Summary Sheet , AFIS/CV to SAP/OS et al, "Air Force Intelligence Service's Joint Services Support Directorate Manning," 5 Dec 83, SD 151.
in all matters related to the Code of Conduct, was to transfer to
the directorate from the Air Training Command.  

The transfer of the function was recommended by the
director of Legislation and Legal Policy of the Military Personnel
and Force Management Office of the assistant secretary of defense,
on 7 June. The director stated:

The increased attention being given to the
Code of Conduct, its history and training in support
thereof, through Congressional inquiries and hearings
could better be served with the historian/librarian
function and concomitant research capabilities locally
available. Additionally, the detailed requirements for
thorough coordination of programs among the Military
Departments, development of more specific uniform
training guidance for all Military Department's training
programs and consideration for development of a
peacetime conduct policy in the very near future all
would be facilitated by the transfer. Further, the
value of the historian/librarian function as a local
research resource available to the headquarters of other
Federal agencies also would be extensive.

Each of the foregoing factors would justify,
by itself, having the historian/librarian available
locally to departmental-level decision-making offices of
the Defense agencies, the Military Departments, and
other officials having a need for historical background
or perspective in implementing extant or developing new
Code of Conduct policies. Accordingly, this office
concurs with the relocation of the Code of Conduct
historian/librarian function to the Washington, D.C.,
metropolitan area and collocation with the Director,
Escape and Evasion/PW. It is recommended the relocation
be accomplished expeditiously.

Exercise RIDGE RUNNER 83

Purpose

The third annual exercise RIDGE RUNNER was conducted 11-
23 September, at and in the vicinity of Camp Dawson, West
Virginia, of the West Virginia Army National Guard. The
directorate and its Training Branch (IMURA) sponsored the exercise
in accordance with AFIS EXPLAN 01-83. Its purpose was to provide

\[1\] Historical Data Rprt, AFIS/INU, Jan-Dec 83, SD 166.
\[2\] Memo, Director, Legislation and Legal Policy, OASD, to
Director AFIS/INU, "Code of Conduct Historian/Librarian," 7 Jun
83, SD 171.
\[3\] Ibid.
Schedule of Events: 

Exercise Ridge Runner 83, ARIS/INR, 7 Jun 1983, SD 173, 3/212D, Director, Legislation and Legal Policy, OSD, to 
Claude Watkins, ARIS/INR, 3/212D, Director, Legislation and Legal Policy, OSD, to 
Claude Watkins, ARIS/INR, 3/212D, Director, Legislation and Legal Policy, OSD, to

Participants during the exercise. 84 students (runners) completed all phases and represented the active Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Army Reserve. The exercise was unique for five reasons:

1. The trainers were its basic concept.
2. There was no forced captivity.
3. It was not a small part of a larger exercise.
4. It was conducted in an area representative of a large portion of the world and containing a cooperative population.
5. It provided training for selected members of all four U.S. armed services whose duties entitled them to teaching and/or conducting basic, advanced, or continued evasion training.

A concerted training program for selected members of all four U.S. armed services whose duties entitled them to teaching and/or conducting basic, advanced or continued evasion training.
Results and Cost

The number of runners, 84, was the largest of any of the previous RIDGE RUNNER exercises, and they sustained less serious injuries (one minor ankle sprain and one minor groin pull) than in

1Ibid.
2Ibid.
3Ibid.
4After Action Rprt Exercise RIDGE RUNNER 83, AFIS/INU, SD 173.
5Ibid
1982 or 1981. None in 1983 were apprehended by the passive enemy forces.\(^1\)

The exercise cost $32,000. The directorate stated that when that amount was prorated against the value of the unique and important training for 84 people over twelve days, the trade off was highly positive.\(^2\)

Lessons Learned

According to the directorate's "after action" report, the major "lessons learned" with applicability to future RIDGE RUNNER exercises were:\(^3\)

b. The three days allocated for academics and local area field training practice was inadequate and resulted in one twelve-hour academic day and insufficient time for the field practice. Recommendation: time be increased from three to four days; the number of evaders be reduced to one per war-time area; the subject of escape not be mentioned; the number of ex-PWs be reduced to one. The extra time thus made available will result in a more motivating academic schedule and a full day and night for pre-exercise training.

Coordination for RIDGE RUNNER 84

From 21-23 October, MSgt Charles W. Lovelady of the Training Branch visited Camp Dawson to clear operational and messing fund accounts, obtain lost receipts, brief operational area commanders on RIDGE RUNNER 83 "lessons learned," and begin the coordination process for RIDGE RUNNER 84. He accomplished all aspects of his mission.\(^4\)

\(^1\)Ibid.
\(^2\)Ibid.
\(^3\)Ibid.
Marine Corps SERE School, Cherry Point, NC

For example, in March, Colonel Webb and SMSgt Mitchell visited the Marine Corp's SERE School at Cherry Point, North Carolina. The purpose was to assist the school with developing a resistance training program. Colonel Webb made a two-hour presentation about his experience as a prisoner of war in North Vietnam, and SMSgt Mitchell made a presentation on the development of the INR directorate, a history of the Code of Conduct, communist methods of exploitation, effective resistance techniques, and suggestions for operating a resistance training laboratory. Col. Jerry Marvel, the commander of the NCAS at New River, North Carolina, was also a former prisoner of war in North Vietnam, and he and Colonel Webb held a one-hour extemporaneous discussion about their POW experiences, which was video taped, with a copy being sent to the AFIS compound. Colonel Webb believed that the Marine SERE School staff were dedicated to their mission and eager to adopt Air Force suggestions about their developing program.²

Army SERE School, Fort Bragg, NC

Also in March, Colonel Webb and SMSgt Mitchell visited the Army SERE School at Fort Bragg, North Carolina to familiarize themselves with the school facilities, operations, and development of the Army's training program. They saw the extensive training facilities at Camp Mackall, North Carolina, and monitored a one-hour presentation on evasion principles and techniques. The colonel thought that the progress of the Army's program over the last two years was commendable, especially with the approval for funding for the construction of a resistance training laboratory, the completion of which was to enable the Army to have a high-risk-of-capture training program.³

²Memo for Record [ ], Col Webb, AFIS/INU, "Trip Report - NCAS Cherry Point/Fort Bragg NC," 6 Apr 83, SD 178.
³Ibid.
FOAL EAGLE '83 SEREREX

In October and November, TSgt Allen E. Erickson of the Code of Conduct Training Branch observed the FOAL EAGLE '83 SEREREX (survival, evasion, resistance, escape, and rescue exercise) in Korea, conducted by the Combined Unconventional Warfare Task Force in the 9th Combined Special Forces Operational Base area of operations.

The SEREREX consisted of 1) evasion courses, emphasizing joint training in survival procedures and techniques for rescue forces and evaders and 2) interrogation, emphasizing joint training for interrogators and prisoners of war in interrogation, indoctrination, and resistance techniques.

Observations

TSgt Erickson was an observer and his trip report included many observations about the safety precautions imposed on the exercise operations, especially with the interrogation center and process. Some of his other findings were the following:

a. At least some ROKAF personnel receive resistance training of some sort. I observed a ROKAF NCO use more than 5 resistance postures quite skillfully.

b. US Army personnel observed received little Code of Conduct/Resistance Training. Some young enlisted personnel remembered that there was such a thing from a lecture they had received in basic training two years before. One WO-1 received OJT from his travel partner while they were evading. He said he had no resistance training at all.

c. Some USAF crewmembers had trouble recalling the details of navigational skills that they had learned as long as 11 years earlier or as recently as two years ago but managed to sort it out enough to reach their objectives on time. Other than that subject, their retention/recall of survival knowledge was amazing.

d. The aforementioned aircrews were able to move through heavily populated countryside for three days without being detected by the local populace or the US and ROK Special Forces troops that were assigned as spotters in the area.

e. Evaders said that they wished that they had received more night navigation training and practice. The evaders also said that they were going to talk to their life support personnel in an attempt to

---

1Trip Rpt [99], TSgt A. E. Erickson, AFIS/INU, "FOAL EAGLE '83 SEREREX," 14 Dec 83, SD 179.
2Ibid.
3Ibid.
4Ibid.
5Ibid.
6Ibid.
7Ibid.
get space blankets included in their survival vests. Aircrew members also stated that small, lightweight, binoculars would have aided their evasion greatly.  

Similar activities may take place during TEAM SPIRIT 84 with evasion and interrogation practice being conducted in various locales in Korea.  

Revision of AFR 64-3

The HQ USAF/XOOTA, the office of primary responsibility for Air Force Regulation 64-3, "Combat Search and Rescue," requested that the directorate review, comment upon, and coordinate on the draft revision of AFR 64-3. The directorate's recommendations were included in the final draft of the regulation, including the adoption of the Isolated Personnel Report, which standardized the Department of Defense with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on this item.  

DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Within the directorate, the Defense Support Programs Division with its three branches, Combined Services Support, Anti-Terrorism, and Technical Support was the action office for the executive agent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for operational combat survival. As such, it developed operational concepts, initiated and monitored programs, systems, and techniques to support. According to the division's mission statement, it also did the following:

- Developed and produced training in support of Air Force Regulation 208-1 on hostage survival.  
- Provided, upon request, technical recommendations to support human intelligence (HUMINT) and HUMINT-related activities.  
- Provided Air Force augmentation to, and management of the Combined Services Support Program (CSSP).  

Special Operations Conference

In December, Colonel Webb and five members of the directorate travelled to Fort Bragg, North Carolina, to attend the 1983 Worldwide Special Operations Conference in order for the directorate to exercise responsibility as the action office for the executive agent in the area of escape and evasion operations.

---

1Ibid.  
2Ibid.  
3Intvw AFIS Historian w. Col Webb, AFIS/INU, 17 Apr 84; Historical Data Rprt AFIS/INU, Jan-Dec 83, SD 166.  
4AFIS Regulation 23-1, 15 Feb 84, Section R, SD 182.  
5Ibid.  
6Ibid.  
7Ibid.
Colonel Webb, by request of J-1/SOD, was chairman of the Evasion and Escape Workshop, 6-7 December. There were five other workshops at the conference in addition to Colonel Webb's: Research and Development, Requirements, Command and Control, Communications/Electronics, and Psychological Operations. On the third day of the conference, each of the workshop chairmen reported back to the conference in general session.¹

**Evasion and Escape Workshop**

Specific topics of discussion during the Evasion and Escape Workshop included:²

c. Evasion equipment/lists/charts.
d. Joint Chiefs Staff Manual 718-83.
e. CINC's evasion and escape requirements.
f. Evader/escape debriefing procedures.

**Workshop Conclusions**

Conclusions of Colonel Webb's workshop were as follows:

b. The action office for the executive agent will draft, with the aid of the Army SERE School at Fort Bragg, a joint escape manual and disseminate to the CINCs and services for coordination.⁴

d. Joint Chiefs of Staff Memorandum 718-83, "Delineation of Responsibilities for Escape and Evasion," was discussed at length. Lines of communication, both formal and informal, must remain open to accomplish the initiatives necessary for a successful evasion and escape responsibility.⁶

¹Memo for Record and Atch, MSgt Lovelady, AFIS/INUAA, "Trip Report - Fort Bragg, NC - 5-7 Dec 83," 25 Jan 84, SD 180.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Ibid.
⁶Ibid.
CINC's evasion and escape requirements:
1. Requirements were voiced by the CINC's represented and were discussed at length.
2. The action office for the executive agent will respond and manage. 

Escape and evasion debriefing procedures will be drafted by the action office for the executive agent and disseminated to the services and CINC's for coordination.

An escape and evasion security classification guide will be drafted by the action office for the executive agent and disseminated to the services and CINC's for coordination.

The members of the directorate believed that the conference was a good opportunity to show the Special Operations community that the executive agent for escape and evasion was serious about making progress and achieving community supported goals.

Antiterrorism Program

Authorities


AFR 208-1 mandated that the ACS/I had to do the following:
- Work with the Air Force Office of Special Investigations to combat terrorism
- Produce intelligence on international terrorism
- Provide guidance to and train high-risk USAF personnel in the conduct of hostage survival
- Debrief rescued, escaped, or otherwise repatriated USAF hostages
- Coordinate debriefings with Air Staff to ensure all areas of interest are properly covered

Mission

---

1Ibid. 2Ibid. 3Ibid. 4Ibid. 5Point Paper Col Webb. AFIS/INR, "Hostage Survival Training," 17 Dec 82, SS 181. 6Ibid.
Presentations by Claude Watkins

Since 1980, in response to the U.S. embassy take-over and hostage crisis in Iran, Mr. Claude Watkins of the directorate provided hostage training to approximately 10,000 people from the four military services, the State Department, the National Security Agency, the Defense Nuclear Agency, the Defense Communications Agency, and the Central Intelligence Agency. His presentation was based on extensive research about "lessons learned" from past terrorist kidnappings of both civilian and military personnel. It drew heavily from the experience of Brig. Gen. James Dozier, USA, during his detention by a faction of Italy's Red Brigade and included examples from the U.S. hostage experience in Iran, hijacked civilian air crews and passengers, kidnapped businessmen, and a few prisoners of war.\(^2\)

Revising DOD 1300.7

On 10 November, the directorate submitted to the RCS/1 its recommended revisions to Department of Defense Directive 1300.7, "Training and Education Measures Necessary to Support the Code of Conduct," 13 May 1986. The submission included a nine-page section, "Guidance for Peacetime Conduct of US Military Personnel," and offered guidance for detention by both hostile governments and terrorists.\(^3\) The rationale for the guidance was as follows:

DOD personnel, due to their wide range of activities, are subject to peacetime detention by unfriendly governments or captivity by terrorist groups. This guidance seeks to help individuals survive these situations with honor and does not constitute a means for judgment or a vehicle for enforcement of proper conduct. This guidance, although exactly the same as the Code of Conduct in some areas, applies only during peacetime. The term "peacetime" denotes a situation where armed conflict does not exist or where armed conflict does exist but the US is not directly involved.

---

\(^1\) Historical Data Rprt AFIS/INU, Jan-Dec 1983, SD 165.

\(^2\) Ibid: Point Paper Col Webb, AFIS/INR, "Hostage Survival Training," 17 Dec 82, SD 181. For a chronological list of presentations by C. Watkins see Historical Data Rprt AFIS/INU, Jan-Dec 83, SD 166.

\(^3\) DOD Directive 1300.7 Proposed Revision as Atch, Staff Summary Sheet AFIS/INU to AF/IN et al. "DOD Directive 1300.7 Changes," 10 Nov 84, SD 151.
For specific missions or areas of assignment where individuals may have a high risk of peacetime detention or terrorist captivity, the military services are obligated to provide training and detailed guidance to such personnel to ensure their adequate preparation for the situation. Training will be reviewed and monitored for adequacy and consistency with this guidance by the executive agent for ASD/MRA&L.¹

¹Ibid.
Col. Ronald J. Webb, addressing participants at RIDGE RUNNER 83.
A participant in Exercise RIDGE RUNNER 83.
DIRECTORATE OF SOVIET AFFAIRS

MISSION

The mission of the Directorate of Soviet Affairs (INC), headquartered in Building 520 on Rolling AFB, was to carry out the U.S. Air Force Soviet Awareness Program, which was designed to keep each member of the Air Force informed and aware of Soviet doctrine, strategy, tactics, force structure, and combat employment.¹

PERSONNEL

Col. George V. Wish continued to head the directorate, a position he held since 1 October 1980. Lt. Col. William C. McDonald was chief of the Soviet Awareness Division since 15 June 1982, and Lt. Col. Larry Patterson was chief of the Literature Research Division, since 5 August 1982.²

The directorate's manpower strength was as follows:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>NUMBER ASSIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The manning situation in the directorate improved considerably this year as incoming personnel smoothed out some of the turbulence caused by changeovers which impaired mission effectiveness in 1982. The Soviet Awareness team came within one officer of being fully manned, thereby approaching a two-team capability. The Literature Research Division reached its authorized strength of officers and civilians, with only one enlisted billet vacant, which was a Slavic Crypto Linguist-Russian (20873A) slot. The third vacancy was an enlisted Intelligence Operations Technician (20170), whose position was created upon the deletion of a supply position.⁴

¹The detailed INC mission statement is found in AFISR 21-1, 15 Jul 82, Section F, SD 2. For an organizational chart of INC see SD 184.
²For a list of key personnel see SD 185. For a biographical summary sheet on Colonel Wish, see SD 186.
³Historical Data Rpt ⁵, AFIS/INC, Jan-Dec 83, SD 215.
⁴Ibid. See also Ltr ⁶, AFIS/INC to AFIS/DPR, "Transfer of Enlisted Billets," 15 Dec 83, SD 216.
Area Specialist Quota

In July, Colonel Wish requested that the agreement between his directorate and the Directorate of Attache Affairs (INH) be re-established with the Directorate of Personnel (DP), when DP assumed responsibility for the Area Specialist Program from INH. The agreement identified one officer per year for entry into the Area Specialist Program for training as a Soviet area specialist. Upon completion of training, the officer would receive follow-on assignment to the Soviet Awareness program. Colonel Wish stated, "If we can maintain this source of personnel, it will greatly alleviate some of the problems we have experienced in assigning fully qualified officers to the Directorate of Soviet Affairs." ¹

The colonel explained that his directorate would continue to look for its own nominees, but would also like to review those who had already applied to the Area Specialist Program. Should his directorate's nominee not be selected by the board for the program, he requested that his directorate still have the opportunity to interview the selectees and to identify one for a follow-on assignment to Soviet Affairs.²

The directorate did not receive a formal reply from DP, because the new temporary head of the program, Major Robert P. Aitraghi, was not able to formally allocate a quota of one slot to the Directorate of Soviet Affairs. The major was able and willing to cooperate with INC in other ways, some suggested by INC, to work to ensure that highly qualified individuals were assigned to Soviet Affairs.³

Soviet Awareness as "Breeding Ground"

Over the years, Soviet Awareness had become a "breeding ground" for future attaches and a follow-on assignment for post-attaché duty. A former Soviet Awareness director returned from Moscow in 1983, after having been the air attaché there for two years. Former team members were serving in defense attaché offices in Belgrade and Sofia. Another former team member and an executive officer were slated to report to Moscow in July 1984. One current team member had served an attaché tour in Moscow, as did a former division chief. The current executive officer and another former team member were selected for duty in Moscow in August 1986. In addition, the directorate was a source for qualified personnel to work in the demanding environment of the U.S. Military Liaison Mission in Potsdam, East Germany.⁴

¹Ltr ✎, APIS/INC to APIS/DP, "Annual Quota for Soviet Area Specialist Program," 5 Jul 83, SD 187.
²Ibid.
³Conversation ✎, APIS Historian w. Maj Aitraghi, APIS/DP, 16 Mar 84.
⁴Historical Data Rprt ✎, APIS/INC, Jan-Dec 83, SD 215.
Requests for Additional Manpower

In November, Soviet Affairs submitted two new initiative requests for the fiscal year 1986-1990 joint programming/budget data call. The first request was for three officer positions to enable the Soviet Awareness team to achieve a two-team capability. According to the requirement description, the current authorization of twelve officers was insufficient to field two six-man teams. Team personnel had to always be available to schedule deployments, to coordinate visits with the major commands and bases, to review and establish curricula, to set up special presentations, and to conduct training programs for new personnel. The three additional positions were to fulfill these management duties and were already validated by the Air Force's Management Engineering and Analysis Division in the fiscal year 1984 Program Objective Memorandum. The justification stated, "We are almost one year behind schedule with the Soviet Awareness Road Show; in CY 83 we will have visited 20 bases which had previously hosted the Soviet Awareness Team. Only 5 of these bases were briefed before in CY80, which means that our deployment schedule has indeed slipped toward a four year interval between visits. Given this slippage, due to manpower constraints, in exposing active Air Force members to Soviet Awareness, we lack the wherewithal to honor numerous requests by Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units who would be delighted to host our eight-hour Road Show. Thus we are not able to contribute to the Total Force Concept whose very relevancy would be substantially enhanced by the unique training conducted by Soviet Awareness."

The second initiative requested one additional manpower slot for the Literature Research Division, in order to continue publication of AFPR 200-1, "Soviet Press Selected Translations," at its current length and quality. According to the requirement description, AFPR 200-1 served a readership of approximately 6,000, ranging from academics to senior intelligence analysts to unit intelligence officers. Material for the publication was originally compiled, translated, edited, and published by two first lieutenants, one of whose billets was on loan, while the other was deleted at the end of the third quarter of fiscal year 1983. Since that time one captain and one civilian GS-7 accomplished all the work on a temporary basis. Maintaining AFPR 200-1 at its current length of 40-44 pages per issue, 6 issues per year, was a two-person job. If the additional slot was not funded there

1Ltr AFIS/INC to AFIS/XP, "FY86-90 Joint Programming/Budget Data Call," 3 Nov 83, SD 188; Narrative Justification for New Initiative AFIS/INCR, PR Code 847520, "Two Soviet Awareness Teams," 3 Nov 83, SD 189.
was predicted a permanent decline in publication frequency, quality, and length.¹

SECRETARY ORR'S VISIT AND REFURBISHING PROJECT


³Ibid; Memo [REDACTED], Secretary of the Air Force Verne Orr to Maj Gen Marks, ACS/I, "Memorandum for General Marks," 19 Jan 83, SD 192.
Due to the high level interest in the project generated by the secretary's comments, the priority ranking of the refurbishing project was raised drastically. Actual construction started in fiscal year 1983, instead of in fiscal year 1985 as originally planned.2

**ALLOCATION OF BUILDING 1304**

In October, the ACS/I requested that Air Force Programs and Resources consider allocating Building 1304 on Bolling AFB to the Directorate of Soviet Affairs. Colonel Wish had informed him that the building was to be vacated by the 21st Air Force NCO Leadership School and by units of the 1100th Air Base Wing, and that his directorate would welcome the move from the crowded and noisy Building 520. In justifying the move, the ACS/I stated, "Adequate office space would be provided for both divisions in the directorate. The auditorium already in place in Bldg 1304 could be modified to accommodate 100 seats vice the 70 in Bldg 520. It is also a larger more attractive room, thus more conducive as a learning medium for our objective of awareness. Naturally more personnel would be able to attend our courses. Our Russian source research facility which has burgeoned to over 10,000 volumes would have suitable space to permit more effective use by analysts throughout the intelligence community."3

A decision from the Programs and Resources unit was expected in early 1984.

**SOVIET AWARENESS PROGRAM**

This year there were no major revisions in the curriculum of the Soviet Military Power Week presentation nor in the one-day eight-hour Soviet Military Power Day presentation, the latter given at Air Force bases around the world, and referred to as the "Road Show." There was, however, a continuous upgrading of the 35 mm slides and video clips to ensure the currency of presentations. The four themes which characterize Russian (pre 1917) and Soviet (post 1917) history continued to be highlighted: 1) ideology, the importance of a shared belief system, 2) despotism, the command and control of society from Moscow where power was centralized, 3) modernization, the need to overcome

---

1 Ltr [Redacted], Maj Gen Marks, ACS/I, to 76 ALD/CC, "Upgrade of Soviet Awareness Equipment Display" [Redacted], 9 May 83, SD 193.
3 Memo [Redacted] and Atch [Redacted], Col Wish, AFIS/HCC to ACS/I, "Allocation of Building 1304, Bolling AFB," 14 Oct 83, SD 195.
backwardness, and 4) expansionism, the imperative to project influence externally as a matter of messianic destiny.¹

Statistics on Presentations

For 1983, attendance at Soviet Awareness presentations was categorized as follows:²

27,660 - Eight-hour classified programs, including Soviet Military Power Days and Road Shows

2,991 - Unclassified programs

907 - Soviet Military Power Weeks

41 - TDY Deployments

The cumulative attendance figures from 1975 through 31 December 1983 were the following:³

182,559 - Classified programs

31,510 - Unclassified programs

346 - TDY Deployments.

Diverse Groups of Attendees

Throughout the year, the Soviet Awareness presentations at Bolling AFB were attended by diverse audiences from the National Capital Region, including personnel from the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation; White House staff members; the Secretary of the Air Force, personnel from the Army and Navy, active and reservist; and members of the Reserve Forces Policy Board. For each of the last two years, the directorate presented a one-week class exclusively for special agents of the FBI who worked on Soviet foreign counterintelligence matters. According to the assistant director of the Intelligence Division at the FBI, "The Soviet Awareness School has been uniformly praised by FBI attendees, and knowledgeable counterintelligence training personnel consider the course the best of its kind given anywhere. For reasons of efficiency and operationally oriented priorities, FBI counterintelligence training programs have de-emphasized area and background studies. The Soviet Awareness School is an excellent vehicle for filling this training gap."

¹Historical Data Rprt ☐, APIS/INC, Jan-Dec 83, SD 215.
²Historical Data Rprt ☐, APIS/INC, Jan-Dec 83, SD 215.
³Ibid.
Road Show Presentation Declined

Although the audience for the Soviet Awareness presentations was diverse, it was also limited and restricted. In March, the operations manager for security, safety, and health at the TRW, Inc. at Redondo, California, wrote to Colonel Wish requesting that the Road Show be presented at his facility because he thought it was an "extremely effective course covering the hostile intelligence threat" and would be of value to his company, a Department of Defense contractor, in its awareness effort. Colonel Wish had to inform the manager that he could not schedule a presentation at the facility. He explained that the Soviet Awareness team did not schedule programs for contractors or any non-Department of Defense organization except by the direction of the assistant chief of staff, intelligence, for the U.S. Air Force. Contractors directly employed by the Department of the Air Force, however, were eligible to attend Soviet Awareness presentations at Air Force installations.  

Presentation at Vandenberg AFB

The Soviet Awareness presentation at Vandenberg AFB, California, 17-18 November, was presented to one of the largest audiences to date, 1,035 in the classified sessions and 475 at the unclassified shorter session. Since April, scheduling arrangements were underway to enable the Soviet Awareness team to visit Vandenberg, last visited by them in August 1980. The commander of the 1st Strategic Aerospace Division worked closely with the team to ensure that their unusual and demanding support requirements were met, including security, theater, equipment, and billeting support. The commander agreed to follow the strict ground rules for the unclassified two-hour evening presentation and had an excellent turn-out for the program. The rules were:

1Memo to Assistant Director, Intelligence Division, FBI, to Maj Gen Pfautz, ACS/I, "Soviet Awareness School, 19 Sep 83, SD 196; Memo, William H. Webster, Director, FBI, to ACS/I, "Soviet Awareness School," 4 Mar 83, SD 197.

2Ltr to Regis J. Carr, Jr. to Col Wish, AFIS/INC, r.s., 18 Mar 83, SD 198; Ltr to Col Wish to Regis J. Carr, Jr., TRW Inc., "Request for 'Red Eagle Road Show' (Your Ltr, 18 Mar 83)," 14 Apr 83, SD 199.
A. No press in attendance. People associated with the press could attend, but not in a reporting capacity.
   a. No discussion of topics other than those covered in the program.
C. The host commander or staff personally identifying all attendees.
D. The unclassified evening program offered in the same location as the classified program.

As with the Vandenberg program, a visit by the Soviet Awareness team to any base was preceded by months of planning and coordination, and this usually insured high caliber, flawless presentations. ¹

Presentation at Keflavik, Iceland

Staff from the directorate who were members of the Soviet Awareness briefing team visited Keflavik, Iceland, on 2-4 June, at the request of the commander, Air Forces Iceland. He was especially eager to have the team address the people under his command because they formed one of the few organizations in the Air Force which intercepted Soviet aircraft on a recurring basis. They had in April already intercepted 40 such aircraft since the start of the year. The team briefed 640 people in the classified program and 68 who attended the evening unclassified program. Some of those in attendance were Navy personnel who performed antisubmarine warfare operations from Keflavik. ²

USSR Orientation Visit Cancelled

One week before directorate personnel were to leave for a one-week orientation visit to the Soviet Union, the Soviets refused to issue entry visas, thus causing the cancellation of the trip in 1983. The trip had been planned for six months with the defense attache officers in Moscow; Sofia, Bulgaria; and Helsinki, Finland. The itinerary was to enter the USSR via rail from Helsinki, then to tour Leningrad 26-30 June; depart for Moscow via rail the night of 30 June and tour Moscow 1-7 July and depart Moscow via air for Sofia the morning of 8 July.

Approximately two weeks after the initial submission, the first indication of a problem occurred. The Soviets inquired about why the visitors would enter the country via Leningrad instead of Moscow. The standard U.S. official business reply was

² Ltr 4 , Col J. E. Smith, AFI/CC, to AFIS/INC, "Soviet Awareness Team," 12 Apr 82, SD 203; Ltr 5 , AFIS/INC to AFI/CC, n.s., 28 Jun 83, SD 217.
given. There were no further indications of a problem until 17 June, when the office at the Pentagon which handles passports informed the directorate that the Soviets officially refused to allow entry. Upon consultation with the Soviet desk at the State Department, it was learned that entry had been denied to other groups as well. The directorate planned to try again to send a team in 1984.1

**Briefing for ABC News Correspondent**

In May, the Public Affairs Office of the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force asked the ACS/I to provide an informal off-the-record discussion on Soviet matters for John McWethy of ABC News. McWethy wanted background information in preparation for a five-part special on defense that was to air sometime in the fall of 1983. A discussion with McWethy took place on 27 May. Present were Lt. Col. James M. Simpson, Capt. Mark C. Chavez, and Lt. McCutcheon of INC; Lt. Col. Phillip Gardner and Maj. Michael J. Sterling from INER; and Lt. Col. Fuller and Maj. Rand from public affairs.2

McWethy's main interest was a comparison of Soviet military training, tactics, and technology with those of the U.S. armed forces. The discussion was friendly and free-flowing. Lt. Col. Fuller informed the briefers that at some point McWethy wanted to get something on film. He said that McWethy understood that he would not be able to film or interview intelligence personnel, but that he did express a desire to film a Soviet Awareness presentation, showing just the audience and slides with a briefer's voice as the audio.3

McWethy's presentation was aired in the fall as a ten-part series. There was no film footage taken of a Soviet Awareness briefing, but McWethy did present Paul Holman from the DIA, who was a former director of curriculum at INC and who was a captain in the USAF Reserves who spent reservist time at INC reviewing, updating, and critiquing Soviet Awareness presentations.4

**Assistance with AF NCF Movie**

From at least December 1982 through September 1983, the

---

2Memo for Record, Lt Col McDonald, AFIS/INCR, "Background Discussion with John McWethy of ABC News," 12 Jun 83.
3Ibid.
4Intw, AFIS Historian w. Capt Yablonski, AFIS/INC, 22 Mar 84.
Aerospace Audio-Visual Service at Norton AFB, California, was producing an update of an Air Force NOW movie about the Soviet threat, made July 1976. The service requested and received the assistance of the Directorate of Soviet Affairs in this effort. On 15 and 16 February Captain Catherine Roeder from Norton, the film's producer, discussed Soviet history, ideology, people, and geography with Soviet Awareness staff members.  

In June, the Soviet Awareness staff reviewed and critiqued the movie script. A major objection focused on the linking of American nuclear freeze advocates with direct Soviet involvement and manipulation of the "freeze movement." On this subject, the script was rewritten and film edited. Another objection concerned the use of "Soviet Awareness" as the title of the film. It was subsequently retitled "An Update on the Soviet Union."  

LITERATURE RESEARCH  

During the year, the directorate's Literature Research Division continued to critically review authoritative and influential Soviet writings on military doctrine, strategy, tactics, and operational art and to translate selected materials into English.  

All Volumes and Issues Published in 1983:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soviet Military Concepts</th>
<th>Pub. Date</th>
<th>825 Addressees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 4-82 and No. 5-82 Electronic Warfare</td>
<td>Jun 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 6-82 Russian-English Glossary</td>
<td>Aug 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRP 200-1, Soviet Press Selected Translations</td>
<td>Pub Date</td>
<td>6300 Addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan and Feb Issue</td>
<td>Apr 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar and Apr Issue</td>
<td>May 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May and Jun Issue</td>
<td>Jul 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Memo [ ], Col Wish, INC/CC, to AF/IN, "Internal Information Coverage of Soviet Threat (AFSINC-OLE Ltr, 15 Feb 1983) - INFORMATION MEMORANDUM," 1 Mar 83, SD 207; Air Force NOW preview sheet, with handwritten annotations, "Soviet Awareness - A Special Report." Sep 83, AFRP166 Synopsis, SD 208.  
2Intvw [ ], AFIS Historian w. Capt Yablonski, AFIS/INC, 22 Mar 84.  
3Historical Data Rprt [ ], AFIS/INC, Jan-Dec 83, SD 215. For the INC publications in 1983 see SD 209.
AFRP 200-1. Soviet Press Selected Translations

Pub Date

6300 Addresses

Jul and Aug Issue
Oct 83

Sep and Oct Issue
Dec 83

Nov and Dec Issue
Jan 84

Copies Sold by the Government Printing Office: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>1983 Sales</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE SALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Soviet Military Thought&quot;</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>94,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Studies in Communist Affairs&quot;</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>14,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Feature - KAL 007

The special feature in the Nov-Dec 83 issue of "Soviet Press Selected Translations" included a translation of Colonel V. Filatov, "Flight From Anchorage," in Krasnaya zvezda, 13 September 1983, which was an interview with Soviet pilots involved in the Korean Airlines Flight 007 shootdown. Krasnaya zvezda (Red Star) was the official newspaper of the Ministry of Defense, appearing six times per week. It was published since 1 January 1924, and contained diverse articles of military interest, focusing on training, exercises, and military and political indoctrination. 2

Canadian Translations

---

1Ibid. For a list of sales figures on all titles within the SMT and SCA series see "Sales of Soviet Military Thought" Books FY 1983, 6 Dec 83, SD 210.
2AFRP 200-1, Nov-Dec 83, 83-6, "Soviet Press Selected Translations."
Coordination with Department of State

The Department of State assigned Edmund McWilliams as the new publications procurement officer in Moscow, and Colonel Wish informed the coordinator of maps and publications at the State Department that he hoped the new officer would continue to supply a steady flow of Soviet publications -- books, newspapers, magazines, and journals -- to the directorate. The colonel stated the directorate's priorities for publication acquisition:

a. Soviet military doctrine, strategy, and tactics.
b. All Soviet Air Force and Air Defense-related publications.
c. All other Soviet military-related publications.
d. Soviet military posters and uniform items.
e. Political, economic, and social publications.
f. Tourism publications.

The colonel concluded, "The publications procurement program has provided us with numerous worthwhile publications over the years. We look forward to a continuation of this relationship under Mr. McWilliams' guidance."²

Exchange in the National Review

In the National Review on 30 September 1983, there was an exchange of comments between Brig. Gen. Richard F. Abel, Director of Public Affairs for the Air Force, and Brian Crozier, who had written the article, "The Burial of Detente?" in the NR, 8 July 1983, in which he discussed the supposed cessation of translation of Soviet "textbooks" instituted by the Air Force.

²Ltr Col Wish to Elizabeth K. Womeldorf, Coordination for Maps and Publications, Department of State, n.s., 7 Jul 83, SD 218.
during Maj. Gen. George Keegan's tenure as director of Air Force Intelligence. General Abel stated the following:

The Air Force has not suspended publication of these translations, and, in fact, the office whose responsibility it is to produce these books has added two other continuing publications to its output: another book series that serves as a vehicle for Western students of Soviet military affairs and a periodical devoted to a detailed study of Soviet military terminology. You will be interested to note that the most recent item in the new series is a two-volume collection of Soviet military writings compiled in part by Joseph D. Douglass, when Mr. Crozier mentions as "one of the best informed American students of Soviet war doctrine."

Crozier replied by stating, in part:

General Abel's letter is perhaps technically accurate, but it is also seriously misleading...

1. After General Keegan's departure as head of U.S. Air Force Intelligence, publication of translated Soviet texts did continue, but a) was reduced to a trickle; and b) consisted for the most part of low-grade material of no great interest.

2. The reason (or pretext) for this dramatic change was the Soviets' decision in 1973, to adhere to the Universal Copyright Convention. (The important material previously published had all been issued before 1973). The reason, it may be ventured, was to avoid giving offense to the Soviets in the interest of detente.

In fact, as General James L. Brown, who succeeded General Keegan, has stated, publication of post-1973 texts could have been made on a restricted "government-only basis," but this option seems to have been very sparingly used. An important example of Soviet use of the copyright weapon was Moscow's refusal in March 1977 to allow the USAF to publish Admiral Gorshkov's book Sea Power of the State.

The directorate and the Air Force did not respond to Crozier's reply.

---

1 Ltr, "Russians in Print," National Review, 30 Sep 83, photocopy, SD 213.
2 Ibid., See also Ltr, Brig Gen Abel to William F. Buckley, Jr., Editor, National Review Incorporated, n.s., 14 Jul 83, SD 214.
3 "Mr. Crozier Replies," National Review, 30 Sep 83, photocopy, SD 213.
Since the 1970s, the Soviets, through their USSR All-Union Copyright Agency (VAAAP), have periodically refused to allow INC to translate and publish some books. According to the Universal Copyright Convention of 1952, a party to the convention could still print works which were denied, after a period of seven years.¹

¹Intvw , AFIS Historian w. Capt Yablonski, AFIS/INC, 22 Mar 84.
Some of the Soviet items on exhibit by the Directorate of Soviet Affairs.
Publications and research area of the Directorate of Soviet Affairs.
DIRECTORATE OF ATTACHE AFFAIRS

MISSION AND DEFENSE ATTACHE SYSTEM

The principal mission of the Directorate of Attache Affairs (INH) was to develop capabilities for Air Force participation in the Defense Attache System (DAS), to monitor performance and results of that participation, and to exercise general cognizance over Air Force aspects of the attache program. The Defense Attache System was a joint military service activity, which since 1965 operated under direct control of the Defense Intelligence Agency. In 1983 the distribution of positions in the system was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Service</th>
<th>No. of Positions</th>
<th>Percentage of DAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARMY</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR FORCE</td>
<td>192*</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVY</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINE CORPS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>596</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure includes 7 positions authorized by the DIA, but not yet on the AFIS/INH authorization list.

There were 92 defense attache offices around the world, and because some attache were accredited to more than one nation, they had responsibility for over 100 countries. The Air Force positions in the DAS were assigned to 61 embassies. In 21 countries, the air attache was also the senior service attache and was designated the "defense" attache, commonly referred to as the DATT. Defense attaches who were Air Force officers served in the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Honduras, Israel, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Soviet Union, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia. In three countries, Brazil, China, and the Soviet Union, the DATT position was filled by an Air Force officer for 2 of every 6 years.

1The detailed INH mission statement is found in AFISR 23-1, 15 Jul 82, Section M, SD 2; Brfg Paper , "Air Attache Briefing," AFIS/INH, Jan 84, pp 5-6, SD 219. This paper contains a brief historical sketch of the military attache system, and on 8 Sep 83 Lt Col Gillaspay and SSgt Harland presented it to Kenneth E. deGraffenreed, the Director of Intelligence Programs for the National Security Council. Intvw , AFIS Historian w. Capt Gibbs, AFIS/INH, 17 Jan 84.

The positions Air Force personnel were assigned to in the DAS were defense attache (DATT), air attache (AIRA), assistant air attache (AAIRA), operations coordinator (OPSCO)—similar to the NCOIC position—intelligence assistant, and mechanic. Civilians were sometimes intelligence assistants or secretaries.1

**New Positions**

In 1983, the DIA established three officer positions within the attache system to be filled by Air Force personnel: defense attache in the United Kingdom, air attache in El Salvador, and assistant air attache in the People's Republic of China. Also, the DIA switched two enlisted intelligence assistant positions from London to South Africa and Korea. This occurred because the DIA reorganized the enlisted staff in London in order to have one intelligence assistant from the Army, Navy, and Air Force, instead of three from the Air Force. The defense attache in London had requested the changes in order to provide the office tri-service expertise in the support areas.2

**Attache Manning Rates**

Over the last four fiscal years, the attache manning rates have been the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 84 (1st Q)</th>
<th>FY 83</th>
<th>FY 82</th>
<th>FY 81</th>
<th>FY 80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Authorized</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Assigned</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The directorate considered attache positions as "authorized," dating from the time the attache was expected to arrive on station as an embassy.3

**INH DIRECTORATE**

The Attache Affairs Directorate was located on the

1Interview, AFIS Historian with Capt. Gibbs, AFIS/INH, 17 Jan 84; "Defense Attache Offices," Arch 5, INH Recruitment Package, SD 220.

2Interview, AFIS Historian with Capt. Gibbs, AFIS/INH, 14 Feb 84; Ltr CON, INH to AF/IN (Col. Morris, Br Gen Martin, Maj Gen Pfautz), "Realignment of Air Force Intelligence Assistant Billets Within OAS," 28 Jul 83, SD 221; DIA Form 665, Control No. U-368-83/RHR-3C, 22 Nov 83, SD 222; DIA Form 665, Control No. U-270-83/RHR-3C, 22 Aug 83, SD 223.

second floor of Building T-1923 in the AFIS compound. From March through June the area underwent extensive renovation and the capability of the staff to conduct business as usual was limited. Suspended ceilings with recessed lighting were installed, and new walls with paneling were constructed.\(^1\)

**Personnel**

Col. James E. Steinmiller continued as director of INH, which was organized into two main divisions. Lt. Col. Edward D. Gillaspy was chief of the Officer Selection, Training, and Support Division, and SMSgt Kenneth E. Pool was chief of the Enlisted Selection and Administration Division. The directorate was manned according to authorized strength.\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Authorized</th>
<th>Number Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\)One officer billet was vacant since May 1982 when Lt. Lomax was medically retired. It was filled in October 1983 when Lt. Leach arrived.

**MICOM 2002 Word Processor**

In 1983, the directorate acquired a new Philips MICOM 2002 Word Processing System, to replace the Hazeltine 2000 system, which was obtained in 1976 and which often malfunctioned or broke down. A major feature of the MICOM was its compatibility with the system in use in the AFIS Directorate of Personnel, which had the possibility of future interface with the Personnel Data System at the Headquarters Military Personnel Center at Randolf AFB, Texas.\(^3\)

**ATTACHE SELECTION STATISTICS**

In coordination with Headquarters USAF and the Air Force Manpower and Personnel Center, the INH directorate reviewed, evaluated, and nominated 38 officers to the Defense Intelligence Agency for service in the Defense Attache System. The following

---

\(^1\)DA Form 4283 ( ), 2 Nov 81, Serial No. 00052, Bldg 1923, SD 224.

\(^2\)Historical Data Rprt ( ), AFIS/INH, Jan-Dec 83. For a biographical sketch of Col Steinmiller see SD 225. For an organizational chart of INH see SD 226. For a list of INH key personnel see SD 227.

is a comparative summary of the officer panels conducted in 1983 and 1982:

OFFICER SELECTION STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CY 1983</th>
<th>CY 1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Panels</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by Panels</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproved by Panels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated to DIA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawals before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA Approval</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by DIA</td>
<td>35 (others pending as of 31 Dec 83)</td>
<td>40 (includes 2 pending in Dec 82, approved 83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawals after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA Approval</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproved by DIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by DIA but</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned because of Incumbent Extension</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive Overseas Tours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Attache Team Members Selected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of persons nominated to DIA (38) exceeded the number approved by the panels (37), because one officer was nominated who had prior experience in the Defense Attache System, and for him a panel interview was not necessary.

ATTACHE SELECTION CRITERIA

Of the officers approved by the panels in 1983, there were 6 nominated to positions as defense attache, 16 as air attache, and 13 as assistant air attache. There were 16 colonels approved, 7 lieutenant colonels, 7 majors, and 5 captains. The following criteria were used to make the selections:

1. GRADES - Captain through brigadier general.

---

1 Historical Data Rprt, AFIS/INH, Jan-Dec 83; AFIS History, 1 Jan-31 Dec 82, p 92.
2. REAL PROMOTABILITY - Outstanding record looked for and no passover accepted.

3. ADVANCED DEGREES - Preference for degrees in international affairs or foreign languages.

4. LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY - Proficiency rating of S-1/R-3 required for most positions.

5. WELL-ROUNDED AIR FORCE CAREER - Volunteers encouraged, but officer must fit requirements.

6. AIR ATTACHE SELECTION PANEL - Interviews potential attache and spouse.

Most attaches were rated officers. They were recruited by "word-of-mouth," by current and former attaches, and through the Air Force News Service, the Air Force Association Magazine, and the Air Force Times. Personnel from the directorate also briefed students about the defense attache system who were attending the Air War College, Air Command and Staff College, Squadron Officer School, Air Force Academy, and Air Force NCO academies.\(^1\)

**SELECTION PANELS**

The Air Force was the only military service which used panels during the process of selecting personnel for nomination to the DIA and the attache system. The director of Attache Affairs, Colonel Steinmiller, believed that the panels were worth their expense because the Air Force had fewer people recalled from embassies than the other services, since the panels enabled the Air Force to select and send individuals of the highest caliber.\(^2\)

The officer panels consisted of six members: the chairman, who was the deputy assistant chief of staff for intelligence or his designated representative, and a representative from the Defense Intelligence Agency.\(^3\)

The attache directorate brought the potential attache and spouse to Washington to appear before the selection panel, the purpose of which was to determine if the husband and wife could work as a professional team and creditably represent the U.S. government, the secretary of defense, the secretary of the Air Force, and the ambassador, while acting independently in a highly visible official and social milieu. While in Washington, the candidate also had an opportunity to learn more about the attache.

---

\(^1\)Intvw □, AFIS Historian w. Col Steinmiller, AFIS/INH, 17 Jan 84.

\(^2\)Ibid.

program and pose questions about the Defense Attache System and particular assignments and living conditions.\(^1\)

**ENLISTED SELECTEES**

Enlisted personnel chosen for duty in the Defense Attache System were usually staff through master sergeants, who were assigned as "intelligence assistants," and senior and chief master sergeants, who were assigned as "operations coordinators." The positions were mostly for administrative specialists and aircraft mechanics for C-12 Beechcraft twin-engine aircraft.\(^2\)

Enlisted candidates and their spouses were also interviewed by panels. The enlisted panels consisted of seven members: the director of Attache Affairs, the chiefs of the two divisions within the attache directorate, three senior NCOs from within the Air Force intelligence community, and a representative from the Defense Intelligence Agency. The following is a comparative summary of the panels conducted in 1983 and 1982:\(^3\)

**ENLISTED SELECTION STATISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CY 1983</th>
<th>CY 1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Panels Conducted</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by Panels</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproved by Panels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated to DIA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawals before DIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by DIA</td>
<td>42 (2 pending)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproved by DIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by DIA but Returned because of Incumbent Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive Overseas Tours</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Attache Team Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number nominated to DIA exceeded the number approved by the panels because some persons were nominated for consecutive

---

\(^1\) Intvw \(\_\_\), AFIS Historian w. Col Steinmiller, AFIS/INH, 17 Jan 84; Srfg paper \(\_\_\) "Air Attache Briefing," AFIS/INH, Jan 84, p 18, SD 219.

\(^2\) Intvw \(\_\_\), AFIS Historian w. Col. Steinmiller, AFIS/INH, 17 Jan 84.

\(^3\) Ibid; Historical Data Rprt \(\_\_\), AFIS/INH, Jan-Dec 83; AFIS History \(\_\_\), Jan-31 Dec 82, p 92. For a list of the NCOs selected, see SD 231.
overseas tours or had prior attache service experience and no panel interviews for them were required. 

ENLISTED MANNING RATES

Over the last four fiscal years, the enlisted manning rates have been the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO. AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>NO. ASSIGNED</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>OFFICER AUTHORIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY84 (1st Q)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY83</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY81</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the authorized officer positions have increased by 5 over the years, from 89 to 94, the authorized enlisted positions have remained unchanged at 91.

TRAINING PROGRAM

After the selection process, the Attache Affairs Directorate designed a training program tailored to the needs of the designate, taking into consideration his background and the country to which he might be assigned. As a rule, each attache attended a twelve-week attache course at the Defense Intelligence College in Washington, D.C. Spouses were encouraged to attend the entire course and to join tours and attend seminars conducted by the State Department. When necessary, an attache and spouse attended a five to ten-month language course. Some attaches required additional specialized training, which included training with the C-12 aircraft. In those countries where the government was considering the purchase or had already purchased a certain aircraft, such as the F-5, F-15, or F-16, the directorate arranged a series of specialized briefings with the system's project officer and with factory representatives at the production line. The attaches also attended a series of specialized briefings and consultations with the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Air Staff in the Pentagon.

1Intvw  , AFIS Historian w. SMSgt Pool, AFIS/INH, 14 Feb 84.
2"Attache Manning Comparison" , AFIS/INH, 31 Dec 83, in AFIS Commander's Book, AFIS/CV.
Prior to arriving on station attaches received briefings at the appropriate unified command.\textsuperscript{1}

\textbf{Naval Postgraduate School}

\textsuperscript{2} To improve the qualifications of the attaches, the directorate sent some designates to the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California, to enroll in a master's degree program sponsored by the Air Force Institute of Technology. Every six months, January and July, approximately ten students were sent. The academic phase of the program lasted twelve months. Language training then followed, conducted by the Defense Language Institute, which lasted from six to twelve months, depending on the difficulty of the language. Upon completion of language training, the officers were awarded masters degrees in national security affairs.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{3} The directorate funded a guest lecture program at the Naval Postgraduate School, which enrolled attaché designates. There were 43 speakers in 1983 (some repeats) costing $8,270.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{4} Because of the critical importance of language fluency to the attaché mission, the directorate funded a language tutorial program for the designates. In 1983, languages were tutored for 126 hours at a total cost of $4,564, an average expenditure of $14 per hour. The languages were: Hebrew, 8 weeks; Portuguese, 7 weeks; Japanese, 20 weeks; Italian, 7 weeks; German, 7 weeks; Chinese Mandarin, 16 weeks; and Brazilian, 3 weeks.\textsuperscript{4}

\textbf{AIR ATTACHE MISSIONS}

\textsuperscript{5} Attaché Affairs was located within AFIS, because a primary mission of an attaché was the overt collection of intelligence information. The INH directorate described the four primary missions of an air attaché as follows:5

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1. The overt collection and reporting of military and politico-military intelligence information. The attaché has been the first link in the United States strategic warning system regarding an outbreak of
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{1} Excerpt from Brfg Paper \textsuperscript{6}, "Air Attache Briefing," AFIS/INH, Jan 84, p 19, SD 219.

\textsuperscript{2} "Naval Postgraduate School," Atch 4, INH Recruitment Package, SD 220. In 1983, the Area Specialist Program was transferred from the AFIS Directorate of Attache Affairs to the Directorate of Personnel. See p 216 of this history.

\textsuperscript{3} Inquiry Response from Capt Gibbs, AFIS/INH to AFIS Historian, 5 Mar 84.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{5} Excerpt from Brfg Paper \textsuperscript{7}, "Air Attache Briefing," AFIS/INH, Jan 84, pp 6-7, SD 219.
hostilities, and collection and reporting in his primary mission.¹

2. Representation of the chief of staff and the secretary of the Air Force to the host country air force. The attache is the key to the representational system, suitably placed to influence other countries' air forces to "marry" into United States Air Force equipment, tactics, doctrine, etc.²

3. Foreign military sales. This part of the air attache mission is performed in a selected number of countries that have no United States military advisory group or mission, due to the reductions in manning of the military advisory groups and mission. There is a growing trend to shift more of this responsibility to the attache.³

4. Advisory role to the ambassador. In world crises and conflicts, attaches are not only the defense department's eyes and ears, they are also heavily depended upon for their military expertise in the coordinated execution of U.S. policy, working with the presidential representative -- the ambassador.⁴

STAFF VISITS TO DAOs

¹Ibid., p 6.
²Ibid., p 6-7.
³Ibid., p 7.
⁴Ibid., p 7.
⁵Ltr [REDACTED], INH to AFIS/CV, AFIS/CC, ACS/I, "Visit to Africa/Middle East Defense Attache Offices (DAOs)," 21 Jul 83, SD 232.
Some of Colonel Steinmiller's conclusions were as follows:¹

¹Ibid. The colonel's remarks were extracted from his trip report and edited by the historian. For the lengthy original report, which the ACS/I read and commented on, see SD 232.

²Ibid.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
RESULTS OF TRIP

As a result of several suggestions and proposals from Air Force personnel in the field, including a suggestion to Colonel Steinmiller on his trip to Africa and the Middle East, the directorate started to print a newsletter, Attache' Affairs. In 1983, two editions were published, in July and December. In the July issue, Colonel Steinmiller told those in the defense attache system, "We have created Attache' Affairs to serve you and complement our efforts to meet our mission of providing a link between you and the Air Force. For those of you at the far corners of the world, as well as those of you right around the corner, Attache' Affairs will relay Air Force information we feel

1Ibid.
2Ibid; Intvw [ ], AFIS Historian w. Col Steinmiller, AFIS/INF, 17 Jan 84; Ltr [ ], Director, DIA, Lt Gen J. A. Williams, to All Defense Attaches, "Role of the Defense Attaches" 23 Nov 81, SD 233. The letter was originally classified, but here appears as a supporting document with two paragraphs deleted, making the letter unclassified.
might be of particular interest to all of you out there in 'never
never' land." The newsletter was to cover topics such as changes
in personnel policies, the follow-on assignments of those
departing station, consecutive tour assignment options, personnel
changes in the defense attache system, and convening dates of
promotion and professional military education boards.¹

In the second edition of the newsletter, the ACS/I told
those in the field:

As a former Attache I am well acquainted with the
demands on you and your families. Being so far away,
you may often feel somewhat forgotten and believe your
efforts are not fully recognized here in Washington. I
assure you this is not the case.

Your duties are as important as they are unique.
You are representatives of the United States and the Air
Force. As such, you play a key role in enhancing our
diplomatic relationships and fostering mutual
understanding and accord. Additionally, you are in a
position to provide first-hand assessments of your
assigned country's political events and policy changes.
This is essential to the development of our own national
policies and objectives.

Few other jobs have the magnitude and scope of
responsibilities as do those in the Defense Attache
System. You are doing a fine job in meeting those
challenges. Please keep up the effort.²

AIR ATTACHE INCENTIVE SUPPLY PROGRAM

The directorate continued to manage the Air Force
Representational Gift Program, but changed the name of the program
to "Air Attache Incentive Supply Program." This was a program
whereby tasteful yet inexpensive items were given to individuals,
organizations, or groups who were in positions to assist in
developing social contacts. The name was changed for two reasons:
1) the program was limited to air attaches and was not an Air
Force program as the first name indicated and 2) Air Force
Regulation 200-4 provided definitions for "representational gifts"
and "incentive supplies" and the latter term more appropriately
described the attache use of the items.³

SUPPORT ON STATION

More than a dozen times, the directorate provided
support to the attaches on station, assisting them with

¹Newsletter, Attache Affairs, AFIS/INH, Jul 83, p 1, SD 234.
²Ibid., Dec 83, SD 235.
³Inquiry Response, Capt Gibbs, AFIS/INH, to AFIS Histor-
iian. 5 Mar 84.
information items, or referrals to those who were best able to provide the required answers. The following cases illustrate the type of assistance the directorate directly provided:

In April, the Israeli Air Force requested use of public relations films about the space shuttle or current aviation and flying subjects. The directorate arranged for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to mail the attaché a copy of the film, "STS-4, Post Flight Press Conference Film," 16 mm, color and sound. Also in April, the Peruvian Air Force requested a copy of a report on the South Atlantic conflict, which was mentioned in a newspaper article published in Lima, referring to a report on the British-Argentine conflict of 1982. After coordinating with the Navy, the directorate sent the attaché a copy of the study, "Lessons of the Falklands."¹

In May, the Hong Kong Aviation Club was to auction off equipment from the defunct Far Eastern Technical School. The attaché notified the directorate about the pieces to be auctioned and requested that the Smithsonian Institution be notified. The directorate contacted the National Air and Space Museum, which was interested in the items.²

In July the Australian Department of Aviation requested detailed information about the capabilities of Canton Island and Johnston Atol for handling Boeing 727S aircraft. Australia was purchasing them and was considering ferrying them through Canton/Johnston, where they would require refueling. The directorate told the attaché that the department should communicate directly with the associate administrator for international aviation and provided the Washington, D.C. address.³

In August, the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) was considering a lease-purchase agreement for Gulfstream III aircraft, similar to the agreement between the company and the U.S. Air Force. The Australians were interested in details of

¹Msg ☐ USDAO, Tel Aviv, Israel, to AFIS/INH, "Public Relations Films," 1416542 Apr 83; Msg ☐, AFIS/INH to USDAO, Tel Aviv, "Public Relations Films," 2119122 Apr 83; Msg ☐, USDAO, Lima, Peru, to AFIS/INH, "Request for Information, South Atlantic Conflict," 1417162 Apr 83; Msg ☐, AFIS/INH to USDAO, Lima, Peru, "Request for Information, South Atlantic Conflict," 2119302 Apr 83.

²Msg ☐ USDLO, Hong Kong to AFIS/INH, "Auction of Antique Aircraft and Engines," 0208112 May 83; Msg ☐, AFIS/INH to USDLO, Hong Kong, "Auction of Antique Aircraft and Engines," 0220302 May 83.

³Msg ☐ USDAO, Canberra, Australia, to AFIS/INH "Airfield Facilities at Canton Island and Johnston Atol," 2700202 Jul 83; Msg ☐, AFIS/INH to USDAO, Canberra, Australia, "Airfield Facilities at Canton Island and Johnston Atol," 0218302 Aug 83.
the U.S. agreement. In particular, they wanted to know the flying hour maintenance arrangements and the lease financing and future-buy options. The RAAF was somewhat disturbed upon reading in Aviation Week that the initial three aircraft that the USAF was to lease in 1983-1984 for $3.2 million was $10 million cheaper than the price quoted to the RAAF. 1

In October, the attache in Athens, Greece, requested information on the SIII 5-3ER ejection seat, manufactured by the Stencel Corporation of Asheville, North Carolina. The directorate contacted a representative of the company, who promptly sent the information to the attache. 2

MID-TOUR REPORTS

The directorate instituted a new policy this year by requesting that the attaches submit mid-tour reports, according to a suggested format. Colonel Steinmiller explained that the reports would be used to improve the lot of the attaches for the last half of their tours and to insure that there were "no surprises" for their successors. He encouraged candid comments concerning classified and unclassified subject matter. At the end of December, twenty-four reports were submitted, forming the basis of an invaluable source of information about the nature, problems, and opportunities of air attache duty at specific defense attache offices around the world. 3

PROMOTION STATISTICS

Promotion rates for attaches as a group were traditionally 15 to 40 percent higher than line of the Air Force. Over the last five years the statistics were the following: 4

ATTACHE PROMOTION STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIR FORCE</th>
<th>ATTACHE</th>
<th>NO. ELIGIBLE</th>
<th>NO. SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CY79</td>
<td>Col 35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LtCol 60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maj 74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Msg "USDAO, Canberra, Australia to AFIS/INH, "Gulfstream Lease-Purchase by USAF," 010011Z Aug 83.
3Form Ltr Col Steinmiller, AFIS/INH, to [Attaché] "Mid-Tour Report," n.d. For the twenty-four valuable reports see SD 229.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIR FORCE</th>
<th>ATTACHE</th>
<th>NO. ELIGIBLE</th>
<th>NO. SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CY80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LtCol</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LtCol</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LtCol</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LtCol</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the years, the captains eligible for promotion to major have had the best promotion rate, with everyone eligible consistently being promoted.

Statistics available for enlisted promotions were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENLISTED PROMOTION STATISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the two years, the enlisted personnel in the attache system were constantly promoted at higher rates than their counterparts in the line Air Force. SMSGt Pool noted and disseminated this
data about higher promotion rates when he recruited personnel for
the Air Force enlisted positions in the Defense Attache System. 1

UNSCHEDULED RETURNS FROM STATIONS

Two enlisted personnel and two officers returned
unscheduled from their duty stations in 1983. 2

A master sergeant from Ecuador returned because of a
dependent’s medical problems. In Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, a tragic
occurrence caused a second master sergeant to return for medical
care. On 3 June, two intruders broke into the home of MSgt and
Mrs. Stanley M. Nestor, and stabbed the sergeant in the chest,
face, shoulder and thigh. He was flown for treatment to Clark Air
Base in the Philippines. The physician there prognosed permanent
loss of sight to the left eye. MSgt Nestor was eventually sent to
Malcolm Grow Hospital at Andrews Air Force Base. He was also
reassigned to Andrews and did not return to Kuala Lumpur. 3

A colonel, the air attaché to Romania, returned to the
United States, in the best interest of the Defense Intelligence
Agency and the Air Force, after serving eighteen months of a two-
year tour. A captain, the assistant air attaché to Germany,
returned after serving only three months for personal reasons
involving dependents. 4

1Intvw w, AFIS Historian w. SMSgt Pool, AFIS/INH, 17 Jan
84 and 14 Feb 84. Historical Data Rprt w AFIS/INH, Jan-Dec 83.
There were two promotion cycles for MSgt in 1983. See SD 236.
2Intvw w, AFIS Historian w. SMSgt Pool and Capt Gibbs,
AFIS/INH, 17 Jan 84.
3Ibid.; Msg and Atchs, DSDAO Kuala Lumpur to AFIS/AFSAC,
"Assistance - MSgt Stanley Nestor," 060328Z Jun 83, SD 237.
4Inquiry RespOuses Capt Gibbs, AFIS/INH, to AFIS
Historian, 5 Mar 84, 16 May 84.
Col. Don H. Kincaid, Air Attache to Japan, (center, rear) and a Japanese delegation.
Col. Conal J. Brady, Jr., (left, foreground), Air Attaché to Poland, carries a wreath at a ceremony in Poland.
Col. Wilfred C. Hamann (left, foreground), Air Attaché to the Netherlands, attending a field briefing.
Captain and Mrs. S. K. Palmer at the Great Wall near BeDaling, China. They were trained for attache duty through the Directorate of Attache Affairs.
CHAPTER V

INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT

Directorate of Security and Communications Management
Directorate of Intelligence Reserve Forces
Directorate of Personnel
Directorate of Intelligence Data Management (See Annex B to AFIS CY 1983 HISTORY)
MISSION

The Directorate of Security and Communications Management (INS) managed and evaluated all sensitive compartmented information (SCI)** security functions and controlled and disseminated SCI information. It also managed the worldwide Air Force Special Security Office (AFSSO) system by ensuring compliance with SCI security policies concerning communications, administration, physical security, billet management, and personnel programs.¹

Personnel from the directorate represented the Air Force on five Director of Central Intelligence committees: Security Committee, Physical Security Subcommittee, Training and Security Awareness Subcommittee, Unauthorized Disclosure Subcommittee, and Compartmentation Subcommittee.²

REORGANIZATION

The directorate underwent reorganization in 1983, the main results being the following:³

1. The elimination of the INSA division, Collateral Security and Administrative Support.
2. The establishment of two branches within the Personnel Security Division (INSB): For Cause/Due Process Branch and the Adjudication Branch.

The reorganization occurred over a period of months and had multiple causation. The ACG/I directed that the INSA division, Collateral Security and Administrative Support, be eliminated, and when this was done, some of the division’s functions were distributed to the operational control of AF/IN. This presented an opportunity for the directorate to work closely with the AFIS Manpower Office to formally structure the directorate into divisions and branches and to have these and associated

---

*See also Chapter VII, INSPECTOR GENERAL, "Special Inquiry."

**According to DOD 5200.1-R, 7 Dec 82, sensitive compartmented information was defined as that information and material that required special controls for restricted handling within compartmented intelligence systems and for which compartmentation was established.

¹The detailed INS mission statement is found in AFISR 23-1 15 Jul 82, Section K, SD 2.
²Intvw AFIS Historian W. Col Ruey and Lt Col Abel. AFIS/INS, 25 Apr 84.
³Ibid. AFISR 23-1 15 Jul 82, Section K, SD 2.
positions and billets officially entered onto manpower and personnel documents. Prior to this time, the directorate’s manpower documentation showed only positions and personnel with no formal structural organization. Within the directorate, however, such structures as divisions and branches did exist, but unofficially. It was an appropriate time, too, to consider and implement recommendations from a study of the Personnel Security Division (INSA), by the Manpower Office in 1982.¹

On 20 May, the INSA division was eliminated.² Effective 9 November, the Personnel Security Division was restructured into three branches: 1) Adjudication with three sections, A, B, and C, each with its own chief; 2) Billet Management, with two sections, Billet Management and Data Automation, and 3) For Cause and Due Process.

Within the Management Division (INSC), the three branches of the organizational structure remained basically the same as in 1982: Policy Branch, Administrative Support Branch, and Facilities Branch. The position of division deputy chief, however, was established in June 1983 to provide greater coordination of actions between the Policy Branch and the Facilities Branch. In August, the title of the position was changed to “operations officer” to provide a more descriptive, functional position title.⁴

Finally the reorganized INSD division consisted of three branches.⁵ As requested by the Manpower Office, definitions of

¹Intvw with AFIS Historian w. Col Huey and Lt Col Abel, AFIS/INS, 25 Apr 84. Over the years, the collateral security function had passed in and out of the control of the INS directorate, which primarily managed the SCI security function. See for example, AFIS History, 1 Jan - 31 Dec 82, pp 63-64. See also Ltr and Atchs, AFIS/INS to AFIS/INS, "Manpower Standards Study Final Report," 2 Apr 82, SD 239.

²Ltr and Atch, AFIS/INS to AF/IN Exec et al, "Realignment of AFIS/INSA Authorizations and Functions (AF/IN Exec Memo, 20 May 83)," 23 May 83, SD 239.


⁴For detailed functional statements for each branch of the Management Division, see Historical Data Rprt, AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 241.

⁵Ltr with 2 Atchs, AFIS/INS to AFIS/INS, 6 Jun 83, SD 243; Ltr with 1 Atch, AFIS/INS to AFIS/INS, "AFIS/INSD Reorganization (Your Ltr, 6 Jun 83)," 20 Jun 83, SD 244; Ltr with 1 Atch, AFIS/INS to AFIS/INS, "AFIS/INSD Reorganization (Your Ltr, 6 Jun 83)," 12 Sep 83, SD 245.
branch responsibilities were formulated, and abbreviated versions were as follows:

INSDE - Special Security Education Branch - Develops, implements, and manages all sensitive compartmented information (SCI) education and training for the assistant chief of staff, intelligence. Assists in the promulgation of all SCI education and training policy for the Department of the Air Force.

INSDR - SCI Product Validation Branch - Manages the validation of all SCI product requests for the Air Force. Conducts routine liaison with Washington area elements of the U.S. intelligence community and ensures appropriate Air Force operational forces are on distribution for new or revised SCI products.

INSDO - Special Security Operations Branch - Manages the timely dissemination, control, and accountability of SCI materials in direct support of the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, Air Staff, Air Force Intelligence Service, the Office of Special Investigations, and other Department of Defense SCI consumers. Manages the National Capital Region's SCI program.

PERSONNEL

The reorganization did not result in a major transfer of personnel within or out of the directorate.

Key Personnel

In July 1983, however, Col. George J. Mercuro, the director of Security and Communications Management, was transferred to Patrick AFB, Florida, to assume responsibilities as inspector general. Col. Robert B. Huey, Jr., assumed the duties as director on 16 August 1983. As the director, he was also the Air Force member on the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) Security Committee (SECOM) as well as the chairman of the Compartmentation Subcommittee of the DCI SECOM. Immediately prior to his transferral to AFIS, Colonel Huey was commander and professor of aerospace studies, AFROTC Detachment 890, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.  

1Ltr [201], AFIS/INS to AFIS/MO, "AFIS/INSD Reorganization (Your Ltr, 20 June 1983)," 22 Aug 83, SD 246; Ltr [202], AFIS/MO to AFIS/INS, "Manpower Requirements for the FY 84-85 POM," 4 Feb 82, SD 247; Position Description, Chief, SS Ed Branch, n.d., SD 248.

2Intvw [203], AFIS Historian w. Col Huey and Lt Col Abel, AFIS/INS, 25 Apr 84. For a biographical sketch of Col Huey see SD 249.
Lt. Col. Ray Abel was the deputy director of Security and Communications Management. On 6 September, Colleen M. Cornwell assumed responsibilities as chief of the Personnel Security Division. The position had been vacant, with its duties performed by an acting chief. On 27 July, Lt. Col. William R. Burton was assigned as the Chief of the Management Division; this position, too, had been vacant. Maj. Richard P. Viscio continued as chief of the Special Security Office, HQ USAF, a position he held since 1 November 1982. CMSgt Robert C. Brown continued in administration, having been with the directorate since December 1981.

**Manning Strength**

The directorate's manpower strength as of December was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Authorized</th>
<th>Number Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One individual was not performing regular duties because of a loss of security clearance.*

**Polygraph Use in Abeyance**

On 11 March, President Ronald A. Reagan issued a National Security Decision Directive which included a mandate concerning the use of polygraph examinations in cases involving unauthorized disclosure of classified information. The president's directive was sent through the INS directorate through channels of the intelligence community, and a portion of the president's message was as follows:

The Office of Personnel Management and all departments and agencies with employees having access to classified information are directed to revise existing regulations and policies, as necessary, so that employees may be required to submit to polygraph examinations, when appropriate, in the course of investigations of unauthorized disclosures of classified information. As a minimum, such regulations shall permit an agency to decide that appropriate adverse

---

1For complete list of INS personnel, see Historical Data Rprt APIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
2Intv APIS Historian w. Col Huey and Lt Col Abel, APIS/INS, 25 Apr 84.
consequences will follow an employee's refusal to cooperate with a polygraph examination that is limited in scope to the circumstances of the unauthorized disclosure under investigation. Agency regulations may provide that only the head of the agency, or his delegate, is empowered to order an employee to submit to a polygraph examination. Results of polygraph examinations should not be relied upon to the exclusion of other information obtained during investigations.¹

Since August 1982, when the deputy secretary of defense had instructed military departments to implement a program of polygraph screening for persons with SCI access, the INS directorate had been working with the Air Force Office of Special Investigations to design and implement such a program.²

Because of congressional concern regarding the polygraph, especially after the president's directive of 11 March, agreements by members of Congress and the executive branch delayed the implementation of new polygraph programs until April 1984. This included the polygraphing of SCI indoctrinated individuals within the Department of Defense.³

**Anecdotal Study**

On 11 August, the chairman of the DCI Security Committee tasked the Personnel Security Subcommittee (PerSSub) to present by 2 September a specific plan for an anecdotal study of polygraph use. The subcommittee met twice, 22 and 31 August, and devised a plan, which was submitted on 2 September. Personnel from the INS directorate represented the Air Force at these subcommittee meetings. They indicated a willingness to contribute anecdotes of counterintelligence and counterespionage cases.⁴

During discussions with the polygraph experts from the Army, Navy, and Air Force, it became clear that recalling the needed cases was going to require a great deal of research and assistance from overseas detachments; therefore, the subcommittee established 5 December 1983 as the completion date for the survey.⁵

On 9 September, the chairman of the subcommittee sent the INS directorate a memorandum by which INS was tasked to select

¹Ibid.
³Intvw [redacted], APIIS Historian w. Col Huey and Lt Col Abel, APIIS/INS, 25 Apr 84.
⁴Memo [redacted], Chairman, PerSSub, to Chairman, SECOM, Serial: PerSSub-M-23-83, "Polygraph Study [redacted], 11leg. Sep 83, SD 252.
⁵Ibid.
and present cases on polygraph use, according to the following abbreviated plan:¹

¹For the complete plan see Memo and 1 Atch, Chairman, PerSSub, to PerSSub Member, U.S. Air Force, et al., Serial: PerSSub-M-24-83, "Polygraph Study," 8 Sep 83, SD 253.
Air Force Anecdotal Cases

The Air Force contributed four anecdotal cases to the subcommittee's report. The cases were as follows:¹

I. EXAMINEE STATUS/CLEARANCE: Active duty military/TS-SCI

TYPE OF INVESTIGATION: Espionage

INFORMATION AVAILABLE: Information was received from another agency that an individual was in contact with a hostile intelligence agency. A lengthy investigation, which included visual surveillance failed to verify the information. When interviewed the individual denied any contact with any non-US intelligence agency individuals. The individual agreed to a polygraph examination.

POLYGRAPH RESULTS: Deception indicated by the individual when he denied contact with, passing information to, and receiving money from a hostile intelligence service.

NOTE: The individual subsequently admitted initiating contact with a hostile intelligence service, collecting an extremely large number of highly classified documents, and passing those documents to the hostile agency in exchange for a relatively small amount of money.

II. EXAMINEE STATUS/CLEARANCE: DOD Civilian Employee/TS

TYPE OF INVESTIGATION: Unauthorized Disclosure

INFORMATION AVAILABLE: Information was received that an unidentified Department of Defense employee had passed sensitive classified information to an unauthorized individual. Only the section the individual worked in could be verified.

¹PerSSub Anecdotal Survey Cases I-IV, AFIS/INSB, 1983, SD 254.
POLYGRAPH RESULTS: Examinations of a large number of military and civilian employees resulted in deception by only one employee.

NOTE: Subsequent to the polygraph testing, the employee admitted passing classified information to several uncleared friends.

III. EXAMINEE STATUS/CLEARANCE: Active Duty Military/SCI

TYPE OF INVESTIGATION: Espionage

INFORMATION AVAILABLE: Information was received that an individual was in contact with the embassy of a hostile country. An investigation which included lengthy and complex surveillance failed to disclose any real evidence of espionage activity; however, many espionage indicators were noted. During an interview the individual denied any contact with any hostile agencies or individuals, and denied any espionage activity. The individual agreed to take a polygraph examination.

POLYGRAPH RESULTS: A lengthy series of polygraph examinations resulted in indications of deception concerning contact with a hostile agency, and passage of classified material to hostile agencies. The individual admitted initiating contact with a hostile intelligence agency, collecting a large amount of highly classified material, and passage of that material to the hostile agency in exchange for money. All polygraph results were verified by the individual's admission of guilt.

NOTE: Polygraph examinations were used in this instance to determine not only whether the individual was engaged in espionage, but to determine the type and amount of information he had passed.

IV. EXAMINEE STATUS/CLEARANCE: Active Duty Military/SCI

TYPE OF INVESTIGATION: Espionage

INFORMATION AVAILABLE: Information was received from a senior military officer that one of his subordinates may have passed classified information to a member of a hostile intelligence service. During the initial interview by the investigating agency, Subject admitted passing one piece of classified information to the hostile country representative, but denied any other disclosures. The individual agreed to take a polygraph examination.

POLYGRAPH RESULTS: Examination showed deception in the individual's response when he denied passing other information to the representative of the hostile country.
The individual subsequently admitted passing a number of classified items to the same hostile country representative.

NOTE: Further investigation verified the representative was a member of his country's intelligence service.

Resumption of Periodic Reinvestigations

On 1 April, the Defense Investigative Service (DIS) resumed conducting Periodic Reinvestigations (PR) of Special Background Investigations. In June 1981, the service had stopped such investigations, termed SBI "Bring-Ups," which were required by the Director of Central Intelligence Directive 1/14. The reinstatements were stopped to enable investigators to concentrate on and complete background investigations and special background investigations. Since 1981, the Defense Investigative Service was able to hire and train enough new investigators to absorb the periodic re-investigation workload.¹

In all essentials, the new periodic reinvestigations were handled as were the old ones. The involvement of the Air Force Special Security Office was limited—in most locations consisting of identification of persons due for re-investigation. There was no screening interview conducted by supervisors, commanders, and Special Security Offices. Once the case was opened, a trained agent from the Defense Investigative Service conducted the interview. Overseas, an agent from the Air Force Office of Special Investigations did the interviewing. The reinvestigation included a National Agency Check, two developed character references, local agency checks, a credit check, and employment checks.²

As of 31 December, the directorate's Personnel Security Branch had adjudicated 850 SBI-PRs and denied continued SCI access to 1 individual as a result of derogatory information contained in the PR.³

SBI Case Processing Time

In 1983, the Defense Investigative Service significantly reduced the Special Background Investigation (SBI) case processing

¹Background Paper ( ), AFIS/INSB, "SBI-Periodic Reinvestigations," 4 Apr 83, SD 255; Memo ( ), AFIS/INS to AP/IM-AFIS Staff, AFSAC/CC, "DOD Personnel Security Investigative Policy," 3 Feb 83, SD 256.
²Ibid. For a definition of National Agency Check see DOD 5200.2-R, Dec 79.
³Historical Data Rprt ( ), AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
time. As of December, the average case time was 65 days as opposed to 110 days in June. For over 24 months, the DIS had been working to reduce case time. The hiring of additional personnel, automation of the records processing and maintenance system, and better management techniques resulted in the speedier conclusion of investigations.¹

Microfilmed and Computerized Data Bases

During 1983, all cases were microfilmed immediately upon completion of adjudication. The result was a centralized location for all files. The microfilm data base contained more than 150,000 security clearances. Over the 12 months, 8,816 cases were microfilmed.²

Also, sensitive compartmented information (SCI) eligibility and ineligibility determinations were entered into the computerized System for Adjudication and Billet Reporting (SABRE) on a daily basis immediately following the final eligibility determination and before the copies were microfilmed. As of 31 December, more than 80,000 SCI access determination entries were on file in SABRE.³

Nondisclosure Agreements

In 1983, Nondisclosure Agreements continued to be collected. These were documents signed by individuals authorized access to sensitive compartmented information (SCI) and indoctrinated about the information. In part, the agreement stated:⁴

Intending to be legally bound, I hereby accept the obligations contained in this Agreement in consideration of my being granted access to information protected within Special Access Programs, hereinafter referred to in this agreement as Sensitive Compartmented Information. I have been advised that Sensitive Compartmented Information involves or derives from intelligence sources or methods and is classified or classifiable under the standards of Executive Order 12356 or other Executive order or statute. I understand and accept that by being granted access to Sensitive Compartmented Information special confidence and trust shall be placed in me by the United States Government.

¹Intvw [Redacted] APIS Historian w. Col Huey and Lt Col Abel, APIS/INS, 25 Apr 84.
²Historical Data Rprt [Redacted], APIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
³Ibid.
⁴DD Form 1847-1, Jan 83, "Sensitive Compartmented Information Nondisclosure Agreement," SD 257. For the "ninth" or indoctrination memorandum, see SD 258.
I have been advised that any breach of this Agreement may result in the termination of my access to Sensitive Compartmented Information and retention in a position of special confidence and trust requiring such access, as well as the termination of my employment or other relationships with any Department or Agency that provides me with access to Sensitive Compartmented Information. In addition, I have been advised that any unauthorized disclosure of Sensitive Compartmented Information by me may constitute violations of United States criminal laws, including the provisions of Sections 793, 794, 798, and 952, Title 18, United States Code, and of Section 783(b), Title 50, United States Code. Nothing in this Agreement constitutes a waiver by the United States of the right to prosecute me for any statutory violation.

All agreements signed through December 1982 were entered into the System for Adjudication and Billet Reporting (SABRE) database. They were to be put on tape prior to being retired to permanent storage. As of December 1983, no efforts were underway to place agreements signed subsequent to December 1982 into the SABRE system.¹

**SCI Billet Processing**

In July, the directorate assumed accountability for the sensitive compartmented information (SCI) billets in the new Space Command.²

**Test of Billet Requests by Message**

In November, three months after becoming director, Colonel Huey announced a six-month test period for the submission of requests for billets by message format instead of by letters.³ In explaining the test, to commence 1 January 1984, the colonel stated:

... It has become increasingly evident that a dire need exists for significantly improving the entire SCI billet authorization process from development and justification of the billet to validation and approval.⁴

... We expect the message format to drastically reduce the lengthy hardcopy mail distribution delays and thus improve turnaround. Recommend that INSBB be added as an

---

¹Historical Data Rprt AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
²Ibid.
³Draft Msg AFSSO/USAF/INS to ODANS, 'SCI Billet Processing,' Nov 83, SD 259.
⁴Ibid.
information addresses on the field request to the MAJCOM. This will allow our billet personnel advance warning of a potential billet requirement prior to MAJCOM validation. It will also allow the MAJCOM to make reference to the original field request and provide their validation approval/disapproval.\footnote{1}

The test did not change the requirement for the major commands to validate billet requests from the field nor did it obviate the need for field units to accomplish proper staffing to insure the billets were necessary. To assist users in understanding the billet process, the directorate was rewriting regulation USAF/INTEL 201-1, Chapter 12, which dealt with SCI billet management.

\textbf{4C System}

\begin{itemize}
\item New formats were used on all billet structures undertaken during the year so that they were in a form compatible with the Community-Wide Computer Assisted Compartmented Control System (4C). The Central Intelligence Agency directed that this information be used in order to offer a coherent approach throughout the intelligence community to managing SCI billets and recording SCI access eligibility data. It was to include a historical file containing a person's complete access history, such as the date each person who was with the Air Force was indoctrinated and then debriefed for each SCI compartment.\footnote{2}

\item The system was to be used by the directorate to communicate billet and access information automatically to appropriate Air Force Special Security Offices, thus eliminating the need for separate eligibility messages, access disapproval messages, traffic relating to billet changes, and manually maintained SCI billet structures.\footnote{3}

\item By 31 December, the directorate had the older SABRE computerized file ready to merge into the new 4C system.\footnote{4}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Transferral of "For Cause" and BRAVO Responsibilities}

\begin{itemize}
\item Responsibility for the processing of "For Cause" cases was transferred from the Management Division to the Personnel Security Division. Policy development and promulgation remained the responsibility of the Management Division. This move was made to increase the coordination between personnel adjudication actions and "For Cause" discharge actions.\footnote{5}
\end{itemize}

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize\textit{1}Ibid. \\
\footnotesize\textit{3}Ibid. \\
\footnotesize\textit{4}Historical Data Rprt \textsuperscript{[1]}, AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242. \\
\footnotesize\textit{5}Intvw, AFIS Historian w. Col Husky and Lt Col Abel, AFIS/INS, 25 Apr 84; Historical Data Rprt \textsuperscript{[2]}, AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
\end{flushleft}
Lightened sensitivity to the "For Cause" actions, intensified due to several complex cases in 1983, and led to a decision to revoke the closure authority delegated to the commander of the Electronic Security Command (ESC) for "For Cause" cases within ESC.¹

The BRAVO policy development and promulgation responsibility was transferred from the Personnel Security Division to the Management Division, to more appropriately align policy actions.²

**Statistical Summary of Personnel Security Activity**

The calendar year 1983 statistical summary of personnel security activity were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF AFIS/INSB ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS FOR 1983</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. File Searches Conducted                29,634  
2. Cases Microfilmed                     8,816   
3. Billets Branch:  
   a. Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) Billet Actions Staffed 7,074  
   b. SCI Billet Realignment/Redesignations 113,367  
   c. Number of TDY Messages Dispatched 3,174  
   d. Number of Reserve Actions Staffed 297  
   e. Number of Congressional/Foreign Visit Requests Staffed 177  
   f. Number of Changes Made to Alpha/Billet Rosters 119,649  
   g. Number of Transfer in Status Actions 461  
   h. Number of Computer Jobs Completed 468  
   i. Number of Clearances Certified Telephonically 12,877  
4. Cases Adjudicated:  
   a. Approved by INSB 21,329  
   b. Disapproved by INSB 739  
5. PA/FOIA/Congressional/White House/IG Inquiries 34  
6. Indoclination Oaths Forwarded to AFIS/INSO 468  
7. Due Process Actions 716  
8. For Cause Discharge Actions Processed 22  

**Publications**

The Policy Branch of the Management Division continued to extend and update Air Force security publications dealing with sensitive compartmented information (SCI). USAFINTEL 201-XX series, during 1983. Issued in accordance with AFR 8-3, these publications were used to promulgate Director of Central Intelligence SCI security policies by establishing standardized

¹See previous note.  
²See previous note.
Air Force procedures. The sensitivity associated with the policies and procedures prescribed for management of the SCI security system precluded their incorporation into standard Air Force regulations. The division was responsible for nine USAFINTEL publications, as well as AFR 200-7, "Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) Security System" and AFR 205-19, "Control of Dissemination of Intelligence Information." Normal distribution of these publications included all accredited Air Force SCI facilities (SCIFs), Air Force-manned Unified & Specified Command SCIFs, and selected U.S. intelligence community SCI activities. The division was also responsible for the administrative review of any USAFINTEL publication produced by other AF/IN or AFIS elements, and for any regulation from an Air Force major command, special operating agency, or direct reporting unit, which implemented a USAFINTEL publication.¹

Some of the key changes made in 1983 were as follows:

a. **USAFINTEL 201-1**, "The Security, Use and Dissemination of Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI)" was updated on 13 April 1983. Changes were made to Chapter 10 to clarify the protection of security containers for SCI waste, and to Chapter 15 to clarify the requirement for U.S. only janitorial service and establish the procedure for justifying and requesting exceptions.²

b. **USAFINTEL 201-4**, "The USAF Implementation of the DOD TCS" (actual title is classified) was updated on 29 August 1983. Changes were made to Chapter 2 to clarify the SCI access policy for communications, cryptologic, and automatic data processing operators and technical control and maintenance personnel within SCIFs.³

c. **USAFINTEL 201-6**, "Communications Intelligence (COMINT) Classification Guide" was completely revised on 20 September 1983; a minor hardcopy Change 1 was also issued 6 December 1983.

d. **USAFINTEL 201-10**, "Sanitization and Use of Communications Intelligence (COMINT) Products Outside COMINT Channels" was republished on 5 December 1983. This revision implemented COMINT sanitization and operational use policy changes contained in DCS Signals Intelligence Security Regulation Volume I, directed the establishment of sanitization training programs, changed rules on keeping records and reporting sanitization and operational use actions, expanded the Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations, updated the listing of Proper Authorities, added a

¹Historical Data Fpt, AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242. See also List of Current USAFINTEL Publications, AFIS/INSC, 16 Jan 84, SD 261.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
subject index, and made other minor changes throughout the directive.\(^1\)

e. \(\boxed{\ldots}\) The following publications were undergoing revision during 1983 and were expected to be republished during 1984:\(^2\)

(1) USAF INTEL 201-5, "Sensitive Compartmented Information Facilities Directory (SCIFD)."

(2) USAF INTEL 201-7, "Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) Communications Policies and Procedures."

(3) USAF INTEL 201-9, "TCS Classification Guide" (actual title is classified).

f. \(\boxed{\ldots}\) There were some 35 additional publications reviewed for classification, accuracy, and SCI policy or application during 1983. These were a diverse group of publications: Air Force regulations, statements of need, operations plans, emergency action plans, program management directives, briefings, memoranda of agreement, concepts of operation, intelligence agency publications, short stories, magazine articles, and personal memoirs.\(^3\)

Travel to Yugoslavia by SCI Indoctrinated Personnel

---

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^3\)Ibid.

\(^4\)Memo \(\boxed{\ldots}\) William J. Casey, Chairman, to National Foreign Intelligence Council, "Security of Foreign Travel by Cleared Personnel" \(\boxed{\ldots}\) NFIC-9.2/78, 7 Nov 83, SD 262. See also, related documents \(\boxed{\ldots}\) SD 262.

\(^5\)Ibid.

\(^6\)Ibid.
The Air Force, in concert with SCI security officials from the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) and other military departments, jointly worked on writing Department of Defense (DOD) Directive C-5200.xx, which was to replace two obsolete directives from 1965 and 1957 and to establish uniform policy and guidance on the security and administration of the DOD SCI programs. The significant changes included the assigning of specific responsibilities to the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the military departments for the implementation, direction, management, coordination, and control of DOD sensitive compartmented information programs. The military departments (MILDEPs) were also given authority, in lieu of the DIA, to accredit SCI facilities (SCIFS) for sensitive compartmented information at the SI/TK/SCI levels. The departments up to then had only SI accreditation authority. This was a major concession by the DIA, which assumed an oversight role, and it consolidated accreditation authority at the MILDEP level, restricting further delegation. Both MILDEP and DIA security officials had been concerned about SCI security practices at the Service Cryptologic Elements and the dilution of MILDEP SCI span of control.3

1Ibid.
2Ibid.
The directive was not finalized before the end of the year, and publication was expected by mid-1984.¹

Publication of INS CI 205-4

On 26 August, the directorate published INS Operating Instruction 205-4, "Treatment of Special Access Programs Involving Sensitive Compartmented Information." The directive provided specific instructions on how to handle the delicate relationships with special access programs established under the provisions of the Information Security Oversight Office Directive 1/DOE Directive 5200.1-R. It supported the "streamlined management," "must know," and "nonexposure" themes inherent in the programs and yet allowed for sufficient control to provide SCI security assistance and oversight. The instruction was also to be included in the revision of USAFINTEL 201-1, as a separate chapter, in order to provide consistent guidance for the USAF as a whole.²

Protection of SCI after KAL 007 Shootdown

¹Historical Data Rprt APIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
²INS-OI 205-4, "Treatment of Special Access Programs Involving Sensitive Compartmented Information," 26 Aug 83, SD 265.
³Draft Msg APIS, Deputy ACS/I to SSO SAC et al, "Protection of Sensitive Intelligence," Sep 83, SD 266; Memo APIS to W. J. Casey to National Foreign Intelligence Board et al, NFIC-5-1/69, "Protection of Sensitive Intelligence," 12 Sep 83, SD 267; Historical Data Rprt APIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242. For other statements on unauthorized disclosures see Memo APIS, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger to Secretaries of MILDEPs et al, "Unauthorized Disclosure of Classified Information," 21 Sep 83, SD 268 and Attachments APIS.
⁴Ibid.
Use of SCI in ACSC Curriculum

In December, the directorate granted authority to the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) to begin incorporating sensitive compartmented information into its curriculum. The original Air University (AU) request, however, had been turned down because it involved the entire ACSC student body, without regard for actual or potential "need-to-know" requirements. AU was told that a modified concept satisfying valid requirements through a combination of curricula in the electives and Tailored Instructional Program (TIP) would be considered.¹

The modified AU concept was patterned after the Air War College program for integrating SCI into the curriculum. The program was limited to those officers who had already been indoctrinated for SCI access and who expected to be involved with SCI materials in their next assignment.²

The modified concept and the basic education philosophy for ACSC were thoroughly discussed among the Directorate of Security and Communications Management, the Directorate of Intelligence Plans and Systems, and the Directorate of Space. It was determined that the decision to limit access to selected students was not in the best interests of the Air Force, insofar as the preparation of Air Force battle managers was concerned.³

When the directorate approved the incorporation of SCI into the ACSC curriculum, it also stated that the Air Staff believed that Air University should seriously consider incorporation of the following into future ACSC policy:⁴

1. SCI eligibility as a prerequisite for all U.S. students attending the Air Command and Staff College.

¹ Msg ☐, APIS/INS to APSSO/AU/IN, "Use of SCI in ACSC Curriculum," 28 Dec 83, SD 269; Staff Summary Sheet ☐, APIS/INS, Col Husey to ACS/I et al, "Use of SCI in ACSC Curriculum," 14 Dec 83, SD 270.
²Ibid.
³Ibid. See also Ltr ☐ with 1 Atch ☐, AU/IN to APIS/INS, "Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) in the Air Command and Staff College Curriculum," 19 Jul 83, SD 271.
⁴Ibid.
This would involve Special Background Investigation submission upon selection notification and favorable SCI eligibility determination for all officers prior to the start of class.

2. SCI fully incorporated into the ACSC curriculum to provide all U.S. students with a complete appreciation and education of all-source intelligence capabilities and collection resources, to include space operations. Non-U.S. students would be excluded from attending SCI sessions.

Participation in Physical Security Course

Mrs. Elizabeth A. Hall of the directorate's Management Division was a member of the Physical Security Working Group of the DCI Security Committee and helped to develop a national level Physical Security Course for all Department of Defense and government agencies. The first class was held in August, and future classes were to be offered once a quarter, starting in January 1984. 1

Discontinuance of Off-Line PCS

The directorate conducted a survey of the use of the Air Force Off-Line Privacy Communications System in early 1983. This was a secondary and back-up system to the primary Defense Special Security Communication System used by senior intelligence officers. The survey revealed that the off-line system rarely had been used in the last two and one-half years; in fact, it was last used for operational off-line messages in 1981 by only 2 of 34 users. Noting this, the directorate, which was the office of primary responsibility for the system, discontinued its operation in July. The lack of its use was due to the high reliability and quality of the primary system. 2

1 Historical Data Rprt [ ], AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
2 Memo [ ], with 1 Atch [ ], Chairman, DCI Security Committee, to Members, Physical Security Working Group, "Physical Security Seminar No. 2," SECOM-D-249, 22 Dec 83, SD 272.
3 Intvw [ ], AFIS Historian w. Col Huey, Lt Col Abel et al, AFIS/INS, 25 Apr 84; Msg [ ], AFIS/INS to AFSSO AD/INS et al, "Termination of Keylist for USAF Off-Line Privacy Communications," 21 Jun 83, SD 273.
Revitalization of I/SAV Program

During the year, personnel from the directorate's Management Division revitalized the inspection and staff assistance visit (I/SAV) program. They visited Air Force Special Security Offices at all major commands except those of the Air Force Systems Command and the Alaskan Air Command. A total of 74 sensitive compartmented information facilities (SCIFs) were visited, representing 30 percent of the total number of such facilities in the Air Force SCIF system. There were 14 Special Security Offices included within the total, representing 40 percent of the AFSSO system. Also, 11 Contractor Special Security Offices (CSSOs) and SCIFs were visited, representing 25 percent of the total number of CSEO facilities. Additional trips were conducted to provide training, orientation, conference support, and special assistance.¹

Assistance for the Korean COIC

Personnel from the directorate contributed approximately 250 man-hours assisting the engineers at the 60 percent design phase of the Korean Combat Operations Intelligence Center (COIC) to be constructed at Osan Air Base, Korea. By the directorate's participation in the design phase, compliance with physical security standards was more assured.²

Statistics

Reports disclosed that there were 134 SCI security incidents or violations during 1983. The directorate was to conduct in 1984 a comprehensive analysis of the types of incidents and violations and then undertake appropriate corrective educational measures. As of December, there were 248 SCIFs accredited, 42 of which belonged to contractors. There were 109 pending actions for construction or major modification of SCIFs.³

Gray Telephone Service

¹For a list of SCIFs visited in 1983, see Historical Data Rpt ☐, AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 274.
²Historical Data Rpt ☐, AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
³Intvw ☐, AFIS Historian w. Col Huey and Lt Col Abel, AFIS/INS, 25 apr 84; Historical Data Rpt ☐, AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
GDIP Guidance for APSSO System

In October, Lt Col Raymond E. Abel, Jr., published for the first time comprehensive and clear guidance for the Air Force Special Security Offices with regard to the budget for the General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP). The guidance provided the entire APSSO system with the basic information required for developing annual GDIP submissions. The information was to be included in the revised USAFINTEL 201-1 as a separate chapter and was to allow a more finite computation of monies spent on SCI security. ²

SPECIAL SECURITY ACTIVITIES

Security Management Course

1Interview with Col Ruay, Lt Col Abel et al., APIS/INS, 25 Apr 84.
³See: Historical Data Rept, APIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
⁴AFIS SCI Security Management Course Outline (AFIS 082), Class Handout #1-1, APIS/INS, 19 Sep 83, SD 276.
For the conference at Homestead AFB, three communicators from the Electronic Security Command were attached to AFIS to assist in operating the Air Force Special Security Office (AFSSO) CORONA communications facility. Directorate personnel and personnel from the 1942d Communications Squadron activated communications circuits, inspected all equipment, and ensured AFSSO CORONA was ready to receive traffic prior to the arrival of the conference.²

Some problems surfaced at Homestead, which were identified and corrected prior to the conference at Colorado. Three of the CORONA SOUTH problems were the following:³

The directorate's support for the CORONA FALL 83 Conference at the Air Force Academy consisted primarily of

---

¹Historical Data Rprt, AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
²Trip Rprt, AFIS/INSO to AFIS/INS, "CORONA SOUTH 83," 2 Mar 83, SD 279.
³Ibid.
providing SCI and privacy communications support. The message load was heavy because of the Grenada assault and the destruction of the Marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon. Daily contact was maintained with the Contingency Support Staff, Headquarters, USAF, and with the AF/IN Intelligence Watch. Contact was also established with the Command Post of the Tactical Air Command and with the Indication and Warning Centers of the Military Airlift Command and Strategic Air Command for unique intelligence support to respective commanders. On Saturday, 30 October, a continuous watch was maintained in the Indication and Warning Center of the NORAD Cheyenne Mountain Complex from 0000-1600 hours to watch for any messages or events that would require the attention of CORONA FALL attendees. Several messages were received that were delivered during the return Special Air Mission support flight to Andrews AFB.  

Consolidated SIGINT Catalog

The directorate's Product Validation Branch managed the validation of all SCI product requests for the Air Force. It was solely responsible for reviewing all SCI requests for Air Force customers worldwide, and it conducted routine liaison with Washington area elements of the U.S. intelligence community and ensured appropriate Air Force operational forces were on distribution for new or revised SCI products.

In August, the branch forwarded to appropriate Special Security Offices all portions of the Consolidated SIGINT Catalog (CONCAT), thus completing the catalog so that the offices could begin to revalidate their SIGINT requirements. The National Security Agency forwarded Annex E of the catalog, and the branch instructed users to consult it, because it was a "vital section," and to request SIGINT product requirements according to its listings.

Statistical Summary of Special Security Office Operations

---

2Ltr , AFIS/INS to SSOs , "HQ USAF Consolidated SIGINT Catalog (CONCAT)," 13 Aug 83, SD 281.
3Historical Data Rpt , AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83, SD 242.
The INSD division established a fifth defense address group, ROXAD, within the Defense Special Security Communications System. Address groups served the purpose of establishing permanent lists of recipients to continually receive certain types of information. The ROXAD recipients were all Air Force Special Security Offices and all Special Security Offices servicing Air Force organizations. The ROXAD information concerned SCI security awareness and training.¹ The directorate's five address groups were the following:²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFENSE ADDRESS GROUP</th>
<th>RECIPIENT</th>
<th>TYPE OF INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DSSIZ</td>
<td>Major Commands</td>
<td>Policy Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ODANS</td>
<td>AF Special Security Offices</td>
<td>Policy Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OILAH</td>
<td>Air Force Elements</td>
<td>Policy Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. JUCBY</td>
<td>Air Force Elements</td>
<td>SCI Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ROXAD</td>
<td>Special Security Offices</td>
<td>SCI Awareness and Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Intvw AFIS Historian W. Col Hoey and Lt Col Abel, AFIS/TNS, 25 Apr 84.
²Ibid.
In 1983, the division also began numbering and serializing address group messages for better accountability of the messages at the field level.¹

Renovation of Facilities

Room BD-91 was renovated for the Special Security Office in order to provide more working space and to improve its run-down appearance, especially since the SCI indoctrination classes were to be held there. Among the improvements were the installation of sound soak panels and the repainting of walls. With the installation of new carpeting in early 1984, the rehabilitation was to be complete.²

¹Ibid.
²Interview with AFIS Historian w. Col Bushy and Lt Col Abel. AFIS/INS, 25 Apr 84; Ltr AFIS/INS to AF/INA et al., "Amendment to Space Services Request," 9 Jun 83, SD 282, and Attachments.
MISSION AND ORGANIZATION

The Directorate of Intelligence Reserve Forces (RE) centrally managed the Air Force Intelligence Reserve Program and developed and maintained a reserve force to support intelligence operations during peacetime contingencies and wartime mobilization. The directorate consisted of two divisions, the Operations and Readiness Division, which was subdivided into an Operations Branch and a Readiness Branch, and a Personnel Management Division, subdivided into three branches: Manning, Security, and Quality Force.¹

PERSONNEL

Col. John R. Oberst continued to head the directorate, although as of 16 January 1984, he was to begin a new assignment for the Air Force at the Pentagon as the chief of the Defense Intelligence Agency's POW/MIA Affairs Division. The colonel had been director of the reserve forces program since 15 October 1980. In a letter he wrote in December, the colonel stated, "My last three and one-half years as Director, APIS/RE, have been personally gratifying and professionally rewarding. . . . I will carry new friendships with me as I depart and will forever be partly a Reservist at heart." Lt. Col. James A. Warner, the Chief of the Operations and Readiness Division, was to assume command of the directorate when Colonel Oberst departed. Warner had been with the program since May 1979. Lt. Col. James L. Blauch was the chief of the Personnel Management Division and had been with RE since June 1982.²

The mobilization assistant (MA) to the ACS/I was Brig. Gen. Arthur W. Green, Jr., who assumed the position 1 June 1983, and the MA to the deputy ACS/I was Col. Jacques P. Klein, who assumed the position 1 May 1983.³

The board of advisors was a committee composed of senior members who had served as area directors, or detached training site commanders, or in key enlisted positions. The members of the board, individually and collectively, advised the director of RE on policy matters. They were tasked by and reported to the director. The members were Col. Charles A. Boyd, chairman, Col.

¹The detailed RE mission statement is found in AFISR 23-1 15 Jul 82, Section N, SD 2.
²Ltr Col J. Oberst to ADS et al, "End of CY 1983 Letter," 19 Dec 83, SD 283. For a biographical sketch of Col Oberst, see SD 284. For a list of RE key personnel see SD 285.
³For a mobilization assistant's position description see SD 286.
The directorate’s manning strength was as follows:²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authorized</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The authorized strength of 32 made RE the largest of the AFIS directorates in the Fort Belvoir compound.

RESERVIST STRENGTH

As of 31 December, the directorate managed 1,341 reservists: 1,287 assigned and 54 attached for training. This assigned strength represented a 68 percent manning rate of the authorized strength of 1,897 positions. There were 976 assigned officers and 53 attached, and 311 assigned enlisted personnel and 1 attached. There were 86 percent of the authorized officer positions filled and 41 percent of the enlisted positions. This represented the largest number of reservists in the program since it started in 1974. The directorate’s goal was to have a five percent net increase in the authorized positions filled with qualified individuals.³

The Reservist strength by command was the following:⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Enlisted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PACAF</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAFE</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS/AFSAC</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAILK</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹FACTBOOK, Air Force Intelligence Reserve (AFIR), (hereafter cited as FACTBOOK), 1 Oct 83, pp 2, 6, SD 287.
²Manpower Strength Chart Historical Data Rprt AFIS/RE, Jan-Dec 83, SD 288.
³Intvw, AFIS Historian w. SMSgt Santa Cruz, AFIS/RE, 6 Mar 84; Ltr, Beverly Doyle, AFIS/REPM, to AFIS/REOR, “Request for Additional Information. . . ,” 19 Mar 84.
⁴Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMAND</th>
<th>OFFICER</th>
<th>ENLISTED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF/IN</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACECOM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ADCOM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attached Reservists:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMAND</th>
<th>OFFICER</th>
<th>ENLISTED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTD</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRPS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARFC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pacific Command, Defense Intelligence Agency, and Military Airlift Command were the top three commands to which the most number of reservists were assigned.

INDIVIDUAL MOBILIZATION AUGMENTEES

The reservists were civilians and referred to as "individual mobilization augmentees" (IMAs). An IMA was a member of the Air Force Reserve subject to involuntary recall to active duty by presidential authority under Title 10 United States Code 673 (USC) or 38 USC 2024; by congressional authority under Title 10 USC 672; or on a voluntary basis during a declared national emergency or contingency situation. AFIS IMAs participated in "Category B" training as a part of the Selected Reserve, requiring a 12-14 day annual training tour and 24 four-hour inactive duty training drill periods twelve days annually.¹

The five types of positions to which the largest numbers of IMAs were assigned were as follows:²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER</th>
<th>NO. POSITIONS</th>
<th>NO. ASSIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Air Intelligence Officer</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intelligence Applications Officer Staff</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intelligence Systems Staff Officer</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intelligence Targeting Officer</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Glossary of Terms ², AFIS/RE, n.d., SD 289; FACTBOOK ²
¹ Oct 83, p 12, SD 287.
²Ibid; pp 13-16.
5. Imagery Intelligence Officer 92 62

These five positions were occupied by 76 percent of the assigned officer reservists.¹

ENLISTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>NO. POSITIONS</th>
<th>NO. ASSIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration Technician</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intelligence Operations Technician</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Linguist/Interrogator Technician</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intelligence Operations Specialist</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Imagery Interpreter Technician</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These five positions were occupied by 61 percent of the assigned enlisted reservists.²

DETACHED TRAINING SITES

Each reservist spent at least six weekends at an assigned field location, called a detached training site (DTS), training for proficiency in an intelligence specialty and producing intelligence for active force organizations. The detached training sites were informal administrative entities, at which reservists in common geographic areas were trained and their skills put to use. Small staffs of reservists managed the sites and performed additional duty roles as commander, operations and training officer, personnel officer, and enlisted advisor. Normally located at Air Force installations, the DTSs provided intelligence support to co-located active and reserve units. They also worked on intelligence projects from other remotely located organizations using the special skills available within the DTSs.³

To assist in field management, training, and intelligence production, the directorate grouped the detached training sites into seven administrative areas, each directed by

¹Ibid., pp 13-14.
²Ibid., pp 15-16.
³Ltr 4, Col Cherst., AFIS/RE to SIOs et al. "Air Force Intelligence Reserve (AFIR) Program," 29 Aug 83, SD 290; FACTBOOK 1 Oct 83, p 2, SD 287. The DTSs sent annual unit historical reports to AFIS/RE and for those for calendar year 1983, see SD 291.
an area director (AD), assisted by an area operations and training officer, an area personnel officer, and an area enlisted advisor. All were reservists who performed these duties in addition to their primary responsibility of maintaining mobilization readiness.¹

The commanders of the seven areas were the following:²

1. Pacific Area - Col. Robert W. Parr
2. Northeast Area - Col. Robert C. Bruce
3. Western Area - Col. John R. Nesbitt
5. Southwest Area - Col. Glenn W. Redmond
6. Southeast Area - Col. Charles D. George
7. Central Area - Col. Edward A. Jerawaki

New Sites

This year, the RE director established four detached training sites and one flight, after the area directors had done two things: 1) determined that a valid training opportunity existed to support reservists in a common geographical location and 2) coordinated with host organizations for tenant support for the sites. DTS 53 was established at Patrick AFB, Florida, on 8 April. It formerly was Flight 7A and provided research, analysis, and intelligence support to HQ Eastern Space and Missile Center and HQ Air Force Technical Application Center. DTS 46 was established at Francis E. Warren AFB, Wyoming, on 1 October. It provided intelligence support to the 90th Strategic Missile Wing and the 153d Tactical Airlift Group (Wyoming Air National Guard). Flight 23A was established on 28 April at RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, to support the 48th Tactical Fighter Wing.³

Also, the director upgraded two other flights to DTSs because they were doing the work of DTSs and had the minimum manning strength for DTS status. Flight 37A was redesignated DTS 36 at Kirkland, and Flight 14B was redesignated DTS 41 in Dallas. Other locations considered as potential host bases for new DTSs or flights were Little Rock AFB, Arkansas; Seymour-Johnson AFB, North Carolina; and Camp Smith, Hawaii.⁴

DTS 44 in Monterey, California, was downgraded to flight status because of a decrease in its manpower strength, which fell below twelve officers and enlisted personnel, the minimum necessary for a DTS. The flight was determined to build itself back up to DTS status in 1984.⁵

¹Ibid.
²Ibid., pp 5-6.
³Historical Data Rprt, AFIS/RE, Jan-Dec 83, SD 292.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Intvw, AFIS Historian w. SMSgt Santa Cruz, AFIS/RE, 8 Mar 84.
As of 31 December, there were 51 detached training sites and 7 flights.¹

PROJECTS

Seven reservists supported the military action by the United States in Grenada. They served from 28 October to 7 November as Spanish linguist/interrogators. Following short notice, the directorate reviewed reservist records, verified qualifications, and determined availability, before the seven were activated for duty.² See Chapter II of this history for an account of AFIS/AFSAC involvement in Grenada.

¹Ibid; FACTBOOK 30, 1 Oct 83, p 7, SD 287; Intvw 30, AFIS Historian w. SMSgt Santa Cruz, AFIS/RE, 8 Mar 84.
²Ibid.
In 1983, the directorate monitored over 450 locally and remotely tasked intelligence projects at the detached training sites in support of 30 major commands, special operating agencies, joint service commands, the Air National Guard, and the Navy. The projects served two purposes; they provided proficiency training for the reservists, and they provided intelligence support to active force and reserve force users.¹

The directorate monitored the projects by studying the training weekend reports submitted by each site. The reports included information about the number of projects at the sites, project descriptions, the tasking organizations, estimated completion dates, time each reservist devoted to projects, and the reservists Air Force specialty or skill codes. The directorate compared the data in the report with previously submitted data, and analyzed it in terms of training value and progress. Directorate personnel and members of the area directors' staffs made staff assistance visits to the sites to monitor projects and assist with their accomplishment.²

Examples from DTS 28

The following information about projects undertaken and accomplished by personnel at detached training site 28, located at Fort Myer in the National Capital Area and commanded by Col. George S. Rader, provides examples of the types of substantive projects worked on by intelligence reservists in 1983.³

Detached Training site 28 had an end of year strength of 50 members, 49 officers and 1 non-commissioned officer. Nearly 90 percent of the officers were taking or had completed some form of professional military education, an increase of over 10 percent from last year. Fourteen officers were enrolled in the Air War College, Air Command and Staff College, or Squadron Officer School

¹Historical Data Rpt AFIS/RE, Jan-Dec 83, SD 292.
²Ibid.; For a list of site support visits by RE personnel see FACTBOOK, 1 Apr 83, p 11, SD 293, and 1 Oct 83, p 11, SD 287. For an example of a report from a DTS, see Rprt DTS 9/CC to AFIS/RE, "Command Interest Items," 11 Dec 83, SD 291.
³Unit History Rprt AFIS/DTS 28, Fort Myer, Lt Col Daniel J. Worthington, Jan-Dec 83. For a list of projects for the DIA, see Ltr Dts 1 and Atch 6, DIA Deputy Director for Resources and Systems to ACS/L, "Air Force Reserve Support to DIA," 26 Oct 83, SD 294. For a list of projects ESAA DETs 21 and 23 worked on see Ltr and Atch ESAA/INXA to All ESAA Activities, "Special Projects for Reserve Augmentees," 5 Dec 83, SD 295. For a "Master Projects List," 1 Jul 83, see SD 295.
correspondence courses. Three officers completed the Air Command
and Staff College by correspondence during 1983.¹

The reservists worked on 30 projects, an increase of 9
from 1982. The major consumers of their products were the Air
Staff (the Directorate of Operations and Readiness and the Air
Force Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence) and the Defense
Intelligence Agency.²

Summary of DTS 28 Intelligence Projects - 1983.³

DTS-28 Continuing Projects:

1. One of the major requirements for DTS 28 was to
provide augmentation of the Air Staff (AF/INXY) Unit at the
Consumer Support Center. It was responsible for the collection
of requirements for advanced national reconnaissance system at a
remote location in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area.

2. Since January 1981, DTS 28 had been involved in a
joint Central Intelligence Agency/Defense Mapping Agency effort to
produce a special map series on the Soviet Union, depicting major
military and industrial locations. A dozen map overlays were
produced by a highly specialized group of officers during 1983.

3. DTS 28 continued to provide assistance to the
intelligence community in developing a comprehensive world-wide
data base containing both technical and deployment information on
weapons systems.

DTS-28 Completed Projects:

1. DTS officer 28 officers completed a long-term study
on Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) security requirements for a
Semiautomated Population Analysis System. As part of this study,
the officers produced a data management users' guide for
application in DIA.

2. DTS 28 officers finished a project which was
initiated in 1975 in support of the Operations Section of the Air
Force Special Activities Center (AFSAC). The project required in-
depth review and analysis of classified human resource
intelligence operations.

3. A DTS computer expert assisted DIA in the integra-
tion of a Hewlett-Packard terminal with a Burroughs computer for
command, control, and communications (C³) support.

¹Unit History Rprt ☐ AFIS/DTS 28. Fort Myer, Lt Col Daniel
J. Worthington, Jan-Dec 83, SD 291.
²Ibid.
³Ibid. These have been edited by the AFIS Historian.

5. A DTS 28 officer completed for DIA an evaluation of major sections of a Space Intelligence Master Plan relating to the collection, processing, and production of information on Soviet military capabilities and intentions in space.

6. DTS 28 completed five studies for the Air Staff's Directorate of Operations and Readiness during 1983. These studies involved:

   -- a review and assessment of Soviet radio-electronic combat capabilities in Central Europe;
   -- an analysis of the impact of trends and developments in Soviet airborne forces;

7. DTS 28 officers produced for the Air Staff (AFIN/INES) an assessment of Mexico's economic situation and the impact of its sagging economy on foreign political and economic relations.

8. A DTS 28 officer completed for the Air Staff (AFIN/INER) an assessment of the nature and scope of French arms exports to Third World countries.

DTS-28 New Initiatives:

1. DTS 28 continued to assist the Air Staff's Directorate of Operations and Readiness in its assessment of the Air Force's capability to respond to Soviet aggression through a variety of scenarios. Topics addressed included Soviet force projection capabilities in Southwest Asia, Soviet aerial tactics, and Soviet Air Force reinforcement options in the European Theater.*

2. DTS 28 was analyzing Brazil's political and economic situation and assessing the impact of changes in the economy on Brazil's role in the region. A report covering this topic was expected to be completed for the Director of Research at the Defense Intelligence College by March 1984.*

3. A DTS 28 officer stationed overseas was providing support to a Defense Attache Office. This support involved the review and translations of articles in the local media.

4. A DTS 28 Scientific and Technical (S&T) intelligence officer was conducting a comparative analysis of the performance characteristics and capabilities of US and Soviet phased array radars.*
5. A DTS 28 flight whose personnel had expertise in Automated Data Processing (ADP) Systems was working on three new projects, two in support of DIA and one supporting the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force. The DIA-sponsored projects were to provide managers with support in ADP planning and requirements definitions for distributed processing systems, microcomputers, graphic display capabilities, and a new DIA Wideband Bus Communications System. Support for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force was to involve independent assessments and evaluations of a classified systems development project.

6. DTS 28 was supporting the Plans Section of the Air Force Special Activities Center (AFSAC) in its evaluations of MAJCOM Operations plans and the projected requirements for linguists.

7. DTS 28 was supporting the development of a segment of the National War College curriculum dealing with the relationships between intelligence and policy in senior decision-making. This project involved research and review of overt and classified literature dealing with an intelligence/policy issue in which the interaction of the intelligence community affected the policy process.

8. DTS 28 was supporting CIA on two projects worked on for the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI). One project involved a survey and analysis of air and sea violations of Soviet borders and reactions thereto, while the second concerned Soviet perceptions of US encryptions of space systems telemetry.

*Indicates projects whose completion was expected in 1984.

DTS-28 Projects Terminated During 1983:

1. The project involving CAMS software support to DIA was cancelled by the project sponsor.

2. The project concerning international terrorism was discontinued, as the requirement for in-depth research on that subject was withdrawn by the project sponsor.

The lengthy listing above discloses that personnel of DTS 28 were certainly involved with substantive research projects in 1983.

SURVEY OF MAC SUPPORT

In January, two captains from Headquarters, Military Airlift Command (MAC), Intelligence, visited the AFIS compound and requested expanded AFIS reservist support to MAC reserve flying units in order to compensate for active force manning shortages. Six AFIS detached training units were located at MAC bases. The
AFIS directorate prepared a survey of all intelligence support provided to MAC in 1982, for MAC to use in determining how the DTSa could further expand their services. DTS 5 at McChord AFB was already planning to intensify and expand intelligence support to the 446th Military Airlift Wing (Associate). The support was to include the training of additional duty squadron intelligence officers. The directorate worked with the DTSa to reschedule their training weekends to coordinate them with the times that MAC flying units trained. Selected intelligence reservists also were scheduled to meet periodically with MAC reservists.1

EXERCISES

The directorate undertook action this year to consolidate guidance given to the reservist about their mobilization readiness and field readiness assessments, the latter being inspections of readiness of individual reservists conducted by area directors or by staff from the directorate. On 15 November, Operating Instruction 28-1, "War Planning - Individual Mobilization Responsibilities and Field Readiness Assessments," was published and superseded various policy letters and memoranda written in previous years. The instruction described nine areas for which the reservists were responsible: 1) uniforms, 2) chemical biological warfare training/equipment, 3) pre-mobilization actions, 4) mobilization day data, 5) personal affairs, 6) immunizations, and 7) mobilization/travel instructions.2

AFIS Reservists participated in the following exercises originated by major commands in fiscal year 1983:3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXERCISE</th>
<th>COMMAND</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
<th>RPA*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brim Frost</td>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Pingo</td>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud Sabres</td>
<td>AFLC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud Sabres</td>
<td>PACAF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Flag</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintex</td>
<td>USAFE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintex</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Spirit</td>
<td>PACAF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Spirit</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallant Knight</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallant Knight</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Shield</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Flag</td>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Ltr AFIS/RE to MAC/IN, "Intelligence Reserve Support to MAC Airlift Wings (Associate)," 18 May 83, SD 296; Intvw AFIS Historian w. SMSGt Santa Cruz, AFIS/RE, 8 Mar 84.

2RE OI 28-1 15 Nov 83, "War Planning-Individual Mobilization Responsibilities and Field Readiness Assessments (FRA)," AFIS/RE, SD 297.

3FACTBOOKS 1 Apr 83 and 1 Oct 83, SDs 287 and 293.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXERCISE</th>
<th>COMMAND</th>
<th>ANNUAL TOURS</th>
<th>ANNUAL DAYS</th>
<th>RPA* TOURS</th>
<th>RPA* DAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flintlock</td>
<td>USAFE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Shield</td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Interrogation</td>
<td>AFIS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Flag</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Lens</td>
<td>PACAF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Fire</td>
<td>USAFE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Runner</td>
<td>AFIS</td>
<td>_____________</td>
<td>___________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RPA: Man-days funded from reserve personnel appropriations which pay the reservist while in a training status or while providing training support.

PRESSURE POINT Exercise

The PRESSURE POINT Exercise originated at the level of the joint chiefs of staff, and for the RE directorate involved the largest number of reservists than any other exercise during the year. It occurred in November. The directorate was to conduct a full telephone alert and a comprehensive test of the ADPS/mailgram mobilization of reservists who were assigned in the continental United States and overseas.1

In the directorate's after-action report, Colonel Oberst stated that the exercise "went exceedingly well." Performance in the telephone alert achieved a 94.5 percent contact rate exceeding the 93 percent rate in exercise PROUD SABER 83. Using preformatted messages, the directorate tested a new alert notification system for contacting dispersed overseas members, which resulted in a "drastic" improvement over the older contact method. The total contact rate was 96 percent, the highest rate ever achieved. The directorate, however, was unable to test the mailgram system because the Air Reserve Personnel Center would not furnish computer support. Also, no mobilization through progressive levels was exercised because according to the exercise scenario there was to be partial mobilization at the start of the exercise. One recurrent problem was noted: the distribution of message traffic. This area showed improvement over PROUD SABER 83, but still required refinements.2

One assessment of participation in the exercise by major command intelligence units concluded that some of the commands "forgot" that they had reservists available to recall. One month

---

1Appendix 2 to Annex A to AFIS EXPLAN 0024 AFIS/RE, 15 Sep 83, SD 298: Historical Data Rpt AFIS/RE, Jan-Dec 83.

2Ltr AFIS/RE to AFIS/XF, "PRESSURE POINT 84 After Action Report." 8 Dec 83, SD 299. Historical Data Rpt AFIS/RE, Jan-Dec 83.
before the exercise, a message was sent to all of the user commands informing them of the directorate’s participation in PRESSURE POINT and providing them with instructions for command interaction during the exercise. There were no replies and no queries about the message. During the exercise, only two commands attempted to mobilize their reservists.\(^1\)

**JOINTEX 83**

Detached Training Site 47, Fort Belvoir, planned and hosted a joint interrogation exercise for members of DTS 1, McGuire AFB, DTS 5, Dover AFB, and DTS 21, Fort Belvoir. The exercise was a shortened version of the Advanced Interrogation Course offered annually at the Los Alamitos Armed Forces Reserve Center in California, under the sponsorship of the AFIS/RE. It entailed a major revision and extensive rewriting of the operations plan used in the advanced course, including a major overhauling of 27 of the roles used. The result was an overall operations plan of 306 pages, all of which was produced by members of DTS 47. The plan was to be used by other DTSs beginning in 1984 as the model for similar exercises throughout the program.\(^2\)

**TRAINING**

Training for the reservists included sessions and work performed at detached training sites and assignment to special duty tours and operational readiness exercises. The reservists were assigned a 12 to 14 day annual training tour plus 12 days of paid inactive duty yearly. Inactive duty training was usually performed at detached training sites, and training in excess of 12 days was performed voluntarily for retirement points only. To the extent possible, training conducted during the 12 days of inactive duty was related to wartime proficiency by providing services or developing products for user commands.\(^3\)

Annual tours were performed by each reservist at his or her 8-day command, which the reservist would augment when mobilized. Tasks assigned during these tours provided experience in wartime skills. In addition to annual tours, reservists performed school tours and special active duty training (man-day) tours to increase their proficiency and qualify prepare them for mobilization.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Memorandum REOR, Capt Durand, MAJCOM/IN Participation in Mobilization Exercises, n.d., SD 304.

\(^2\) Unit Historical Rprt AFIS/DTS 47, Ft. Belvoir, Jan-Dec 83, SD 291.


\(^4\) Ibid., p 5. For a list of training course participation as of 1 Oct 83, see FACTBOOK, 1 Oct 83, p 23, SD 287.
Special man-day tours are designed to provide fully qualified reservists to meet temporary active force needs. The need may have resulted from the necessity to use a uniquely qualified reservist in support of an important requirement or from a personnel short-fall caused by a contingency or temporary loss of active force manpower. The man-days were requested and justified annually on a programmed basis by user commands and were consolidated by the directorate and submitted to the appropriate Air Staff agency for review and allocation.\(^1\)

The directorate scheduled over 2,000 annual and special tours in 1983. The 19,735 man-days committed to these tours equated to over 65 man-years of active force support and training.\(^2\)

### Support Provided to Commands in 1983:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
<th>EPA*</th>
<th>EPA+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>Man-Days</td>
<td>Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTCOM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANTCOM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACAF</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDCOM</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHCOM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACECOM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAFE</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976</td>
<td>11664</td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EPA: Man-days funded from reserve personnel appropriations which pay reservists while in training status or while providing training support.

+EPA: Man-days funded from active force military personnel appropriations which pay reservists on temporary tours of active duty in support of a critical, temporary active force mission requirement.

\(^1\)Ibid.
\(^2\)Historical Data Rpt [89]. APIS/RE, Jan-Dec 83, SD 292.
These figures reflected a slight decrease from the 1982 totals. The increased number of personnel assigned and the reduced man-day allocations necessitated close management of both IMI and man-day resources.

Intelligence Officer AFSC Conversions

On 1 November, major revisions to Air Force Regulation 36-1 went into effect and "drastically increased training requirements" for the reservists. The training section performed a study of the impact of the revisions and conversions of Air Force Specialty Codes and used the study results as background material for participants in the Intelligence Reserve Forces Conference held 17-19 November.¹

The findings of the study revealed that just over 67 percent of the officers were fully qualified. Of the 33 percent not fully qualified, over half were only awaiting time for upgrade and had completed in-residence training. The findings revealed that the conversions would have a minimum impact on training in the AFIS/RE program. Until new resident courses were designed and implemented according to the revised regulation, existing courses were to be used for upgrade for those who had not had in-residence training. The study also showed that of the new specialty codes requiring other prerequisite codes, less than 10 percent of the not-fully qualified members held the prerequisite codes.²

Retrainability of 702XOs

The topic of retraining reservists in the administrative 702XO specialty code was a "hot issue" among the enlisted reservists. For a number of months, personnel in those positions had heard that the major commands were considering the elimination of 702XO reservist positions. That being the case, many would want to retrain into another field, but reservists were not normally allowed to retrain. With no retraining, the 702XOs would be forced to leave the reserve program.³

In anticipation of a MANREQ-FORESIZE exercise, which could have deleted up to ninety 702XO reservist positions from the AFIS/RE manning document, the directorate's training section conducted a preliminary review of 702XO retrainability. A "worst case" scenario was examined. Ninety-one records were evaluated revealing no immediate problems; however, there might have been a few retraining problems in the senior grades.⁴

Humint Training

HUMINT or human intelligence training in the detached training sites continued throughout the year. The directorate

¹Intvw AFIS Historian w. MSgt Kimble, AFIS/RE, 8 Mar 84.
²Ibid. For a chart of the Officer AFSC Conversions, see SD 301.
³Intvw AFIS Historian w. MSgt Kimble, AFIS/RE, 8 Mar 84.
⁴Historical Data Rprt AFIS/RE, Jan-Dec 83, SD 292.
noted an improvement in the content of intelligence reports sent from the DTSs, showing a more thorough questioning of sources and the substantiation of information gathered. New scenarios emphasizing hostile interrogation were added to the exercise inventory to build proficiency in prisoner-of-war exploitation.¹

One reservist, who had practical experience in interrogating a wide range of sources, wrote a paper entitled, "The Confidence Level of the Interrogator." The chief of the Readiness Branch, Ralph Whitebergh, had extensive discussions with the author about the paper as it was being written and sent copies of it to the commanders of the DTSs, stating, "I believe this monograph is worthy of study and discussion and more importantly, it is worthy of practical experimentation in your DTS interrogation exercises." Concerning the concept of "confidence" as the focus of the paper, the author stated, "This theme was selected after careful analysis of all the factors contributing to successful interrogation. This theme continually surfaced when discussing this paper with other interrogators who have conducted hundreds of interrogations of sources from various backgrounds. It also seemed most significant in analyzing my own experience of interrogating sources from many foreign countries representing broad differences based upon culture, education, occupation, age, intelligence and coming from many different social and political ideologies."²

To boost the HUMINT state of the art, the directorate and Detached Training Site 47 jointly developed a postgraduate level interrogation seminar featuring sophisticated methodology selected from the special interrogation course of the Laboratory for Scientific Interrogation, Tel Aviv. The four-day seminar was designed for officers in charge of HUMINT training and advanced trainees at the detached training sites. The seminar was expected to begin in the fall of 1984, be attended by ten to twelve people per class, and include the topics "detection of deception" and "psychology of interrogation."³

Foreign Language Training

The directorate continued to offer language specialists two training options each year: three scattered weekends of "total immersion" in a language at a detached training site or two solid weeks of training at the Defense Language Institute at Monterey, California. The total immersion technique was two years old, and participants who spoke the same language met on an assigned weekend at a designated site and talked exclusively in the common foreign language, usually being Russian, Chinese,

¹Historical Data Rpt AFIS/RE, Jan-Dec 83, SD 292.
³Intvw AFIS Historian w. SMSgt Santa Cruz, AFIS/RE, 8 Mar 84.
German, or Spanish. Up to the end of 1983, total immersion training emphasized conversational proficiency in the common use of the language in order to build a foundation for more sophisticated capabilities. All teams were ready to progress into area study topics as well as technical vocabulary and the description of weapons systems. This sequence of progress was keeping with foreign language program objectives.¹

Team leaders who completed the second year of total immersion language training held a workshop at Monterey, 22-23 October, in order to evaluate the three weekends of training in 1983. Their assessments of the techniques were positive. AFIS/RE Flight 44 in Monterey was charged with managing the RE foreign language program, and it sponsored the workshop.²

Revised Language Skill Ratings

The Defense Language Institute revised the foreign language skill rating system within the Department of Defense to bring it into line with the system used by the Foreign Service Institute and the Central Intelligence Agency, and this action affected approximately ninety reservists. The tougher rating system resulted in lower proficiency and spoken language test scores. Test scores generally were lowered by one point. For example, a person who qualified for entry into the AFIS/RE language program by scoring L2-R2 on the LLPT and 2 on the spoken language test would have his scores lowered to L1-R1 and 1 respectively. Minimum skill level requirements in the directorate’s Operating Instruction 50-2 were modified accordingly. The new rating system was to be taken into consideration when the progress was measured of the reservists who participated in total immersion and tutorial training.³

WORKSHOPS

There were four workshops for area directors and commanders of the detached training sites this year:

January 29-30 Western Area and Central Area
March 19-20 Northeast Area and National Capital Area
April 16-17 Southeast Area
June 4-5 Pacific Area and Southwest Area

The respective area directors chaired the workshops, which provided a forum for commanders of the detached training sites to review areas of management, operations, and personnel policies. Col. Oberst and other directorate staff members, with Brig. Gen. Arthur W. Green, Jr., the mobilization assistant to the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, and Lt. Col Edwin Sapp, the Reserve forces Advisor to the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence,

¹Intvw  AFIS Historian W. SMSgt Santa Cruz, AFIS/RE, 8 Mar 84.
²Historical Data Report  AFIS/RE, Jan-Dec 83, SD 292.
³Ibid.
attended the workshop. There was a free exchange of issues, information, and ideas at the workshop.¹

The annual area director workshop took place at Fort Belvoir, September 17–18. Participants were General Green, directorate staff members, the seven area directors, and the six members of the Board of Advisors. The workshop was a forum for discussing items of mutual concern among the leaders of the program and for reviewing accomplishments and determining management objectives for the forthcoming year.²

An area enlisted advisors workshop was held on April 23–24 at Fort Belvoir. This was the first such workshop in nearly five years. Issues pertaining to enlisted personnel in the seven areas were discussed and information exchanged.³

ADMINISTERING THE RE PROGRAM

Use of Lowry SATO

On 1 March, the Air Reserve Personnel Center implemented new rules governing reservist airline ticketing procedures. The directorate agreed with the basic principal which prompted the changed rules, but disagreed with the one rule which required that all airline ticketing for reservists be handled through the Scheduled Airlines Traffic Office (SATO) at Lowry AFB, Colorado, where the Air Reserve Personnel Center was located. Prior to the new rule, individual reservists scheduled their own flights at local government SATO offices around the country. The mandatory use of the Lowry office, according to Colonel Oberst, caused major personal and professional disruptions, negatively affected the credibility of the program with active force major commands and special operating agencies, and adversely affected reservist morale. The telephoning burden placed upon the directorate staff and reservists was excessive. Further, many were frustrated at receiving last minute, expensive, Special/Federal Express delivery of airline tickets sometimes on the day prior to the start of the tour, only to find the flight accommodations inconvenient and more expensive than need have been. Colonel Oberst stated, "The trade-off of cost vs loss of credibility is counterproductive to our mutual goals. While the foregoing may be viewed as 'temporary growing pains,' the alternate payoffs involving individual morale, professional responsibility, and the personal convenience of making one's own airline reservations through government facilities have considerable merit."
The colonel suggested that instead of requiring the mandatory ticket process that the personnel center simply issue guidelines for the reservists to follow when scheduling their own flights. He urged that the center modify the mandatory Lowry SATO ticketing procedure.¹

In response, the personnel center stated, "We have decided that for the sake of flexibility we should allow the individual member to make his own arrangements through local SATO offices if they notify us of their intention on the AF Form 1289. We will cut the orders as 'TR Directed' and mail them to the member without a ticket. The member must then take the orders to a local TMC/SATO office to obtain his tickets. We will continue to constructively establish reporting and departure times, which will govern payment for travel days."²

Recruiting

The directorate's Manning Branch conducted a nationwide recruiting campaign that resulted in a 26 percent increase in applications over 1982. Recurring Air Force Intelligence Reserve advertisements in the Air Reservist Magazine were supplemented by periodic entries in the Journal of Electronic Defense and the Air Force Magazine. Selected issues of Pacific Southwest Airlines Magazine, Republic Airlines Scene Magazine, Continental Airlines Magazine, and Ozark Airlines Magazine carried the recruiting advertisements throughout the nation. Field-developed camera-ready copies of Air Force-approved advertisements were sent to the Reserve Recruiting Advertising Branch, Headquarters Air Force Reserve, for reformatted and inclusion in the 1984 Advertising Handbook for Air Force-wide Reserves recruiter use. Reservists in the program continued their local recruiting advertising initiatives by the use of newspapers, daily bulletins, and other publications.³

POM Submission

The Readiness Branch, in coordination with the AFIS plans and programs unit, wrote a Program Objective Memorandum (POM) submission, which projected gains in the number of reservists from FY1986 through FY1990. These figures were crucial since funding for reservists was based on the actual number of reservists on hand and not on the number of authorizations. The goal was to achieve 100 percent manning by the end of FY1990. The

¹ Ltr AFIS/RE to ARPC/DR, "IMA Travel Initiatives," 20 Jul 83, SD 305.
² Ltr ARPC/DR to AFIS/RE, "IMA Travel Initiatives (Your Ltr, 20 Jul 83), 27 Jul 83, SD 315.
³ Historical Data Rpt AFIS/RE, Jan-Dec 81, SD 292. See also Mag ARPC to AIG 508 et al, "IMA Travel," 111700Z Feb 83, SD 306.
annual cost per person estimate for the Category B reservist was: officer, $3,814 and enlisted, $1,714.  

**Air Force Audit Agency Report**

On 1 April, the Air Force Audit Agency issued a report, "Management of Air Force Intelligence Individual Mobilization Augmentee Programs." The agency had examined management of the three separate programs which controlled Air Force reservists in Intelligence: Air Force Intelligence Service (AFIS), Air Force Systems Command (AFSC), and the Electronic Security Command (ESC). The overall conclusion of the report stated:

Management in all three intelligence IMA programs was making intensive efforts to improve capabilities and personnel strengths. AFIS had implemented aggressive recruiting efforts and initiated a project to improve the quality and utility of IMA training and intelligence projects. AFSC's program at the Foreign Technology Division and ESC's IMA training with assigned active duty wartime units was effective in preparing IMAs for wartime tasks.

In all three programs, IMAs were prepared for rapid mobilization. For example, mandatory pre-mobilization personnel actions (immunizations, physicals, and skill level/position requirement matching) were current and complete. Augmentees performed annual training with their assigned active duty units as required. However, opportunities did exist to improve the effectiveness of reserve personnel through increased management attention to: 1) AFIS-managed and ESC-managed inactive duty training at detached training sites and 2) IMA position vacancies.

Two major issues were discussed in the report:

1. **Inactive duty training**: AFIS-managed augmentees assigned to flying units were not accomplishing inactive duty training with intelligence data and material used by their wartime units. ESC-managed IMAs attached to Naval Reserve Security Groups did not receive inactive duty training capable with military occupations and wartime tasks to enhance preparedness.

2. **Manpower shortages**: Severe manpower shortages

---

1Ibid. See also Memo to AFIS/RE, Lt Col Warner, to INYX, Lt Col Sapp, "Your Question on Program (Auth) Growth Over Next Five Year," 28 Mar 83, SD 307.


3Ibid.

4Ibid.

5Ibid.
existed in the intelligence programs. An interim solution of preassigning intelligence reservists in inactive ready, standby, and retired regular categories to vacant positions may minimize the adverse effects of the manpower shortages should mobilization occur.

The actions management had taken in response to the issues and recommendations discussed in the report and the action planned were also included in the report.¹

**Five-Year Plan**

In August, the directorate distributed its five-year plan, which covered the fiscal years 1983-1987. Three major objectives were the basis of the plan:

1. Employment of reservists in peacetime intelligence functions as an integral part of maintaining skill proficiency and mobilization readiness.

2. Augmentation of active force intelligence operations in peacetime contingencies or wartime mobilization.

3. Achievement of full force manning with full combat readiness, in concert with the stated goals of the Chief, Air Force Reserve.²

**Retirement Recognition Policy**

In May, Colonel Oberst placed special emphasis upon recognizing deserving personnel who were retiring. The colonel stated, "Each year we lose many good people to mandatory retirement. The Individual Mobilization Augmentees have provided twenty or more years in the service of their country and are deserving of some type of recognition for their long years of work and dedication. I am especially concerned that people who have held demanding positions in our program, such as DTS commanders, area directors, and senior enlisted advisors be appropriately recognized on the occasion of their retirement."³

To promote such recognition, the directorate distributed to the area directors and DTS units the lists of people who had upcoming mandatory retirement dates. Area and DTS personnel officers were directed to use the lists to track retirements of personnel to insure appropriate awards were properly presented in a timely manner. They were expected to submit completed recommendations for decorations to the directorate at least six

¹ Ibid.
³ Ltr AFIS/RE to ADs et al, "Retirement Recognition Policy," 23 May 83, SD 310.
months prior to the individual’s retirement date. The policy applied for individuals retiring before their mandatory dates.¹

The colonel cautioned the personnel officers to recommend “deserving” personnel. The directorate was not modifying the standards for award of decorations upon retirement. In the case of individuals who had not performed “above and beyond” expected duties, another form of recognition, such as a certificate of appreciation, was in order.²

Retired Reserve Representative Program

In July, the directorate’s Retired Reserve Representative (RRR) Program was two years old, and Colonel Oberst hoped that the program would continue to grow. The basic rationale for the program was to provide a link with the “blue shirt community” after separation through retirement, as well as an opportunity to be active in areas that would benefit the program. The retired reserve representatives were provided copies of the directorate’s FACTBOOK, yearly activity calendars, area directors and detached training site commanders registers, a copy of the directorate’s five-year plan, and a letter of instruction as an RRR member. In turn, members provided the program with new candidates, gave briefings about the program, and offered suggestions for program improvements. Members participated on a voluntary basis.³

AFIR or AFISR

In February, Colonel Oberst responded to an inquiry from Col. Jack Morris, the executive officer to the ACS/I, about changing the name of the reservist program from the “Air Force Intelligence Reserve Program” (AFIR) to the “Air Force Intelligence Service Reserve Program.” Colonel Oberst requested that no name change be made. He explained that the AFIR title was created as part of the establishment of the AFIS/RE in January 1974 to denote an intelligence reservist program which transcended AFIS, charged with centralized peacetime management of intelligence reservist spaces and resources of over twenty major commands and agencies. The AFIR title was widely recognized and accepted over a nine-year period. Although clearly understood by program affiliates, the directorate did explain the title to the “uninitiated” in order to make them realize that the Electronic Security Command (ESC) and the Foreign Technology Division (FTD) reservist programs were not part of the AFIR program. There was a title to identify the total Intelligence IMA, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve resource: “Intelligence Air Reserve Forces (IARF).”⁴

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
³Ltr ⁴AFIS/RE to Retired Reserve Representatives, “AFIR Retired Reserve Representative (RRR) Program,” 4 May 83, SD 311.
⁴Ltr ⁵AFIS/RE to AP/IM (Col Morris), “AFIS Reserve Program Title (Your Ltr, 1 Feb 83),” 8 Feb 83, SD 312.
The colonel further explained that the real impact of the title change went beyond a technical point. The AFIR title had an "aura" and a "broad appeal" because it conveyed to the affiliates that they belonged to the AFIR organization/program, centrally managed by AFIS/RE. Thus, the title had been an integral part of the AFIR concept from the beginning. A change of title to "AFIS Reserve Program" would have had a negative impact. The affiliates and key supporters on the Air Staff and particularly in the DOD would have perceived the change as a downgrading. Equally important would have been the perception of the "AFIS Reserve Program" title by definition. The new title would suggest that the program was confined to servicing only AFIS. The AFIS title would have placed the program on equal footing with the PTD, ESC, and non-intelligence major command reservist programs which were limited to servicing one command.¹

The name was not changed.²

Consideration of Personnel Consolidation

In February, the Suggestion Program Manager for AFIS received a suggestion to consolidate the personnel functions of three AFIS directorates, Personnel, Reserves, and Attaché Affairs, for a savings of approximately $270,000.³ The suggestion was processed and forwarded to the RE directorate for a response. Colonel Oberst replied, "The suggestion, while seemingly attractive on the surface, is based on assumptions which reveal a basic lack of knowledge of the management philosophies and resulting staff structure of the AFIS/RE program."⁴

The colonel explained that the removal of a portion of the current centralized AFIS/RE staff at Fort Belvoir would have required substantial augmentation of staffs now in place at each of the twenty-three supported commands, at a likely cost of many more manpower spaces than potentially would have been saved at AFIS. Most of the user commands had only a single, part-time intelligence reserve point-of-contact, since the AFIS/RE staff performed most of the management functions for their intelligence reservists.⁵

The colonel discussed approximately six other rationales for keeping the directorate in tact and disapproving the suggestion. The suggestion was subsequently disapproved.⁶

¹Ibid.
²Ibid.
⁵Ibid.
⁶Ibid.
Security

The Security Branch processed 120 Special Background Investigations (SBIs), 107 SBI periodic re-investigations, and 190 periodic re-investigations under interim Air Force procedures. The total of 417 represented a 287 percent increase over the previous year due to reinstatement of periodic re-investigations. Approximately 1250 separate actions were initiated for reserve tours requiring sensitive compartmented information (SCI) access.\(^1\)

Another major SCI action involved updating the USAFINTEL 201-1. The update established uniform procedures for active duty units to use whenever a reservist required SCI access for inactive or active duty training. The revision had been approved and was to be included in the early 1994 USAFINTEL 201-1 reprinting.\(^2\)

Two major actions concerning collateral security clearances were undertaken this year. First, the instruction booklet was completely rewritten because new Department of Defense forms were issued for security investigations. Second, the branch obtained approval from the Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC) and the Air Force Military Personnel Center to directly inquire into the Automated Personnel Data System (APDS) to verify security clearances and trace working investigations. Prior to this change, all such actions had to be routed via individual letters to the ARPC, which inquired into the computerized APDS.\(^3\)

The AFIS/RE reserve SCI billet structure attained its highest number ever, with approximately 90 percent of the 591 permanent billets being filled.\(^4\)

Evaluations and Awards

The Quality Force Branch processed 948 officer evaluation ratings, 239 airmen performance reports and 1257 letters of evaluation. Many of the ratings and reports were done incorrectly and had to be re-done, but on the second attempt, the final acceptance rate was nearly 100 percent.\(^5\)

Statistics for awards and decorations were the following.\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF AWARD</th>
<th>NUMBER OF AWARDS PROCESSED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF AWARDS APPROVED</th>
<th>NUMBER DISAPPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legion of Merit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Historical Data Ppt. \(^2\) Ibid. \(^3\) Ibid. \(^4\) Ibid. \(^5\) Ibid. \(^6\) Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF AWARD</th>
<th>NUMBER OF AWARDS PROCESSED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF AWARDS APPROVED*</th>
<th>NUMBER DISAPPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meritorious Service Medal</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Commendation Medal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Achievement Medal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The figure reflects some awards processed in 1982, but approved in 1983. It also indicates some awards processed in 1983, but not approved at the end of the year.

The Outstanding Officer and Enlisted IMA of the Year Screening Board convened on 30 November and evaluated seven officers and six enlisted candidates. The officer selected was Col. Charles D. George, Southeast Area, and the enlisted selectee was SMSgt Joseph Herod, National Capital Area. They were submitted to the Air Reserve Personnel Center for the Outstanding IMA of the Year Board, which was scheduled to convene 27 January 1984.

The directorate's Reserve Airman Commissioning Program (RACP) evaluated eleven reserve candidates on 13 June and recommended three to the RACP board meeting 23 August. The three candidates were accepted for commissioning during September. Also accepted was a sergeant whose nomination was processed by the Tactical Air Command (TAC), where he was attached for training to the AFIS reserve program.
DTS 14 HUMINT exercise, 33 JAN 22
Guards, interrogators, interviewer, and "AWOL soldier" discuss their observations before "Schmidt's" interrogation.
DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL

MISSION

The Directorate of Personnel (DP) provides the AFIS commander with assistance and recommendations on all matters that pertain to AF-IN-AFIS military and civilian personnel acquisition and assignment, career development and training, career management, and liaison between worldwide intelligence activities and the Air Force Manpower and Personnel Center and PALACE SENTINEL. It monitors the US Air Force Intelligence community personnel resources and programs to facilitate harmonization of interest and efforts.

Subordinate Functions

Civilian Personnel Division (DPC)

Provides complete competitive/excepted civilian personnel support to managers and to operating civilian personnel offices (CPOs). AFIS DPC:

1. Develops policy and directives internal to AFIS that pertain to civilian personnel management.

2. Is the central point of contact with managers and civilian personnel offices on all personnel actions and programs.

3. Administers the civilian awards and decorations programs.

4. Evaluates personnel management requests that affect staffing actions against manpower authorizations.

5. Is responsible for maintaining a civilian personnel data base.

6. Is responsible for administering the functional area of the Civilian Intelligence Career Development Program (ICDP). Provides assistance to the functional managers at all levels on all aspects of the ICDP Air Force wide. Receives policy guidance from HQ USAF and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Installations).

7. Advises management at all levels on a variety of civilian personnel problems, including matters such as supergrade actions, consultant appointment, high-grade ceiling control, and other position actions.

8. Controls supervisory and high-grade civilian positions.

Military Personnel Resources Division (MPR)

1. Together with the Air Force Manpower Personnel Center (AFMPC), identifies and recommends qualified military personnel (lieutenant colonel and below - including noncommissioned officers) for assignment to Air Force Intelligence activities, including all worldwide HUMINT collection.

2. Monitors all Air Force Intelligence activities and HUMINT military personnel assignment actions (lieutenant colonels and below - including noncommissioned officers), such as utilization, reassignment, and career activities.

3. Establishes and implements, as directed by HQ USAF/IN, command policies on all Air Force Intelligence activity military personnel assignments or reassignments.

4. Coordinates all personnel actions for the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence which involve colonel assignment actions for AF/IN and Air Force Intelligence Service activities.

5. Administers the military awards and decorations programs; officer effectiveness reports and airmen performance reports.

6. Represents the Director of Personnel in all personnel subsystem activities that formulate computer output products for staffing requirement information.

7. Manages the Air Staff Training program (ASTRA) for Intelligence.

8. Assists in staff planning, preparing advance analysis of personnel capability, and introduces personnel information and requirements as planning factors.

9. Reviews APR 11-4 agreements and formulates the AFIS/DP position for all joint tenancy matters.

Training, Education & Career Development Division (DPT)

1. Schedules all training of AF/IN-AFIS military and civilian personnel. This includes all residence and correspondence courses, as well as arranging for instructors to come TDY to the area if it saves Air Force travel funds. It also includes scheduling all professional training, as well as Professional Military Education (PME), such as Squadron Officer School (SOS), NCO Academy (NCOA), NCO Leadership School (NCOLES), Executive/Mid-Level Development, etc.

2. Ensures mandatory courses identified on civilian ICDDPs are completed and desirable courses too, if funds permit.
3. Ensures each civilian in ICDP has a five year ICDP plan and completes the required training.

4. Ensures civilians complete their Individual Development Plan (IDP), if funds permit.

5. Uses the Pipeline Management Systems (PMS) to properly manage Command training requirements, validations, allocations, sub-allocations, etc.

6. Budgets for, and obtains additional funding, if necessary, for fiscal year training needs of AF/IN military, AF/IN civilians, AFIS military, and AFIS civilians - each having its own budget.

7. Works closely with the CBFO and CCFOs to insure that training actions are completed.

8. Works closely with the Officer of Civilian Personnel Operations (OCPO) concerning civilian training and with AFIS Comptroller concerning AFIS military training; AP/IN directorates fund their own military training. AF/IN civilian training is budgeted by 1947th CBFO.

9. Monitors training opportunities, advertises them, and obtains quotas, as needed.

10. Works special training programs.

11. Ensures training facilities, supplies, equipment, etc. are provided for instructors TDY to this area.

12. Works with APSAC in sub-allocating APSAC controlled quotas (i.e. Military Operations Training Course, Military Operations Seminar, etc.) Air Force wide.

13. Monitors and funds special MJCOM quotas for 2030XOs, 208XOs, etc.

14. Expands AF/IN-AFIS participation in the Non-resident Foreign Language Training Program. Maintains texts and tapes for distribution, etc.

15. Conducts annual screening and validation of AF/IN-AFIS training requirements.

16. Completes Air Force wide five year ICDP training requirements for DIA.

17. Manages AFIS Suggestion Program

18. Budgets for directorate expenses and AFIS civilian PCS moves.
Intelligence Training Programs Branch (DPRT)

1. Manages the development of policy for Intelligence Training and Research Programs.

2. Manages and administers the Air Force Area Specialist Program.

3. Manages selected Air Force Intelligence Training Programs to include: the DCI Exceptional Intelligence Analyst Program, the Defense Advanced Language and Area Studies Program, and the Quality of Analysis Program.

4. Manages selected Air Force Intelligence Research Programs to include: the Airpower Research Institute Research Fellowship and the Defense Academic Research Support Program.

5. Manages AP/IN and AFIS participation in the AFIS Non-Resident Foreign Language Program. Maintains texts and tapes for distribution.

6. Works closely with the Air Force Institute of Technology, the manager of the Army Foreign Area Officer Program, the manager of Naval Intelligence Training, and the DIA training office.

7. Assists in reviewing the curriculum at the Naval Postgraduate School and the Defense Language Institute.

PERSONNEL

Key Personnel

Col. Ronald J. Skorepa continued as director of DF, a position he held since 1 April 1982. On 10 June Maj. Richard D. Krueger, the chief of the Military Personnel Division, was transferred to the Directorate of Estimates, and was replaced on 10 June by Maj. Stephen D. Broyles. On 19 September, 1st Lt. Cynthia D. VanEvery became chief of the Education, Training, and Career Development Division, which had also been under the authority of Maj. Broyles. Ms. Jean McGarry resigned as chief of the Civilian Personnel Division on 11 March, and was replaced by Ms. Hoopes on 7 August. Tsgt Robert A. Rennicker was chief of the Administration Branch, a position he held since 8 June 1981.¹

Manpower Strength

The directorate was located in Building 1926 in the AFIS compound and had the following manpower strength:

¹For a detailed listing of personnel within the directorate see Historical Data Rprt AFIS DP, Jan-Dec 83, SD 316.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>NUMBER ASSIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFICERS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLISTED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVILIANS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

DOD-Wide Civilian Career Program (ICDP) for General Intelligence Personnel

Career Appraisal

The DD Form 1917 (test) was evaluated and revised. Since this form is important for the careerist as an individual development plan, the training section was moved to the front page. This section is also a very effective tool for management to use by retrieving the data for organizational and component training plans, as well as budgeting and funding for training requirements. The assessment section was moved to the reverse side and will not be included in the DISCHAS data base. The new DD Form 1917 is expected in late 1984.

The DOD Intelligence Career Development Program Office has taken steps to automate the DD Form 1912s (Narrative Supplement) information. Narrative supplement information that is already on file has been converted to an automated format and has been used on a test basis in the referral process during 1983. In early 1984, each registrant in the career program will be given an opportunity to review, validate and update their automated narrative information on the new DD Form 1932-1.

HQ AF/MPK did not concur with the revised DD Forms 1917 & 1932 because the additional workload it imposed on functional managers, employees, and civilian personnel specialists. HQ AF/MPK also felt the two forms were duplications of Air Force forms already in use. The possibility of meeting the data requirements for SF-50, DD Form 1917 and DD Form 1932 by tape transfer of data was discussed at the meeting at the Office of Civilian Personnel Operations (OCPO) in December, between AFIS/DP, DIA and OCPO personnel. The results of the meeting will be held around March 1984, to continue the discussions of an automatic tape transfer of Air Force civilian personnel data to the Defense Intelligence Special Career Automated system.

In view of the mutual agreement that the DOD requirement for the DD Form 1917 can be satisfied by Air Force procedures and tape transfer of data elements, DIA is going to proceed with revision of the form. Air Force Intelligence personnel will not complete the DD Form 1917. The requirement will be satisfied through the transfer of data between the two systems.
Civilian Personnel Data

On 31 December 1982, the AF/IN-AFIS civilian status reflected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authorized</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF/IN</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APIS</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of December 1983, the high-grade control reflected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On-Board</th>
<th>High Grade</th>
<th>High Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>Authorized</td>
<td>Filled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF/IN</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APIS</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduction-In-Force

One Reduction-In-Force (RIF) was conducted in 1983. Due to a change in language requirements, a Translator position in AFSCOM/DET 31 had to be reclassified. The incumbent, Mr. Stephan Low, did not have the necessary language skills, therefore he was placed in RIF status. His employment was terminated on 30 September 1983.¹

Civilian Performance Recognition Program

AFR 40-451, Civilian Performance Recognition Program, 9 Sep 83, replaced AFR 40-470, Civilian Performance Awards Program, 21 Feb 75. Colonel William Sherman was appointed chairperson of the AF/IN-AFIS Merit Pay Unit Committee and AF/IN-AFIS Civilian Incentive Awards Committee effective 1 November 1983.

Incumbents of the following positions will be members of the Merit Pay Committee and the Civilian Incentive Awards Committee:

1. Director or Deputy Director, AF/INE
2. Director or Deputy Director, AF/INY
3. Director, APIS/INS
4. AFSCOM/CC or CV
5. APIS/DP or DPC (non-voting Executive Secretary)

The Committee will direct the merit pay and incentive awards programs by developing local policies and procedures; planning program activities for the year; establishing goals and

¹Ltr "475th ABW/DPCS to DIA, "Separation due to RIF -- Stephen Low," 4 Oct 83, SD 317."
targets: evaluating the program; reviewing nominations; recommending nominees for awards; and, providing advice on program improvements.1

Intelligence Youth Employment Program

In September 1983, AFIS implemented a youth employment program under appointing authority FPM chapter 213, appendix C, schedule A, 213. 3102 (q). Two students were appointed under this authority.

Purpose. To provide training and experience in intelligence and to encourage well-qualified students to pursue Federal career in this field.

Proposal. To establish a youth employment program under appointing authority FPM chapter 213, appendix C, schedule A, 213, 3102 (q).

1. Positions at grade GS-7 and below when appointees are to assist scientific professional, or technical employees.

2. Applicants must be bona fide students at accredited colleges or universities who are pursuing courses related to the field in which employed. Does not permit conversion to career or career conditional.

Advantages of hiring students under authority 213.3102 (q), instead of summer hire.

1. Students can continue working part-time throughout the school year (students cannot work in excess of 1,040 working hours a year).

2. Would enable local CFO and AFIS to advertise at Universities and Colleges for students to attract the best candidates.

Disadvantages of regular summer hire authority 326.402(A):

1. Unable to advertise the type student needed.

2. The CFO uses a SSN# list lottery system. Students with the skills we need may not be in reach.

3. Students do not have to take a Civil Service Exam.

1Ltr Ltr, AFIS/CC to AF/IN and AFIS Staff, "Merit Pay and Incentive Awards Committees." 28 Oct 83, SD 318.
4. Clearances not able to be started until after lottery conducted in Spring.

The program was very successful and will be enlarged in 1984.

Safety, Security, Special Investigation Civilian Career Program (SSSCCP)

On 23 October 1983, the Security Phase of the SSSCCP was implemented. As of that date, all requests to fill Security GS-080-09 and above positions will be forwarded by the Andrews CCP to the Office of Civilian Personnel (OCFO/MPF).\(^{1}\)

As of 28 June 1983, APIS/INS had the following positions covered under the program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-09</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals of the Program

The primary goal is to develop employees with strong professional, technical, managerial, and administrative skills to satisfy current and future Air Force mission needs. Additional goals include:

1. Providing for the employment, development, and retention of exceptional performers.

2. Fostering and promoting the highest standards of personnel achievement through experience and education in either the safety, security, or special investigation functions.

3. Providing employees with assignment and training experiences to improve their capabilities in order to facilitate their movement into more responsible positions.

4. Providing selecting officials with a certificate of the best qualified employees available for promotion and/or reassignment.

5. Providing program registrants a vehicle by which they can be considered for promotion and/or reassignment to vacancies for which they have indicated an interest.

MILITARY PERSONNEL RESOURCES DIVISION

In July 1982, several billets were taken from AFIS/DPR to create AFIS/DPT. After six months of operation, in February 1983, AFIS/DP reassigned one of the "lost" billets back from AFIS/DPT to AFIS/DPR to be responsible for various special programs to include the AF/IN-AFIS recognition programs, promotion actions, and AFIS Command Personnel Records.

Officer Manning

MSgt Paulk went TDY to HQ AFMPC twice during 1983. The first visit was an orientation visit with her counterparts at HQ AFMPC/PALACE SENTINEL from 23-25 May 1983. The second trip was from 11-15 July 1983 to attend an action officer data product working group. Its purpose was to discuss and review prototype data products with the intent of developing standardized authorized and assigned manning products usable at the Center and MAJCOM/SCA levels.

At the beginning of the year, all officer assignments to AF/IN-AFIS had to be processed for ACS/I approval. With the assignment of Major General Pfautz in July 1983 and the pending retirement of Colonel Jack Morris, AFIS/DPR submitted a recommendation that approval of officer assignments be delegated. This concept was approved in part. ACS/I would approve assignments of all colonels, and APSAC lieutenant colonels and commanders; directors would approve assignments of lieutenant colonels and below; APSAC/CC would approve assignment of majors and below. This policy changed in early January 1984. The ACS/I now approves all colonel assignments; directors and APSAC/CC approve assignments for lieutenant colonels and below.

Upon the retirement of Colonel Morris, AFIS/CC appointed the Director of Personnel as the point of contact for all 80XX Colonel assignments, Air Force wide. Colonel Skorpi processes these personally.

AFIS/DPR continued to experience problems with the manning of Human Intelligence Resources (HUMINT) officers, APSC: 8025 (previously, 8024), within Air Force Special Activities Center (APSAC) and its subordinate units. It also experienced problems with 80XX manning in AF/INY. Major General Pfautz

Ltr AFIS/DPT to AFIS Staff, "Visit by CBPO Representative," 12 Feb 83, SD 322; Brfq Paper AFIS/DP to AFIS/CC, BG Martin, Mar 83, SD 323; Staff Summary Sheet AFIS/DP to ACS/I, "Air Staff Training (ASTRA) Program Selectees for FY84," 1 Mar 83, SD 324.
recognized the manning problems and personally addressed the matter by sending a letter to Brig. Gen. Robert L. Rutherford, Deputy Assistant DCS/MP for Military Personnel, and requested his earliest assistance in filling these key positions with high caliber people.

During the last six months of the year, AF/INS underwent a major reorganization. On 29 December 1983, the completed package was forwarded to AFIS/NO to work with their counterparts at 1947th HSG to align manpower spaces as requested in the AF/INS reorganization package.

Air Staff Officer manning for 1983 was 96%; APIS manning was 94%; AFSAC manning was 76%. We expect problems to continue in 80XX manning since the total Air Force manning in the Intelligence career field is 82%. The high manning for AF/IN and APIS is directly attributed to the excellent work of MSgt Paulk in filling these vital positions.1

Competing manning priorities continued to create manning problems for AF/IN-AFIS directorates in 1983. Verbal and written priorities directed by the prior ACS/I, Major General Marks, caused manning shortfalls in other AFIS directorates when the overall AFIS manning was less than 100 percent. Specifically, APIS/INOC, the Intelligence WATCH Facility, and APIS/IN, the Soviet Awareness Team, had priority one fill requirements.2

Enlisted Manning

Airman assignments within AF/IN-AFIS staff elements continued to be manned at a record high on-board enlisted strength in 1983. AF/IN was manned at an average of 100%; APIS averaged 92%; AFSAC averaged 98%. This high manning percentage is a tribute to the outstanding efforts of the personnel serving in the Airman Assignments Branch.

Due to the internal restructuring of APIS/INS and AF/INE, we experienced problems with their manning. Contributing to the manning problems was the addition of six Master Sergeant 70270 billets within AFIS/INS requiring SCI clearance, with only SSgt 70250A replacements projected. Some in-bounds were cancelled; other positions are being considered for the in-bounds

1 Ltr [1], APIS/DP to HQ AFMPC/MPCOSAE, "Central American Joint Intelligence Team (CAJIT Manning)," 20 Jul 83, SD 325; Ltr [1], APIS/DP to HQ AFMPC/MPCYCP, "Request for Functional Responsibility Deviation," 20 Jul 83, SD 326; Staff Summary Sheet [1], AFSAC/IV to ACS/I, "Letter to Maj Gen Springer, AFMPC, Requesting Personnel Briefing to ACS/I," 12 Aug 83, SD 327.

so that manning requirements can be met at the "7" levels. HQ AFMHPC has been extremely cooperative in meeting the AF/IN-AFIS needs and in working several personnel actions.

An unusual situation arose in February. On 17 February 1983, an Air Reserve senior enlisted member assigned to AFIS re-enlisted in the Regular Air Force for a period of six years. Unknown at the time, this was an erroneous enlistment. Current Air Force policy permits a reservist on Extended Active Duty (EAD) to enlist in the Regular Air Force in the same grade as enlistees under the Prior Service enlistment program (Airman through Master Sergeant). Since the Reservist was serving in a grade higher than Master Sergeant, the erroneous enlistment adversely affected FY end strength, career progression, and promotion opportunities within the career field that the person was enlisted in. Air Force policy required that the individual be: a) discharged for erroneous enlistment, b) discharged for other reasons, or c) approve a waiver of the option to discharge. Based on the facts involved in the case, AFIS recommended the serviceman be discharged. Due to the nature of this case, it was reviewed at levels up to and including the Secretary of the Air Force. Upon the request of the individual, a discharge board was convened and recommended immediate discharge. Case is currently under normal review and possible appeal.

Command Records

With the reassignment of SSgt Bonny Downing to AFIS/DPR, responsibility for the AFIS Officer Command Selection Record Group folders was transferred from MSgt Paulk to SSgt Downing in February 1983. SSgt Downing continued to maintain these records for all AFIS assigned officers, second lieutenant through colonel, in an exemplary fashion.

Promotions

The following promotion statistics for AF/IN-AFIS personnel are provided for 1983:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF/IN</th>
<th>AFIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELIG</td>
<td>SEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT COL</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMSGT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMSGT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSGT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSGT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE 1. In addition, Brigadier General Rissell, AFIS Commander, selected Staff Sergeant Robert A. Rennicker, AFIS/DPA, as the Air Force Intelligence Service FY33 Stripes for Exceptional Performers (STEP) promotee; SSgt Rennicker assumed the rank of technical sergeant on 1 January 1983.

NOTE 2. Promotion issues were handled by MSGt Robert Becker until the assignment of SSgt Bonnie Downing to AFIS/DPR on 1 Feb 83; she assumed this responsibility for the remainder of the year.

Regular Air Force Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capt</td>
<td>Jasinski, Andrew B.</td>
<td>ESAA, Det 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Begley, William K.</td>
<td>AFSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Cox, Robert W.</td>
<td>AFSC, Det 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Diggs, Karen R.</td>
<td>AFIS/INS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Ferguson, Thomas A.</td>
<td>AFIS/INOZB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Gibson, Robert G.</td>
<td>AFIS/INT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Giroux, Terrence E.</td>
<td>AFIS/COQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Haggin, Jerry C.</td>
<td>AFSC, Det 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Haney, Lester K.</td>
<td>HQ ESAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Harris, Yolanda R.</td>
<td>AFIS/IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Holtzman, Kenneth E.</td>
<td>AFIS/INU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>House, John W.</td>
<td>AP/INY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Howlett, Judith A.</td>
<td>AP/INET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Humper, David M.</td>
<td>AFIS/INCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Johnson, Patrick J.</td>
<td>AFIS/INOZB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Klahr, Kevin</td>
<td>AFSC/INO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Kuhn, Wolfgang R.</td>
<td>AP/INW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Levy, John W. II</td>
<td>AFIS/OE-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Manning, Rita L.</td>
<td>AFIS/INSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>McCutcheon, Bennet B. Jr.</td>
<td>AFIS/THC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Meltis, Jack J., Jr.</td>
<td>AFIS/INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>New, Benjamin, A.F.</td>
<td>AFIS/INDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Porter, Richard C.</td>
<td>AFIS/INOZC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Prine-Rincon, Barbara K.</td>
<td>AFSC/CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Radloff, Bruce D.</td>
<td>AFSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Septer, Patricia A.</td>
<td>AFIS/INOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Sherman, John C.</td>
<td>AFIS/IND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Smith, Bryan</td>
<td>AFSC, Det 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Sylwesater, Michael R.</td>
<td>AFSC, Det 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Woodard, Vickie L.</td>
<td>AFIS/INOZA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indefinite Reserve Status

The following officers were selected for promotion to the permanent grade of captain and tendered Indefinite Reserve Status during 1983:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Boyd, Reinhard</td>
<td>HQ ESAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Ellis, Patrick M.</td>
<td>AFSC/INX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DIRECTORATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Harris, Richard C.</td>
<td>AFIS/INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Hopkins, Lawrence V.</td>
<td>AFISAC/Det 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Raquib, Tarek M.</td>
<td>AFISAC/Det 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Stanfield, Raymonde N.</td>
<td>AFISAC/Det 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Effectiveness Reports (OERs) and Airman Performance Reports (APRs)

In 1983, AFIS/DPA processed a significant number of OERs and APRs. We also continued to record the on-time and late rate statistics on the reports generated within AF/IN and AFIS. Those year-end figures were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PROCESSED</th>
<th>ON TIME</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>NUMBER LATE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF/IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OERs</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OERs</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRs</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In May 1983, an agreement was reached among the ACS/I, the Electronic Security Command (ESC) Commander and the DCS for Technical Training at Air Training Command (ATC), to forward OERs and APRs on a few select Air Force officers and enlisted personnel assigned to the Defense Language Institute, Monterey, for ACS/I or DACS/I endorsement. This procedure was implemented during the summer of 1983. By year's end, two OERs and two APRs were processed for their signature.

Military Decorations Program

The following are the number of military decorations submitted during 1983:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBMIT'D</th>
<th>AF/IN APPRVD</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>SUBMIT'D</th>
<th>AFIS APPRVD</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSM</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMIT'D</td>
<td>AF/IN</td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>SUBMIT'D</td>
<td>AFIS</td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFCHM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFAM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DSM = Distinguished Service Medal**  
**LOM = Legion of Merit**  
**MSM = Meritorious Service Medal**  
**AFCHM = Air Force Commendation Medal**  
**AFAM = Air Force Achievement Medal**

In the spring of 1983, the AFIS Commander established an AFIS Military Decorations Board system to review decoration nominations and provide him with comments and recommendations. The boards meet at the request of AFIS/DP; each is composed of three senior AFIS officers and one enlisted representative. The first board met 27 June 1983.1

1983 AP/IN-AFIS Recognition Program

The complete success of the program is reflected in the following information:

**AFIS COMPANY GRADE OFFICER OF THE QUARTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>AFIS/Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan - Mar 83</td>
<td>1st Lt Patrick D. O'Leary</td>
<td>AFIS/RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr - Jun 83</td>
<td>Capt Lamont A. Noble</td>
<td>AFIS/OL-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul - Sep 83</td>
<td>Capt Patrick J. Johnson</td>
<td>AF/INER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct - Dec 83</td>
<td>1st Lt Klytie Salcedo</td>
<td>AF/INER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIS SENIOR NCO OF THE QUARTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>AFIS/Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan - Mar 83</td>
<td>SMSgt Bobby P. Carter</td>
<td>PSAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr - Jun 83</td>
<td>SMSgt Charles Lovelady</td>
<td>AFIS/INR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul - Sep 83</td>
<td>SMSgt Guenther Lang</td>
<td>ESAA OL-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct - Dec 83</td>
<td>SMSgt Kenneth E. Pool</td>
<td>AFIS/INH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIS NCO OF THE QUARTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>AFIS/Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan - Mar 83</td>
<td>TSgt Michael Francisco</td>
<td>AFIS/INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr - Jun 83</td>
<td>TSgt Mark W. Osmun</td>
<td>ESAA Det 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul - Sep 83</td>
<td>SSgt James D. Yancey</td>
<td>AFIS/DAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct - Dec 83</td>
<td>TSgt Harvey Stanfield Jr.</td>
<td>AFIS/IND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFIS OUTSTANDING ADMINISTRATION AWARDS FOR 1983**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>AFIS/Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSgt</td>
<td>Rennicker, Robert A.</td>
<td>AFIS/DPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt</td>
<td>Longerbeam, Ramona K.</td>
<td>AFIS/DA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1For the listing of AF/IN-AFIS Decorations Recipients in 1983, see SD 129.
The change of servicing CBPO from the 1100th ABW at Bolling AFB to the 1947th ASG CBPO at the Pentagon was completed on 20 January 1983. Due to the good efforts and close coordination throughout this changeover between AFIS, 1100th ABW, 1947th ASG, and HQ AFMPC, the transition went very smoothly and was completed without any problems.

Grenada Crisis Support

AFIS/DPF worked closely with HQ AFMPC and HQ AFSAC in insuring that appropriate language qualified intelligence personnel were identified and then notified of deployment or potential deployment. HQ AFMPC supported those personnel by placing them on an alert status until released by AFIS. Through the efforts of all involved, the entire action was handled smoothly. The one flaw was failure to include SSANs in a message to HQ AFMPC. All future messages identifying people should include SSANs since the personnel data system is keyed to SSANs: failure to include them resulted in extra manual research and a time delay in HQ AFMPC response to the AFIS request for support.

Word Processing

Throughout the year, AFIS/DP was involved in justifying rental of a word processing system with data capability. The Philips MICOM 2002 was installed in May 1983. After six months usage and training on the system, AFIS/DPF conducted a Word Processing Survey throughout the directorate. The results indicated that two additional terminals and three additional printers were needed in order to optimise productivity and use the systems available. Paperwork was submitted to AFIS/DA for approval and funds to purchase were reserved with AFIS/AC upon approval by AFIS/DA. At present, we are in a “hold” status until we receive approval by HQ AFMPC to use our MODDUM to “talk” with the Advanced Personnel Data System (APDS) at Randolph AFB. Colonel Skorepa, AFIS/DP, has discussed this with HQ AFMPC and has been told that the appropriate password would arrive in January 1984. At that time, the paperwork should be approved by AFIS/DA and AFIS/AC, we anticipate installation of the additional
terminals and printers before May 1984. The configuration will be:

4 x 3 - DP
   - DP Secretary
   - DP
   - terminal
   - terminal and printer

2 x 2 - DPT
   - terminal and printer
   - terminal and printer

The new system purchased is capable of expanding to a 4 x 3 configuration if the need develops.

The primary purpose of this system is word processing; however, a major secondary purpose is also the hook-up with HQ AFMPC. We anticipate much additional flexibility with the MICON system when operational in that we will have access to the APDS data base and can extract what is needed for assignment purposes, manning management, etc. Therefore, we will be able to manipulate data, perform hypothetical configurations, extract information previously done manually, etc. - a major improvement.

Pressure Point 83

AFIS/DP participation was minimal in this exercise with only four messages requiring a response. However, procedures were closely reviewed. In addition, sample messages were prepared for future use during an exercise or actual crisis. This preparation for the exercise proved beneficial during the Grenada crisis. Based on the preparation that went into this exercise, AFIS/DP will be ready for the next big exercise held in the fall of 1984.

TRAINING, EDUCATION, & CAREER DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

The division was established by Colonel Skoorepa, on 12 July 1982, by taking resources from within AFIS/DP and realigning them to create AFIS/DPT. The primary mission of AFIS/DPT was to ensure that AF/IN-AFIS people were properly trained to meet mission requirements. As noted under Special Problems in our 1981 history, the training program within AF/IN-AFIS continued to receive special emphasis. It grew to the point where a separate division was created to properly handle all training needs.

Formal Training

The following shows the growth of AFIS training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY80</th>
<th>FY81</th>
<th>FY82</th>
<th>FY83</th>
<th>FY84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotas</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVILIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotas</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: FY84 Projected

Professional Military Education (PME)

\[ \text{PME opportunities for AFIS Personnel also increased:} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY81</th>
<th>FY82</th>
<th>FY83</th>
<th>FY84</th>
<th>FY85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCOA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCOLS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: FY84 and FY85 are projections.

The following are military personnel designated for attendance at Professional Military Education Programs:

1. Senior Service Schools (SSS)
   a. During FY83, two AF-IN-AFIS officers departed to attend a Senior Service School:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lt Col</td>
<td>Kilburn, Richard F.</td>
<td>AF/INYSS</td>
<td>Air War College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt Col</td>
<td>Brower, Stephen A.</td>
<td>AF/INY</td>
<td>National War College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. For FY84, no AF-IN-AFIS lieutenant colonels were designated for future attendance at a Senior Service School.

   c. The following AF-IN-AFIS colonels were nominated for future attendance at a Senior Service School:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Gardner, Phillip D.</td>
<td>AF/INB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Nicholson, Voy J.</td>
<td>AF/INY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col (sel)</td>
<td>Thompson, Lynn L.</td>
<td>AFIS/LG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Intermediate Service Schools (ISS)
   a. The following AF-IN-AFIS officers were designated for FY84 Intermediate Service School attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Broyles, Stephen D.</td>
<td>AFIS/DF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Currie, Kenneth M.</td>
<td>AF/INOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Martin, William B.</td>
<td>PSAA, Det 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Sullivan, James M.</td>
<td>AF/INY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. The following AF-IN-AFIS officers were designated as alternates for FY84 ISS attendance:
### 3. Squadron Officer School (SOS)

The following officers attended SOS during CY 1982:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Diggs, Karen R.</td>
<td>INE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Gibson, Robert G.</td>
<td>INT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Halstead, Edwin R.</td>
<td>INYSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Hamel, Carol H.</td>
<td>INY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Kadajski, Joseph A.</td>
<td>ESAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lt</td>
<td>Sylwester, Michael R.</td>
<td>ESAA/Det 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Senior NCO Academy

a. During 1983, the following AFIS personnel attended the USAF Senior NCO Academy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMSgt</td>
<td>Carter, Bobby F.</td>
<td>PSAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMSgt</td>
<td>Lang, Guenther</td>
<td>ESAA/OL-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMSgt</td>
<td>Pool, Kenneth E.</td>
<td>AFIS/INB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The following AFIS NCOs were designated for future attendance at the Senior NCO Academy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
<th>SEL STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMSgt</td>
<td>Law, William J.</td>
<td>AFIS/DP</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSGt</td>
<td>Emenhizer, William</td>
<td>AFIS/MO</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSGt</td>
<td>Simpson, David L.</td>
<td>Projected gain</td>
<td>Alternate to AFIS/INT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. NCO Academy

The following noncommissioned officers attended the NCO Academy in CY83:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSgt</td>
<td>Ferguson, George W.</td>
<td>AFIS/RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt</td>
<td>Finger, Clyde W.</td>
<td>AF/INE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt</td>
<td>Graham, Alex</td>
<td>AP/INEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt</td>
<td>Luckel, Henry H., Jr.</td>
<td>AFIS/INSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt</td>
<td>Miller, James D.</td>
<td>AFIS/INS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt</td>
<td>Owens, Darrell E.</td>
<td>AFIS/RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt</td>
<td>Rhodes, Miller C.</td>
<td>AFIS/INOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt</td>
<td>Shoesmith, Gary L.</td>
<td>ESAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training Procedures

Procedures for proper training submissions were established to preclude improper training submissions. In the past, some courses of instruction were not contracted through ATC, and funds were expended needlessly. Seminar attendance increased sharply, and proper procedures IAW AFR 30-9 were instituted to preclude improper approval.

Suggestion Program

For statistics on the Suggestion Program see the program log. 1

INTELLIGENCE TRAINING PROGRAMS BRANCH

This new branch was developed during 1983 to be the single point of contact in the Air Force for selected Intelligence Training and Research Programs. Major R. F. Airaghi was detailed from DIA to begin operation, and a SMSgt position was transferred from AFIS/MS. By the end of the year, one staff sergeant position was taken from AFIS/DIT to help manage the various programs transferred to AFIS/DP from AFIS/INH in May 1983. 2

Air Force Area Specialist Program

Management of this program was transferred to AFIS/DP from AFIS/INH in May 1983. 3

The primary source of training for Area Specialists is the Naval Postgraduate School. The biannual curriculum review is vital to ensure that the area studies courses meet the needs of the program. The students praised the coursework highly and we were able to solve some minor concerns. Although Attaches had

2 Ltr ◼, ACS/I to All SIos, "Intelligence Training Programs for FY84," 29 Aug 83, SD 331.
3 Memo ◼, AF/IN Executive to AFIS/DP, "Manning the Area Specialist and DALASP Programs for AFIS/INE to AFIS/DP," 20 Apr 83, SD 332; Trip Rprt ◼, AFIS/INH to AF/IN, "1983 Joint Service Review of Naval Postgraduate School Curricula," 29 Apr 83, SD 333; Ltr ◼, AFIS/INH to AF/INYX, "FY83/84 Area Specialist AFIT Quota," 15 Mar 83, SD 334.
specific assignments following training, all other Area Specialists had no idea of the nature of their follow-on assignment.  

Although the Area Specialist Program was 15 years old, a complete review of positions had never been done. When the project was finished, it was obvious that there was improper documentation for most positions, and that there were critical shortages in trained officers for certain geographical areas.

The program review established the FY84 training requirement for Area Specialists. AFTT quota was for 35 Area Studies masters degrees and one doctorate degree. This was the largest quota ever for the program. The quota was allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Attaché</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Investigations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political-Military Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was the first time a quota had been allocated to either Political-Military Affairs or Education and Training.

The Air Force Area Specialist Program gained the attention of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force because of comments by the US Ambassador to China. AFMPC/CC responded that the program was serving the Air Force well. However, there are still fundamental problems that prevent full use of trained officers.  

The ACS/I announced the FY84 Selection Board for the program and sixty-one officers submitted applications. The board convened, but AFMPC Resources Advisors made available only two officers for the program. The work of the board was concentrated on developing new application and selection procedures. The board directed that AFR 36-16 be rewritten to strengthen the role of the AFMPC Resource Advisors in identifying candidates, selecting qualified, available officers, and projecting possible future assignments.

The Naval Postgraduate School trained Area Specialists in all geographical regions except Latin America. We were

1 Ltr  , AFIS/DPT to AF/MPS, "FY84 Graduate Education Program," 1 Jul 83, SD 335; Ltr  , AFIS/DPT to AF/INX, "Area Specialist Positions," 14 Jul 83, SD 336; Ltr  , AFMPC/CC to AF/XOX, "Foreign Area Officer Specialty," 27 Jul 83, SD 337.

2 Ltr  , AF/IN to AF/IN Staff, "FY84 Area Specialist Selection Board," 29 Jul 83, SD 338; Minutes  , FY84 Area Specialist Selection Board, 29 Aug 83, SD 339.
disappointed to learn that the projected Latin American program would not be available in 1984. The two Air Force students were sent to Tulane University. It was not the primary civilian institution studying Latin America, but the one that would accept the undergraduate work of our officers.¹

DCI Exceptional Intelligence Analyst Program

Management for this program was transferred to AFIS/DP from AF/INXX in June 1983.²

The program lacked administrative procedures to monitor the progress of training. The DCI directed that the Air Force establish quarterly reporting and ensure that each trainee provide a final report at the completion of training. These steps helped us to oversee that the funds were appropriately spent. Total funds allocated for this program in FY84 was $48,905.³

Four intelligence analysts applied for the FY84 program and the ACS/I nominated three to the DCI. The DCI’s final selections will be announced in January 1984.⁴

Defense Advanced Language and Area Studies Program

Management of this program was transferred to AFIS/DP from AF/INXX in June 1983.⁵

There were many problems in the program that came to light in early 1983. Although the program was three years old, and DIA had provided the Air Force civilian billets and $65,000, no one had been placed in training. The billets had been inadvertently encumbered by analysts in AFIS/IN0EZB. The ACS/I

¹Ltr [ ], AFIT/CIRE to AFIS/DP, “Latin America Area Studies,” 7 Nov 83, SD 340; Ltr [ ] AF/MPCRQ to AFIS/DP, “Proposed Change to APR 36-1, Prefix L,” 21 Sep 83, SD 341.
²Ltr [ ], AF/IN to Director of Central Intelligence, “DCI Exceptional Intelligence Analyst Program,” 30 Jun 83, SD 342; Ltr [ ] Director of Central Intelligence to National Foreign Intelligence Board, “DCI Exceptional Intelligence Analyst Program,” 19 May 83, SD 343; Ltr [ ] AFIS/DPT to Program Sponsors, “Reports for DVI Exceptional Intelligence Analyst Program,” 15 Sep 83, SD 344.
³Ltr [ ], CIA/AC to AF/IN, “FY84 Funds,” 11 Oct 83, SD 345.
⁴Memo [ ], AFIS/DPT to AF/INE, “Nominations for the DCI Exceptional Intelligence Analyst Program,” 11 Oct 83, SD 346; Ltr [ ] AF/IN to DCI, “Nominations,” 20 Oct 83, SD 347; Ltr [ ] AF/IN to DCI, “Nomination,” 16 Nov 83, SD 348.
⁵Ltr [ ], AF/IN to Director DIA, “Defense Advanced Language and Area Studies Program and Defense Academic Research Support Program,” 30 Jun 83, SD 349.
took a personal interest in using the program to provide graduate study of Third World issues.\(^1\)

Although the program allowed equal participation for both military and civilian analysts, no civilian has ever applied for the program. AFIS/DP sent a personal letter announcing the program to 970 civilian intelligence personnel. Still no applications were received. Because of this, the emphasis of the program for civilians will shift to a two-year internship training in Third World analysis.\(^2\)

Five officers applied for this program in 1983. The ACS/I selected three officers as the first Air Force nominees to DIA for this program.\(^3\)

**Quality of Analysis Program**

This program was previously titled "Analyst Orientation and Familiarization Program". Management was transferred to AFIS/DP form AF/INX in June 1983. The title was changed to "Quality of Analysis" and DIA provided the Air Force $75,000 to cover expenses.\(^4\)

Air Force response to this program was considerable. The ACS/I selected the first ten intelligence analysts to participate in the program. Additional funds totalling $25,000 were secured by AFIS/DP to cover additional requests for training under this program.

**Defense Academic Research Support Program**

Management of this program was transferred to AFIS/DP from AF/INX in June 1983.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Ltr ☐, DIA/AT-SA to AF/IN, "DALASP," 29 Sep 83, SD 350; Ltr ☐, AF/IN to AFIS/CV, "DALASP," 29 Mar 83, SD 351; See also Ltr ☐, AFIS/DP to Commandant DLI, "Non-Resident Foreign Language Program," 28 Mar 83, SD 352; Ltr ☐, AF/IN to All STOs, "Non-Resident Foreign Language Training Program," 20 Apr 83, SD 353.

\(^2\) Ltr ☐, AFIS/DP to Civilians in the ICPD, "DALASP," 9 Nov 83, SD 354; Staff Summary Sheet ☐, AFIS/DP to AF/IN, "DALASP," 19 Dec 83, SD 355.

\(^3\) Ltr ☐, AF/IN to Director, DIA, "Nominations for DALASP," 16 Nov 83, SD 356; Ltr ☐, AFIS/DP to DIA/AT-SA, "DALASP," 12 Dec 83, SD 357; Ltr ☐, VP-AI to AF/IN, "Quality of Analysis Program," 1 Aug 83, SD 358; Staff Summary Sheet ☐, AFIS/DSPT to AF/IN, "Nominations for Quality of Analysis Program," 28 Nov 83, SD 359.

\(^4\) Ltr ☐, AF/INX to Director, DIA, "Analyst Area Orientation and Familiarization Program," 30 June 83, SD 360.

\(^5\) Ltr ☐, AFIS/DP to AF/IN, "DARSP," 23 Aug 83, SD 361 Ltr ☐, AF/IN to Director, DIA, "Topics for DARSP," 27 Sep 83, SD 362.
Although this program was three years old, no topics had been submitted by the Air Force to DIA. AFIS/DP solicited Third World research topics from all Air Force Senior Intelligence Officers and consolidated the responses. The ACS/1 selected forty-one topics that reflected the intelligence concerns of Air Force Intelligence and recommended them to DIA.
CHAPTER VI

HUMAN RESOURCE INTELLIGENCE

Headquarters, Air Force Special Activities Center
MISSION

The mission of the Air Force Special Activities Center (AFSAC) was to command, control, and conduct human resources intelligence (HUMINT) collection and exploitation worldwide in support of the Headquarters, United States Air Force, major commands, the Department of Defense, and national requirements. It served as the office of primary responsibility for: 1) the development and review of wartime and contingency plans which required Air Force HUMINT support and for 2) the initiation and staff processing of Air Force HUMINT research and development requirements. It was also the designated control authority for all Air Force HUMINT collection requirements. During wartime or specified contingency operations, it provided active force HUMINT augmentation to major commands and Air component commands.¹

The primary capability of AFSAC augmentation teams was to interrogate captured prisoners of war and debrief other human resources. Additional HUMINT support may have included translation and interpretation, collection operations and management, foreign document exploitation, assistance in foreign material acquisition, and other functions as described in Defense Intelligence Agency Manual 58-11.²

ORGANIZATION

Headquarters

The AFSAC headquarters was organized into two main divisions: 1) Plans, Resources, and Support (INX) and 2) Operations (INO). The former was subdivided into three branches: 1) Plans and Policy, 2) Resources Management, and 3) Career Management and Training. The latter division was also subdivided into three branches: 1) Collection Management, 2) Security, and 3) Operational Support.³

Subordinate Units

There were three types of subordinate units of AFSAC: special activities areas, detachments, and operating locations. The units were the following: European Special Activities Area (ESAA), headquartered at Lindsey Air Station, Germany; Pacific Special Activities Area (PSAA), headquartered at Hickam AFB, Hawaii; Detachment 21, Fort Belvoir, Virginia; Detachment 22, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio; Operating Location B, classified

¹AFR 23-1, “Organization and Functions, Air Force Intelligence Service (AFIS),” Section 5, 15 Jul 82, SD 2.
²Ibid. For the classified mission statement see AFISR 23-2 “Organization and Functions, Air Force Special Activities Center (AFSAC)” 2 Aug 82, SD 506, and AFISR 23-2 14 Oct 83.
³AFR 23-1, Section 5, 15 Jul 82, SD 2.
location: Operating Location G, Fort Huachuca, Arizona; and Operating Location F, classified location. The special activities areas had their own detachments and operating locations.1

PERSONNEL

Key Personnel

Col. Nick Yankowski continued as commander of AFSCC, a position he held since 1 October 1984.2 Col. William F. Bale continued as vice commander, being in that position since 10 September 1981. Lt. Col. Stephen P. Row was the chief of the Plans, Resources, and Support Division since 1 September 1981, while Lt. Col. John W. Dossy was the chief of the Operations Division, since 15 June 1981. Maj. Charles F. Pugh was the executive officer since 1 June 1983. 1st Lt. Barbara K. Prine-Rincon was the executive officer from 8 November 1982 to 1 June 1983. CMSgt Kenny Smith, the chief of Administration, was the unofficial First Sergeant. The AFIS First Sergeant is the official representative for AFSCC.

Manpower Strength3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>NUMBER ASSIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANS, RESOURCES AND SUPPORT4

The major operating limitation encountered by the Plans, Resources, and Support Division (INX) during the year was the near-total disruption of operations caused by extensive interior renovation work in building 1924 between April and August. During this time, the constant presence of unincensed workers, the high

1Appendix A to Unit Personnel Roster 155 Personnel Totals, AFSCC, 16 Jan 94, SD 363. For the unit histories of Det 21, Det 22, ESAA, and FSAA, see SDs 364-367.

2For a biographical sketch of Col. Yankowski see SD 10.

3Appendix A to Unit Personnel Roster 155 Personnel Totals, AFSCC, 16 Jan 94, SD 363.

4This and following segments were prepared by Capt. William J. Mordas and INX staff. The AFIS/BO added footnotes and did some format editing. See Ltr 155 and 1 Atch INX Division CY 83 History, Lt Col Row to AFSCC/CCE, "Plans, Resources, and Support Division History - CY 83," n.d., SD 368.
levels of noise and dust, and the frequent need to rearrange office furniture to accommodate construction activities resulted in poor working conditions and a serious degradation in the division's ability to provide timely staff support to the commander.

The division chief during 1983 was Lt. Col. Stephen H. Rose. The administrative assistant was Mrs. Karen M. Kouitz. Maj. Michael W. Randall served as special assistant to the chief, INX, from 1 April 1983 until his retirement on 31 July 1983.

Plans and Policy

The Plans and Policy Branch (INXA) served as the APSAC point of contact for a large number of planning and policy actions and special projects. Among other responsibilities, INXA handled: MEI preparations and responses; exercise participation management; monitoring of inter-service agreements and memoranda of understanding; reserve affairs, wartime and contingency planning support, including the APSAC HUMINT augmentation team (HAT) program; the development of plans, concepts, and objectives for the worldwide employment of Air Force HUMINT resources; APSAC wartime and contingency communications planning; and maintenance and presentation of the APSAC command briefing and other specialized briefings.

INXA had five manpower positions authorized during 1983, and all were filled for the first time since the creation of HQ APSAC. The branch chief from 1 January until 1 April 1983 was Maj. Michael W. Randall. Major Randall was replaced by Maj. Robert H. Rosey, Jr., who arrived on 10 January 1983. Other branch personnel were Capt. Leon Holleb, chief of the Contingency Planning Section, and Tsgt Robert P. Newell, NCOIC, Plans and Policy Administration. Two other new personnel arrived in the branch in 1983; Capt. William J. Sodas, chief of the HUMINT Plans Section, who arrived on 10 January, and ZLt. Jacqueline C. Sklenar, chief of the Reserve Affairs Section, who arrived on 1 April from an initial training assignment at Lowry AFB, Colorado.

Planning Actions

As the APSAC OPR for wartime and contingency planning, INXA reviewed and coordinated on many ESAA, FSAA, APIS, Air Force, and command plans which involved HUMINT tasking. A major new initiative, unfinished at year's end, was the creation of HUMINT appendices for various CENTAF OPLANs - an effort which was the result of expanded APSAC contacts with CENTCOM and the assignment of a HUMINT liaison officer - Capt. James Clanton - to CENTCOM.¹

¹Lttr APSAC/INXA to APSAC/INX et al, "Trip Report-INXA Staff Planning TDY to HQ CENTAF" 25 Apr 83, SD 369.
Planning actions in the Pacific centered on two major plans: PSAA OPLANs 5000/5001 and 5027.

The USAF War and Mobilization Plan, Volume 1 (WMP-1) Intelligence Annex (Annex 1) was reviewed twice during 1983. The first review, delivered to AF/INXY in March 1983, contained numerous recommendations to update HUMINT wartime functional guidance; the second review was begun on 28 Dec 83 and not completed by the end of the reporting period.

1 Mag 211515Z Oct 83, SD 370, USAFE/IN to AFSAC/CC, "PSAA OPLAN 4102"

2 Ltr 12 Jul 83, SD 371, AFSAC/INX to AF/INYPH, "Review of Draft PSAA OPLAN 5000/5001"; Ltr 19 Jul 83, SD 372, AFSAC/INX to AFSAC/INO, "Review of PSAA OPLAN 5000/5001"; Ltr 14 Dec 83, SD 373, AFSAC/INX to AF/INYPH and AFIS/XP, "Review of Revised Draft PSAA OPLAN 5000/5001".
Under the direction of Lt Sklenar, the first full-scale review of the wartime readiness of APSAC HATs was undertaken during 1983. The study, which was nearly complete by year's end, focused on HAT manning, organization, training, and equipment and was aided by supporting work done by AFIS Reserve OTS 28. When combined with the lessons of URGENT FURY and the results of mobilization exercise PRESSURE POINT 83, the study is expected to yield the first top-to-bottom assessment of APSAC's readiness posture. Planning was also begun in late 1983 for a follow-on study of the organization, manning, and functions of the wartime APSAC headquarters, to be conducted with AFIS Reserve assistance in early 1984.

The publication of the Air Force HUMINT Architecture Plan (AFHAP) on 21 Apr 83 was a significant step forward in the attempt to make HUMINT resource programming more responsive to the needs of the major commands. The initial AFHAP strawman published by AF/INXY was reviewed at HQ APSAC and comments were provided back to INXY on 15 Mar 83. Maj Randall and Capt Bordas attended the HUMINT Architecture Planning Conference at Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, from 20-23 Mar 83 to fine-tune and polish the updated strawman. The completed AFHAP served as a valuable tool for Air Force HUMINT planning and programming actions.¹

¹Ltr and 1 Atch AFPAC/CV to AF/INXY. "HUMINT Architecture Plan (HAP)." 15 Mar 83, SD 374; Ltr AFPAC/INX to AFPAC/INX. "Trip Report." 28 Mar 83, SD 375.
The upgrade of AFSAC's secure telephone systems via the DOD-wide Secure Voice Improvement Program was also addressed in 1983. The AFSAC input requesting new secure telephone units was sent to AFCC/XODV on 12 Oct 83. An interim request for additional KY-3 instruments was made on 9 Sep 83, the result of AFCC/XODV's request for all subscribers to submit their ten most urgent unsatisfied KY-3 requirements. This was in support of an effort to redistribute existing KY-3s as an interim measure to improve secure voice in advance of full SVIP implementation.3

3Ltr AFSAC/INX to AFCC/XODV, "Secure Voice Improvement Program (SVIP) Data Base (Your Ltr, 19 Jul 83)," 12 Oct 83, SD 379; Ltr AFSAC/INX to AFCC/XODV, "Secure Voice Requirements," 9 Sep 83, SD 380; Memo Capt Bordas to AFSAC/INOC, "Secure Voice Requirements," 9 Sep 83, SD 381.
AFSAC Briefing Program

INXA was the QPR for development and presentation of the AFSAC overview briefing, the wartime mission briefing, the mobility briefing, and the Quarterly Management Analysis Review (QMAR), as well as other specialized briefings. A total of over 50 briefings of various types were presented to a wide variety of audiences during the year. Among the most significant briefing guests were:

- Brig Gen Paul Martin, APIS/CC, 3 March 1983
- Col Earl Pontius, FD/C, 24 May 1983
- Brig Gen Richard Beyea, APOSI/CC, 3 June 1983
- Brig Gen Montinari, Italian Air Force ACS/L, 7 June 1983
- Maj Gen Lee Jae-Woo, C-2, Combined Forces Command, 16 September 1983.

INXA also provided briefing support to the Armed Forces Air Intelligence Training Center, Lowry AFB, Colorado, during the regular HUMINT instructor’s attendance at Squadron Officer School.

INXA’s ability to provide timely briefing support suffered a serious setback in August 1983, when Mr. Keith Boyce, APIS/INOZD, was moved to the Pentagon to support the increased graphics requirements of the new ACS/L. The move was made in spite of INXA and INX objections, and left the division without readily available graphics support.1 APIS/INOZD could not accept routine AFSAC graphics requests, and attempts to obtain support from the Ft Belvoir Training and Audiovisual Support Center (TASC) were unsuccessful as that facility could not accept classified work orders. Graphics support was eventually secured from Det 4, 1361st Audiovisual Squadron at Bolling AFB; however, the logistical problems involved in travel between Ft Belvoir and Bolling AFB, and the varying quality of graphics work performed, made this an undesirable long-term solution. Graphics for intra- AFSAC use, for instance, for the QMAR, were handmade within INXA using Xerox transparency film, but this was not a suitable vehicle for professional mission and functions briefings, and robbed the INXA staff of large amounts of time required for other duties and projects. No resolution of the graphics support problem was in sight at the end of the year.

The AFSAC overview briefing was completely revised and updated in 1983, and the QMAR – the Quarterly Management Analysis Review – was revitalized and presented to the Commander and staff each quarter. Work was also begun on an AFSAC regulation to specify content, format, and presentation dates for the QMAR; at

---

the end of 1983 the fully-staffed draft regulation needed only the commander's signature to make it official.

**Management Effectiveness Inspections (MEIs)**

INI was the AFSAC OPR for preparations for MEIs and the responses to MEI reports. The following inspections were conducted during 1983:

---

was inspected by APIS/IG between 14-18 May 83, and was rated overall. The initial reply to the MEI report was delivered to APIS/IG on 3 Jun 83, but several observations still remained open at year's end.\(^1\)

The were inspected by APIS/IG from 9-18 May 83, and were rated overall. INXA prepared information letters both to the and to the in preparation for the MEI, and published a consolidated reply to the MEI report on 31 Aug 83.\(^2\)

were inspected by APIS/IG between 11-28 Oct 83, and received an overall rating of . In preparation for the MEI, INXA provided initial guidance by message and followed up with a staff assistance visit by Capt. Holleb in August. provided an interim input to the MEI report reply on 28 Nov 83, but a final, consolidated input had not been received by year's end, preventing a final reply to APIS/IG.\(^3\)

INI continued to work with HQ ESAA during 1983 to provide ongoing responses to items remaining open from the 1982 MEI of HQ ESAA and its detachments. In most cases the original observations had been answered, but additional questions and recommendations from APIS/IG prevented the report from being closed out.

---

\(^1\) Ltr APSAC/CV to APIS/IG, "Reply to Management Effectiveness Inspection (MEI)\(^*\), 3 Jun 83, SD 383.

\(^2\) Ltr APSAC/INX to All Air Force DCD Representatives, "Management Effectiveness Inspection\(^*\) 31 Mar 84, SD 384. Ltr APSAC/CC to CDA/DDC, "Inspection of USAF Representatives to DCD\(^*\) 4 Apr 83, SD 385; Ltr APSAC/CC to APIS/IG, "Reply to Management Effectiveness Inspection (MEI)\(^*\) 31 Aug 83, SD 386; Msg APSAC/INX to PSAA/CC et al, "Preparation for Management Effectiveness Inspection (MEI)\(^*\) 101500Z Aug 83, SD 387.

\(^3\) Ltr APSAC/INX to APSAC/INX et al, "Trip Report\(^*\) 6 Sep 83, SD 388; Ltr PSAA/CC to APSAC/INX/DOAB, "Interim Hq PSAA Response to APIS MEI\(^*\) 28 Nov 83, SD 389.
On 24 Oct 83, INXA prepared a letter to Det 21/CC, offering guidance to prepare the detachment for its MEI, scheduled for 9-13 Jan 84.1

Reserve Affairs

2Lt. Jacqueline C. Sklenar served as the manager of AFSAC's Reserve program, assigning individual mobilization augmentees (IMAs) to various offices within HQ AFSAC, Detachment 21, and Detachment 22 for training and evaluation. This marked the first time in recent years that INXA had had a single individual responsible for management of this program as a primary duty.

Reserve Support to AFSAC contingency operations was demonstrated during Operation URGENT FURY, when APIS/RE identified seven volunteer IMAs to deploy with the AFSAC team to Grenada. (Volunteers were required, as no Presidential mobilization had been declared.) The Reserve volunteers, ranging in grade from staff sergeant to lieutenant colonel, responded rapidly and served with distinction under difficult conditions.

The utilization of Reserve augmentees in URGENT FURY, however, led to the re-thinking of a key aspect of AFSAC contingency planning—the question of who was responsible for providing mobility equipment to IMAs. Although APR 28-1 and the USAF War and Mobilization Plan specifically tasked the gaining command (in this case, TAC) to provide this equipment, the concern arose that the mechanics and the resources to equip large numbers of IMAs might have to be rethought. The issue remained unresolved at year's end.

Exercise Monitoring

INXA served as the OPF for monitoring AFSAC participation in exercises. This function included compiling lists of participants, participating in scenario-writing conferences, and preparing HUMINT appendices to exercise plans. AFSAC personnel took part in eleven major exercises during 1983.

BRIM PROST 83. Lt. Cegelsky and MSgt. Platt, both from Det 21, represented AFSAC on this field training exercise (FTX) at Fort Greely, Alaska, from 18 Jan - 5 Feb 83. Their experiences in extreme cold weather duty and tactical interrogations led to several sound recommendations for AFSAC mobility planning.2

1Ltr to AFSAC/INX to Det 21/CC, "Preparation for Management Effectiveness Inspection (MEI)" 24 Oct 83, SD 390.
2Ltr Det 21, AFSAC/DOIF to Det 21, AFSAC/DO et al, "Brim Frost 83 Exercise Trip Report" 28 Feb 83, SD 391.
TEAM SPIRIT 83. Maj Roser and 1Lt Smith (Det 22) were AFSAC augmentees to this FTX, held in Korea from 8-23 Mar 83.

GALLANT KNIGHT 83. Capt Holleb represented AFSAC in this CPX from 14-22 Mar 83 at Ft Bragg, NC. Lack of HUMINT planning inputs during the planning phase of this exercise limited the value of the exercise for AFSAC.

FLINTLOCK 83. The interrogation portion of this exercise, the major FTX of the year for HQ ESAA, was conducted at the German Army's Eisberg Kaserne near Magold, FRG, from 25 Apr - 20 May 83. The exercise provided an excellent training vehicle for AFSAC interrogators. TSgt Falco (Det 21) and 1Lt Francona (DCC Atlanta) were the HQ AFSAC augmentees for the exercise. A significant aspect of this year's FLINTLOCK exercise was the use, for the first time, of video monitoring equipment to observe and evaluate exercise activity.

RIDGE RUNNER 83. This AFIS-sponsored evasion training exercise was held at Camp Dawson, WV, from 13-16 Sep 83. CMGt Vukich (INXC) served as the AFSAC representative. Original INX planning had envisioned participation on a larger scale, but coordination problems between HQ AFSAC and AFIS/INO, as well as internal AFSAC staff disagreements on who should participate, led to eventual participation only by Chief Vukich as an observer.

BOLD EAGLE 84. Original AFSAC plans for participation in both the CPX and FTX phases of this REDCOM exercise fell through when HQ TAC (AFRED) failed to arrange for AFIS Reserve

1Ltr w. 4 Atch (Det 12/ESAA Ltr 9 Mar 83; Det 11/ESAA Ltr 10 Mar 83; After Action Rprt 11 Mar 83; Annual Tour 11 Mar 83; ESAA/INX to ESAA/CC, "WINTER 83 - After Action Report" 15 Mar 83, SD 392.

2Ltr w. AFSAC/INX to AFSAC/INX, "Exercise TEAM SPIRIT 83 Trip Report," 12 Apr 83, SD 393; Ltr w. Det 32, PSAA/INX to AFSAC/INX, "Team Spirit '83 Consolidated Critique" 26 Apr 83, SD 394.

3Ltr w. AFSAC/INX to AFSAC/INX, "Trip Report - AFSAC Participation in USCENTCOM GALLANT KNIGHT 83 CPX" 5 Apr 83, SD 395.

4Ltr w. ESAA/CC to AFSAC/CC/INX, "FTX FLINTLOCK 83 After Action Report" 1 Jul 83, SD 396.

5Memo w. 1 Atch w. AFSAC/INX to Col Bale, "Exercise RIDGE RUNNER 83," 16 Jun 83, SD 397; Ltr w. AFSAC/INX to AFSAC/INX, "Trip Report, Ridge Runner (14-17 Sep 83)," 21 Sep 83, SD 398.
role players who would have provided support both to AFSAC and AFOSI interrogators in the PTF. Consequently, AFSAC representation was limited to only two individuals, Capt Bordes and Capt Jacoway (Det 22), who participated in the CPX as a HUMINT Collection Manager and a CPX controller, respectively.\(^1\)

**FOAL EAGLE '83.** After five years without Air Force participation in this exercise, Det 32 was able to revitalize the program and engage in interrogation training exercises similar to those of exercise FLINTLOCK in Europe. Det 32 sponsored the interrogation phase of FOAL EAGLE, augmented by the Korean 6545th AISU, at Camp Humphries, PDK, between 31 Oct and 10 Nov 83.\(^4\)

**ULCHI FOCUS LENS '83.** Det 32, augmented from HQ FSAA and AFIS/FE, took part in this Korean CPX from 19-30 Aug 83.\(^5\)

---

5. Ltr W 1 Atch PSAA/CC to AFSAC/INX et al, "ULCHI-FOCUS LENS CPX Critique," 13 Sep 83, SD 406.
Support Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding (MOU)

Significant attention was given to this area in 1983, as an attempt was made not only to update existing agreements, but also to initiate new ones. Work was begun during the year to update three major MOUs: those governing ESAA and ESAA operations, and the MOU on AFSAC support to FTD. None of these reviews and updates was completed during the year, with the FTD MOU proving to be the most difficult to staff.

Other agreements worked during 1983 included:

- A MOU between ACS/I, USAF and CIA/DDC on USAF Representation and Activities at CIA/DDC Field Offices. This MOU was updated to delete the requirement for annual review.

- A MOU among ACS/I, USAF, AFIS/CC, and USAPSO/CC on AFSAC DL-P. This MOU was revised during 1983, but staffing of the revision had not been completed by year's end.

- AFIS - US Army Engineer Center and Ft Belvoir Interservice Support Agreement (ISSA). This agreement was reviewed in August 1983, and an addition was recommended to cover provision of graphics support to AFIS. Other problems with the agreement, internal to AFSAC, delayed final approval of the revised version beyond the end of 1983.

Resource Management Branch (INXB)

This branch was reorganized on 1 Jun 83 to combine the Fiscal Programs Branch (INKB) and the Logistics Section (LGS). The Fiscal Programs Branch was responsible for acquiring, maintaining, and allocating AFSAC resources by preparing programming documents and reports, maintaining the DIA Project Management File, and conducting all budget and fiscal matters. The Logistics Branch was responsible for management of Operations and Maintenance (O&M) and ICP supplies and equipment.

The Chief, INXB, from 1 January until his retirement on 30 July 1983, was Mr Wesley H. Pegge. SSGt James S. Jinks, Jr. and MSGt Chester D. Ransom were assigned to INXB throughout the year. The Logistics Branch was staffed by SSGt Philip J. Johnson and MSGt Roger F. Cawthorne.

Fiscal Programs (INXB)

A major factor affecting INXB in 1983 was the lack of a
The lack of adequate intelligence training is both an Air Force-wide shortfall and a HUMINT-specific problem. AFSAC's FY 86-90 POM was one method of responding to this shortfall without seriously degrading existing collection activities.

INKB submitted the AFSAC operating budget for FY 86 on 23 Nov 83, in accordance with the AFIS/AC budget call. The submission reflected an increase of $458,600 over the FY 85 budget—a result of the acquisition of new manpower authorizations.

The HQ AFSAC Intelligence Contingency Fund (ICF) program was managed by INKB, and branch personnel provided ICF support to all AFSAC units. The personnel directly involved with the ICF program were:
Lt Col Rowe, SMSgt Johnson, and MSGt Ransom attended the first Intelligence Contingency Fund Conference from 19-21 Oct 83. This conference, held at the Pentagon and hosted by AF/INX, provided a forum for ICF action officers to review and update APR 200-4, and provided training on specific areas of interest to the participants. Several changes were made to APR 200-4, and the revised regulation was forwarded for staffing and HQ ESAA approval - a process not yet completed by the end of the year.

The total ICF expenditure for FY 83 was $872,000—an increase of $112,000 over the previous fiscal year.

During November 1983, INX2 began preparing the FY 86–87 GDIP submission by requesting inputs from AFSC field units and by holding a series of preliminary strategy meetings with representatives from AFSC/INX and INO, and AF/INXSN.

Special Order A-3 AFSAC/DA, 13 Aug 82.
The new initiatives may be summarized as follows:

The GDIP input was nearly complete at year's end, and was expected to be forwarded to AFIS/XP for validation, and consolidation with other AFIS unit GDIPs by mid-January 1984.

Logistics (LGS)

The Logistics Section was involved in several major activities during the year, each of which exercised different aspects of the branch mission.¹

APIS/APSAC Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF). The section obtained over $45,000 worth of equipment for the SCIF, and prepared maintenance contracts for all newly acquired equipment. The SCIF was expected to become operational in early 1984.

Change of Office Areas. In Dec 83, LGS moved both its administrative office and its warehouse from Bldg 1920 to Bldg 1919. The move provided increased warehouse space to accommodate the expanding APSAC mobility equipment inventory.

Mobility Equipment and Supplies for Det 22. Mobility equipment and supplies for 13 deploying positions were acquired and shipped to Det 22.

O&M Supply and Equipment Management

O&M funds expended to support HQ APSAC at Fort Belvoir included $43,000 in Element of Expense and Investment Code (EEIC) 628 (Equipment) and $59,500 in EEIC 609 (Supplies). These funds were used to replace repairable typewriters over seven years old, to purchase mobility equipment for 85 positions, to replace unserviceable furniture, and to buy general housekeeping and administrative supplies.

A total of $62,000 in annual investment (3080) funding was received, and was used to order equipment for the SCIF and a Xerox 860T word processor for Det 21.

Prior year obligation authority was received from HQ USAF for $29,144.39 in EEIC 628 and $15,044.36 in EEIC 609. This ensured that obligated due outs from FY 83 would not be carried over against FY 84 funds.

A complete inventory of all Equipment Authorization Identification Document (EAID) equipment was performed.
All safes were inspected to ensure that they were GSA-approved for storage of classified material. GSA-approved safes were placed on order, and unapproved safes were scheduled for turn-in.

A total of $8048.27 in unserviceable turn-ins was made to base supply.

ICF Equipment Management

Forty-one items valued at $22,389.41, including three vehicles, were turned in to property disposal as being beyond economical repair or excess to APSAC needs.

Approval for the purchase of four replacement ICF vehicles — two for ESAA and two for PSAA — was received from AF/INY.

The designations of all ICF accounts were changed to match the detachment designations (i.e. "C31" for Det 31).

Sixteen ICF equipment items valued at $2747.52 were approved for purchase during the year, and accountability was established on account FX5180.

APIS/IND discontinued responsibility for maintaining the computerized FX (off-line supply) account during 1983, and this responsibility reverted to LGS. At the request of LGS, APIS/IND did, however, write a new program for this automated account to produce a complete accountability and audit trail listing.

Career Management and Training Branch (INXC)

This branch was responsible for the identification, selection, acquisition, training, and career progression of APSAC military and civilian personnel.

The Chief, INXC, was Maj. George A. Nalesich. Capt. Patrick M. Ellis was in charge of non-operational training and officer career development and accession. CMSgt. Louis Vukich served as branch NCOIC and chief of enlisted career management and accession. Mr. Elmer T. Knudsen was the director of operational training. Capt. Barbara K. Prine-Rincon, the former executive officer, was assigned to INXC on 1 July 1983 as a training officer, and the vacant GS-5 secretarial position was filled on 7 March 1983 by Mr. Gerald C. Radovich. TSgt Thomas J. Neel was transferred from DA to INXC on 9 November 1983 to assume the position of NCOIC of Personnel Management.

Personnel Identification and Selection. INXC, initially established as a separate branch within INX on 1 Oct 82, continued to take aggressive action in 1983 to resolve APSAC's chronic personnel acquisition, retention, and training problems, working a wide variety of programs.
Recruitment. An aggressive advertising and recruitment program was pursued throughout the year. Recruiting advertisements were published worldwide in the APMAC Officer Career Newsletter, base bulletins and newsletters, and the APMAC Hotline. In coordination with INXK, Capt. Ellis and Capt. Prima-Reinon developed an unclassified Air Force HUMINT briefing to support the recruiting effort; they took the briefing on the road, bringing the HUMINT message to over 800 cadets attending ROTC summer camps at Lackland AFB, Texas and Dover AFB, Delaware.

Selection. During 1983, 28 officer Personnel Selection Panels (PSPs) were held to evaluate the linguistic and professional potential of prospective HUMINT personnel. The PSPs resulted in the selection of ten individuals for AFSAC assignments, all of whom were in the assignment pipeline by the end of the year. Seventeen enlisted PSPs were held, resulting in the selection of 12 new AFSAC personnel; of these, three were on station by year's end, with four more in the assignment pipeline and five awaiting MRC action. The selection and acquisition actions had raised AFSAC manning by year's end to 260, out of a total authorization of 311—a 33 percent manning rate.

Personnel Management. With the transfer on 9 Nov 83 of TSgt. Thomas J. Neel to INXK, the branch assumed responsibility for AF Form 2095 actions, awards and decorations, Airman Performance Reports and Officer Efficiency Reports (AFRs/OERs), and related personnel actions. These had previously been the responsibility of AFSAC/DA.

Retention Efforts. A major problem which had long plagued Air Force HUMINT was an inability to retain trained, qualified personnel in HUMINT assignments. This difficulty grew partly from a negative perception of promotion possibilities within the HUMINT field, and partly from the competition of other commands—notably ESC and DIA's attache program—for qualified, language-trained individuals. To try to resolve the promotion problem, increased emphasis was placed at all levels on quality of APR and DER submissions, awards, and decorations. To attack directly the retention problem, CMSgt. Vukich coordinated a strong effort to replace the 203X0 (Linguist/Interrogator) AFSC with a Special Duty Identifier (SDI) to uniquely identify HUMINT-trained individuals and make them eligible for language proficiency pay. Chief Vukich presented the AFSAC proposal at a meeting of the HUMINT Enlisted AFSC Working Group at Randolph AFB, TX, from 7-10 Nov 83, where it was well received by the attendees. By the end of the year, the complete proposal was being staffed at the HQ USAF level.

Operational Training Initiatives

In an across-the-board effort to improve the scope and quality of operational training, INXK worked on many fronts throughout the year not only to identify new sources of training, but to increase the use of training avenues already available.
The Department of Defense Strategic Debriefing and Interrogation Course (DSDIC). This course, an Air Force initiative, was finally put into operation in July 1983 at Ft Huachuca, AZ. The course was designed to provide debriefing, rather than interrogation training to military HUMINT personnel, and has been established as one of the prerequisites for award of the fully qualified 8825 AFSC (the Military Operations Training Course - MOTC - may be substituted for DSDDC). Mr. Sulev Sepp, formally of Det 11, ESAA, was assigned to DSDDC as the Air Force instructor. Chief Sukich visited Ft Huachuca from 25-30 Sep 83 to brief at the DSDDC and evaluate the progress of the course. By the end of the year, seven AFSCC personnel had received debriefing training in three, six-week course sessions. AFSCC was allocated two billets per class, with seven class sessions per year—a total of fourteen slots per year.

HUMINT Managers Training Course (HMTC). The HMTC was another Air Force initiative pursued during 1983. This course was intended to provide training for senior HUMINT headquarters staff, operations officers, commanders, and other management personnel in the management of HUMINT field collection units. It was still in the conceptual stage at the end of 1983, largely as a result of interservice disagreements on what the course content should be.

Joint Service Interrogation Wing (JSIW). Although HQ AFSCC did not send any representatives to this interrogation school, run by the British forces at Templar Barracks in England, four JSIW instructors visited AFSCC in July 1983 and presented two, two-day tactical interrogation courses to a total of 20 AFSCC mobility personnel. The courses provided a unique opportunity to obtain valuable tactical interrogation training— at no cost — for a large number of AFSCC personnel.

Air Force Intelligence Reserve (AFIR) Advanced Interrogation Course (AIC). Maj. Roser (INXX) and MSgt. Platt (Det 21) audited this course from 18-20 Jul 83 at the Los Alamitos Armed Forces Reserve Center, California, to assess its value for providing training to AFSC personnel. Their assessment was very positive, and INXX made the necessary arrangements to begin full AFSCC participation in this course in 1984, as the course was offered only once per year.

Other Training Initiatives

In an attempt to satisfy APSAC's need for language refresher training, Chief Vukich attended the annual program review held at the Defense Language Institute (DLI), Presidio of Monterey, CA, from 8-12 Feb 83. A major result of this trip was the discovery that DLI offered an extensive non-resident training program - a source of linguistic instructional materials previously unknown at APSAC, and a resource that was increasingly tapped in the course of the year.

Unit Administration

The Unit Administration Branch was responsible for providing publications and forms management, documentation, security, and administrative staff support to HQ APSAC. This branch was a part of INX from 1 Jan - 31 May 83; on 1 Jun 83 it was transferred to the APSAC command section.

The Branch Chief from 1 Jan-30 Jun 83 was Maj. Charles F. Pugh, who assumed the new position of executive officer to the commander on 1 Jul 83. He was replaced by CMSgt. Kenny Smith, who had been the Superintendent of Administration. TSgt. William C. Etchells and Ann. Dean W. Housten served in the branch throughout the year. Mrs. Cynthia A. Davis, the branch secretary, served from 1 Jan-18 Apr 83, when she took a new position in AFIS/INH; she was replaced on 19 Sep 83 by Mrs. Robin R. Morrison. Mrs. Cynthia A. Gruber, a one-year civilian overhire, worked from 1 Jan until the expiration of her contract on 31 Oct 83. SSgt. Terry Phillips reported for duty with DA on 30 Oct 83. TSgt. Thomas J. Neel, a personnel specialist, served in DA from 1 Jan-9 Nov 83, when his position was transferred to INXC.

OPERATIONS*

The Operations Division (INO) is divided into three

*This section was prepared by Mr. Yoshitaka Hamayasu and INO staff. Some format editing was done by the AFIS/HO. See Ltr 2 Atchs (INO History) and INO Org Chart AFSAC/INO to APSAC/CE, "INO History Input (1 Jan - 31 Dec 83)," 23 May 84, SD 419.
branches: the Collection Management Branch (INOA), the Security Branch (INOS), and the Operations Support Branch (INOC).

Collection Management Branch provides operational guidance to the headquarters of each Special Activities Area and maintains contact with national level analytical and production elements. It consists of three sections: the European Section (INOAA), the Pacific Section (INOB), and the Western Hemisphere Section (INOC). INOAA provides operational guidance and management support to three detachments (Dets 11, 12, and 13) and one area headquarters (HQ ESAA). INOAB oversees the activities of two detachments (Dets 31 and 32) and one area headquarters (HQ ESAA). INOC provides operational guidance and management support to two detachments (Dets 21 and 22), one operating location (OL-P, AFSAC), and Air Force representatives to the Central Intelligence Agency's Domestic Collection Division (CIA/DCD) field offices.

**Significant Events**
functions, and capabilities.

An example of a series of blockages and transitions held on 20 January and 21 October 1983. A total of 13 ARPIN

The ARPAC AIR System Number Operation Blockage were

Deleted per 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(1)
1Lt Peter M. Schuler was assigned as the first Air Force representative to the DCD Pittsburgh Field Office in February 1983.

After a nine month vacancy, the Washington DC Air Force DCD position was filled by 1Lt Bruce D. Radloff in April 1983.

During the week of 15 May – 20 May 1983, the Second Annual AFSAC Commanders’ Conference was held at Ft Belvoir. Attending the conference were the key HQ staff personnel, all the area and detachment commanders and guest speakers from various agencies. A wide range of topics were discussed during the five-day long event. Project officers for the conference were Maj R. Faulkner (INO) and Maj G. Malesich (INX).¹

¹Ltr and 1 Atch AFSAC/CC to All Area and Detachment Commanders et Al, "AFSAC Commanders' Conference Minutes," 19 Jul 83, SD 411.
The Security Branch formulates and develops operational security standards, policies and procedures to protect and enhance USAF HUMINT intelligence activities. It processes the validation, approval, and coordination of new HUMINT operations at the national level. In accordance with current regulations and directives, INOB implements intelligence oversight policies to ensure the legality and propriety of Air Force HUMINT activities. It processes the validation, approval and coordination of new HUMINT operations at the national level. The branch also administers the Foreign Disclosure, Freedom of Information, and Privacy Act Programs for APSAC, and operates the Air Force Central Source Registry and Source Control Program.

Significant Events

During the year INOB processed the following actions:

(a) Contact Coordination/Corporate Approvals: 315
(b) Significant Change Reports: 32
(c) Quarterback Operations: 9
(d) Denied Area Operations: 23
(e) On-Site Operations: 5
(f) Foreign Disclosure Cases: 17
(g) Freedom of Information Requests: 16
(h) LOG Requests: 28
(i) Polygraphs: 3

INOB submitted for approval and publication an APSAC regulation on Operational Use and Control of Intelligence Contingency Fund Equipment and updated and distributed to the field the following regulations:

- APSAC Regulation 200-10, Source Administration.
- APSAC Regulation 200-14, Case Reviews.
- APSAC Regulation 200-19, Restrictions on Foreign Intelligence Activities.

INOB also forwarded to all APSAC units the revised DOD Regulation 5240.1R, Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons.

In October 1983, INOB revised the coordination procedures governing Significant Change Reports to eliminate the need to retransmit the entire SCR to theater commanders for their coordination. This procedure has reduced processing time by 14 days and there have been no incidents of premature coordination by any of the players prior to APSAC commander's approval.
Case Review files and suspense system were set up for all recruited and operational APSAC sources.

Operations Support Branch (INOC)

The Operations Support Branch serves as the Air Force HUMINT requirements control authority and HUMINT reporting and evaluation program managers. It maintains and operates the AFIS sensitive compartmented information facility (SCIF). The branch conducts operational development planning and all-source research, mission/target analyses in support of current and future USAF HUMINT activities, as well as programs to assess the significance, impact, utility and value of the APSAC product.

Significant Events

A chronological summary of significant events and activities concerning INOC, and INDD in the first half of 1983, follows:

1 HUMINT HIGHLIGHTS CY1983, APSAC/INOC, SD 412.
b. On 7 Apr 83, Lt. Col. Jacobs was presented the CIA Seal Medallion for "exemplary professionalism in the service of the national interest" by the CIA Deputy Director, Operations. The ceremony was at HQ CIA and was attended by Col. Yankowski and Lt. Col. Dokey.

d. Lt. Klahr went TDY to FTD 9 - 13 May 83 and went to several meetings in the Washington DC area to assist DIA/DC-4C in their preparation of a DIA assessment of APSAC support to AFSC.

e. On 1 June 83 INOC and INOD amalgamated, Lt. Col. Jacobs became the branch chief and Mr. James assumed the role of technical advisor.

f. On 28 Jun 83, INOCA moved to Building 1917 to begin to establish the APSAC SCIF. The vault was accepted from the contractor on 26 Jul 83.

g. INOCA began to function as a section in June 83 with the writing of a functional description, organization establishment, and personnel actions to fill vacant slots taking most of the year. INOCA will be manned by operations support desk officers for regional areas.

h. On 9 Sept 83 the Fort Belvoir Civil Engineers installed the J-SIIDS alarms in the SCIF.


j. In Oct 83 INOC prepared an operational support concept for support to the DOD HUMINT Program.

k. Lt. Klahr drafted a concept for an Operational Management Information System (OMIS) with the assistance of a reservist on two-week annual tour. The concept was refined through several meetings with INCO representatives who are doing a functional description of APSAC to determine requirements for computer support.

l. On 21 Dec 83 Lt. Klahr was awarded an Air Force Commendation Medal (COL.C) for outstanding achievement in establishing the APSAC SCIF.
CHAPTER VII

AFIS SPECIAL STAFF

Comptroller Division
Plans and Programs Division
Inspector General
Manpower and Organization Division
Administrative Division
Public Affairs Office
Logistics Division
MISSION

The Comptroller Division (AFIS/AC) provided budgetary and fiscal management, advisory, and analytic services to the command, staff, and directorates on policies and procedures that pertained to resource management. The division also established informational and financial control systems to assure efficient and timely management of command resources.¹

ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL

The division consisted of two branches: 1) Accounting and Finance and 2) Management and Budget. The manpower strength was the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>NUMBER Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFICERS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLISTED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVILIANS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lt. Col. Lloyd S. Garner continued to lead the division in the position he held since 20 August 1979. The chief of the Accounting and Finance Branch was MSgt Charles E. Sovine, who replaced SMSgt Robert Grove, and the chief of the Management and Budget Branch was 1st Lt. Terrence M. Frost.

ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE

Audit of ICF Funds

From 24 May to July, the Air Force Audit Agency conducted its annual review of Intelligence Contingency Funds.

The annual Department of Defense Appropriation Act contained authority for the expenditure of a specified part of Air Force operations and maintenance (3400) funds for emergency and extraordinary expenses by, or on the approval of, the secretary of the Air Force. These sensitive, discretionary funds were designated as contingency funds and were allocated by the secretary to the chief of staff for three basic categories of expenditures: 1) miscellaneous current expenses for official representation, 2) special intelligence expenses, and 3) confidential investigative expenses. The report of the Air Force Audit

¹This AFIS/AC segment was prepared by TSgt Ronald LaCoss and the AFIS/AC staff. The AFIS/BO added footnotes and did some editing.

¹For assigned responsibilities see AFISR 23-1, Section C, 15 Jul 82, SD 2.
Agency addressed the use of intelligence contingency funds (ICFs). Official representation and confidential investigative funds were discussed in Air Force Reports of Audit 833047A and 3140213, respectively.¹

Due to the sensitivity of ICFs, an annual audit was required by the assistant secretary of the Air Force, Financial Management. The overall objective of the FY 1983 audit was to determine the adequacy of internal controls used to manage and account for Air Force ICFs. Specifically, the auditor determined if internal controls provided reasonable assurance that: 1) disbursements of ICFs were for authorized purposes and were adequately documented and supported, 2) accounting records entries were accurate and timely, 3) expenditure reports were accurately prepared and submitted on a timely basis, and 4) cash, cash related items, and inventory stocks of representational commodities/incentive gift items were adequately controlled, safeguarded, and accounted for.³

The auditors also reviewed disbursement transactions by the intelligence activities to assess the propriety of expenditures. Audit field application began in February 1983 and involved a review of 98 judgmentally selected disbursement vouchers and 139 subvouchers with a value of $1,141,250 from total disbursements of $2,369,931 between 1 October 1981 and 31 December 1982. This review was accomplished in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.⁴

¹Letter to the Auditor General to Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff, “Project 3140114,” n.d., SD 413; Memo ³, and ¹ Atch ⁴, Deputy for Accounting and Internal Audit to Inspector General, DOD.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.
The findings of the Air Force Audit agency concerning the ICF's prompted the establishment of an Intelligence Contingency Fund Conference to be attended by all organizations maintaining an ICF account. The audit findings, except for one account, were procedural, and many man hours were spent correcting and coordinating new accounting procedures. The months of August and September were busy in preparation for the fiscal year close out and the establishment of the ICF conference. SSgt Sharlene K.

1 ibid.
2 ibid.
Regan spent many hours at the host AFO (Rolling AFB, D.C.) preparing and reviewing accounting records.¹

The ICP Conference was held from 19-21 October at the Pentagon. The revised draft of APR 200-4 was discussed in detail by all attendees and resulted in a final draft being submitted for coordination by Air Staff level agencies. October was also spent establishing new fiscal year accounting records and reviewing prior fiscal year records for accuracy. November and December were spent preparing new accounting documents and forwarding revised APR 200-4 to proper agencies for final coordination. ICF reviews were also necessary to answer Air Force Audit Agency write-up and to prepare for next ICP audit scheduled for January 1984.²

MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Study of Civilian Hiring Procedures

From January through mid-February, work was continued on the AFIS Civilian Hiring Procedures Study, which was begun in November 1982. The purpose of the study was to determine ways to improve civilian hiring practices and to reduce the civilian vacancy rate in military force program (MFP) 3. AC staff visited all activities involved in the hiring process in order to develop a checklist which outlined steps necessary to fill a civilian vacancy. The report concluded, "Most AFIS activities were not aware of the complexity of filling civilian vacancies. There was not enough emphasis on submitting SF Form 52s on time, and not coordinating with AFIS/CPC on position descriptions (PDs) to be sure they justified the grade that was being filled."³

Recommendations were made concerning administrative procedures, command policy, and training programs. The command policy recommendations were the following:⁴

We recommend that AFIS adopt a Civilian Employment and Cost Management Committee similar to the one used by the OSI. During our review, we visited the OSI/DPC. In the past year they have made substantial progress in reducing their lapse rate and generally improving their civilian personnel system. One of the keys to this improvement was their use of a Civilian Employment Cost Management Committee. The OSI Civilian Employment Cost Management Committee meets monthly and includes all Directors and Division Chiefs. We

¹Historical Data Rprt.² Ibid.
³Rprt.³ and Abstract.⁴ "AFIS Civilian Hiring Study," APIS/AC, 9 Mar 83, SD 416.
⁴Ibid.
recommend that AFIS adopt a similar approach with a committee chaired by our CV and include all AFIS directors as members. AC, MO, and DPC should be included as advisors. This committee could meet once every two months and focus on all civilian employment issues. A standard agenda could be developed to include a review of all vacant positions and pending actions, available funds, over hire requests, awards etc. The committee should review special interest items or policy suggestions that could be adopted command wide to improve our civilian employment system. This committee should consider:

a. Conducting central hiring panels only for key civilian positions and give the director/division chiefs the authority to hire their remaining positions. The OSI uses this approach and has been very successful in reducing their civilian vacancy rate. Current AFIS policy requires all professional positions to be currently placed as part of the hiring process. This is time consuming and can add 1 to 4 weeks to the overall hiring times.

b. Adopt training programs for intelligence analysts through the use of summer over hire positions. AF/INES is currently trying to use this type program for five over hires. Our Civilian Employment Cost Management Committee could insure that AFIS supervisors are aware of these opportunities and develop a command wide program for over hires.

c. Establishing a pool of administrative over hires will provide employees with a security clearance when a vacancy occurs. This will prevent a Directorate/Division from being without an employee for three to four months while awaiting a security clearance.

Several recommendations concerning administrative procedures were approved and implemented. The changes in command policy were evaluated and implemented as required.

Budgets and Financial Plans

On 7 January, the FY 1985 Operating Budget (OB) was finalized and submitted to Air Force. The Financial Working Group (FWG) and Financial Management Board (FMB) met on 17 February 1983 and 11 March 1983, respectively, to review the

---

1AFIS Operating Budget FY85 [document number]. RCS: DD COMPT(AR)-1092, OAC40, 7 Jan 83, SD 417.
status of the FY 1983 Operations and Maintenance (O&M) program and the FY 1983 Investment Equipment (3080) program. 1

During the 15 March - 13 May time frame, while 1st Lt. Frost was the HQ Squadron Section commander, MSgt Michael E. Hansen was tasked with preparing the FY 1984 Financial Plan (FP). 2 He planned and scheduled midyear reviews of all AFIS programs which provided a solid starting point for development of the FY84 FP. Through his validation and repricing of approved General Defense Intelligence Programs (GDP), AFIS FY84 unified unfunded requirements were reduced from $3.1m to $1.8m. The O&M program grew from $82.7m to $98.5m in FY84, as a result of expanded budget and execution responsibilities in four intelligence programs. The FY84 FP was submitted to HQ USAF/ACB on 20 May 1983, and after higher headquarters review, was accepted as written.

CY 1983 ended with the submission of the FY86 OB to Air Force on 30 December 1983. 3 RAs submitted their requirements in November 1983. These requirements were validated, coordinated, and finally consolidated in the formats required by Air Force. The AFIS Commander reviewed and signed the FY86 OB submission in mid December and the completed package was forwarded to Air Force.

FY83 Closeout

Since the closeout of FY83 was hampered by the fact that many of the AP/IN special accounts did not spend all available funds, and because five Operating Budget Account Numbers (OBANs) were activated for the Operational, Test and Evaluation program (PE 35887), it was necessary to formalize and standardize a communication system for the execution of our O&M resources. In the past, the division successfully used the Execution Report to manage the HQ's accounts. Beginning in FY84, the division would require all AFIS separate funding points (OBANs) to submit this report. 4

The Financial Working Group met on 15 October to review the FY83 closeout, to review and approve the distribution of the

1Lttr APIS/AC to APIS/DA et al, "Financial Working group (FWG) Meeting," 1 Mar 83, SD 416; Ltr and 1 Atch APIS/AC to All Members, "Financial Management Board (FMB) Meeting," 22 Mar 83, SD 419. See also Ltr and 1 Atch APIS/AC to All Members, "Financial Management Board Meeting," 7 Jul 83, SD 420; Ltr and 2 Atchs APIS/AC to All Members, "FY83 O&M Financial Program and FY85 POM Initiatives in Program 8A and 9," 20 Nov 82, SD 421.


3APIS Operating Budget FY86 1986, RCS: DD COMP(AR)-1092, OAC40, 30 Dec 83, SD 423.

4Historical Data Rpt APIS/AC, Jan-Dec 83, SD 415.
FY84 O&M program, and to approve investment equipment purchases from the FY83 and FY84 program. Each resource advisor (RA) reviewed the proposed distribution of their FY84 O&M program. After three minor adjustments, the FWG approved the FY84 initial distribution.¹

**Telephone Study**

During the final quarter of the fiscal year, APIS/ACM completed a Telephone/Telephone Line Communication Study. The purpose of the study was to review existing capabilities and explore less expensive ways of providing the necessary telephone service. During the study ACM found several bills with local long distance charges which had not been validated as official calls before the bills were paid. ACM noticed a dramatic increase in the number of calls per month within RE during July and August of 1983. C&P telephone was requested to investigate, and the findings disclosed that APIS was overcharged $9,574.00. A letter from the CV, dated 30 November 1983, was sent to the directorates in the compound stressing better telephone control and telephone services that are available in the compound.²

**Commander's Fact Book**

Beginning in April, APIS/ACM began preparation of a "Commanders Fact Book" for the APIS commander. The first draft was presented to the APIS/CV with data current as of 30 June 1983. During the meeting the format of the data was changed and finalized. The Fact Book was then updated by the APIS directorate with information current as of 30 September 1983. After being presented to the CV for his approval, it was decided to prepare the book and present it to the commander on a quarterly basis, with the first formal preparation due in January 1984. This covered the first quarter of FY84, 1 October 83 through 31 December 83.³

¹For minutes of other FWG meetings see Ltrs ☐☐, APIS/AC to APIS/DA et al, "Financial Working Group (FWG) Meeting," 29 Dec 82, 26 Apr 83, 2 Aug 83, 26 Oct 83, 20 Dec 83, SD 424.
²See also Paper ☐☐, APIS/AC, "APIS/ACM...Study...." 1983, SD 425.
³Historical Data Rprt ☐☐, APIS/AC, Jan-Dec 83, SD 415.
PLANS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION*

MISSION

The Plans Division unified and directed all command planning and programming activities toward reaching approved command goals.¹

ORGANIZATION

The division consisted of a Plans Branch and a Programming Branch. In February, the position of chief of the Programming Branch was converted to a civilian slot from a military one to acquire continuity of expertise. In September, however, the same branch, which consisted of a civilian billet and a military billet, became the target of an AFIS reallocation and was reduced to the size of only one billet, the civilian branch chief, GS-11. The military billet was transferred to the AFIS Administrative Division, effective with the retirement of CMSgt Robert O'Toole in June 1984, who was chief of the division.²

PERSONNEL

Key Personnel

Lt. Col. Alden R. Guy continued as the chief of the Plans Division, a position he held since July 1981. The chief of the Programming Branch was Maj. Paul Munninghoff, from November 1982 to March 1983. He was replaced by Carlise A. Bourassa in July 1983. Charles E. Beal retired as the chief of the Plans Branch in September 1983.³

The Plans Branch maintained an aggressive production schedule which was interrupted: 1) in May by the loss of the Plans program analyst, 2) in July by the reassignment of the plans officer, and 3) in September by the retirement of the branch chief. Yet, in light of these events and the arrival of inexperienced personnel, the Plans Division performed the programming and planning requirements of the AFIS directorates and divisions and coordinated these actions with appropriate major commands or USAF headquarters.⁴

---

¹This Plans and Programs section was written by the AFIS/XP staff. The AFIS/NO added the POM/CDIR chronology and footnotes.
²For a detailed mission statement and assigned responsibilities see AFISR 23-1 Section I, 15 July 82, SD 2.
⁴Historical Data Rprt AFIS/XP, Jan-Dec 83, SD 428.
⁵Ibid.
Manning Strength

The manning strength of the division was as follows:¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>NUMBER ASSIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFICERS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLISTED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVILIANS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROGRAMMING

POM and GDIP Initiatives

During the year, the significant projects of the Programming Branch were the AFIS Program Objective Memorandum (POM), the General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP), and the consolidation of requirements for these programs from all AFIS directorates and divisions. This year for the first time the Plans Division was responsible for 1) programming in the POM for individual mobilization augmentee (IMA) funding and, 2) preparing a submission for the Consolidated Cryptologic Program (CCP).² Because much of the required data for separate POM and budget submissions were overlapping, in 1982 the AFIS Comptroller Division (AC), the Manpower and Organization Division (MO), and the Plans and Programs Division (XP), issued a joint data call for FY86-90 POM/budget data. The preparation of POM and GDIP documents involved considerable planning, discussion, coordination, bargaining, and decision-making.

POM and GDIP Chronology

The following chronology discloses some of the complex activity within AFIS necessary for completion of the POM and GDIP cycles:³

- 7 January - AFIS/CV sent AFSAC/CC and AFIS/IND, INO, INS the schedule for the working level and director-level meetings for development of the General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP) command ranking list.

- 14 January - The meeting of the working group (resource advisors and project officers) to rank GDIP initiatives. Representatives from AFSAC and AFIS/IND, INOA, INO, INOR, AC, MO, and XP attended.

- 14 January - XP/CC sent AFSAC/CC and AFIS/IND, INO, INS the proposed ranking of the AFIS GDIP initiatives.

¹Ibid.
²Historical Data Rprt AFIS/XP, Jan-Dec 83, SD 428.
³See SDs 429 through 444.
25 January - The directors met to rank the FY 85-89 GDIP activities.

27 January - AFIS/CV sent AF/INRY the consolidated AFIS FYB5-89 GDIP.

2 February - AFIS/CV sent APSAC/CC and AFIS/IND, INO, INS the final ranking of the AFIS GDIP initiatives approved at the director's meeting on 25 January.

11 February - AF/INRY sent the message to AFIS/XP et al: "We expect FYB5-89 to be cut as much as ten percent below the FY85 column of the FYB4 President's budget . . . . If you have new initiatives that you believe must, repeat must, be funded, notify appropriate PEM immediately and provide necessary information identifying command offsets."

1 April - XP/CC sent APSAC/CC and AFIS/IND, INO listing showing how AFIS initiatives fared in the draft FYB5 Air Force GDIP ranking process.

17 May - XP/CC sent APSAC/CC and AFIS/IND, INO the final ranking of initiatives as submitted by AF/INRY to the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) in the final Air Force GDIP.

23 May - XP/CC sent AFIS/IND, INO, INOA, INOH, INOI the descriptive text of the Air Force GDIP submission, including cover letters, table of contents, and respective portions of the narrative and display pages.

1 October - AF/INY made a data call for the NSA/DDO FYB6-90 Consolidated Cryptologic Program (CCP).

13 October - Acting Chief XP requested attendee nominations and suggestions for topics of discussion for the Third Annual Intelligence Programmers Workshop.

19 October - Acting Chief XP sent to AF/INYR the list of the fifteen AFIS personnel to attend the Third Annual Intelligence Programmers' Workshop.

24 October - Acting Chief of XP sent workshop attendees the agenda.

24-28 October - Third Annual Intelligence Programmers Workshop was held at the Pentagon.

10 November - XP/CC submitted funding increases for the FYB6-90 POM submission to include individual mobilization augmentees (IMAs). In 1983, the XP learned from the 1984 MANREQ document that funding for IMAs must be pursued in the POM process by each command, in conjunction with AF/REP.
15 November - Most APIS elements submitted POM/Budget data, and XP, AC and MO were preparing to rank new initiatives.

16 November - A letter from the APIS/CV explained to units with new initiatives how the ranking process worked.

18 November - Representatives from AC, MO, and XP met to discuss POM initiatives submitted by APIS elements to reach agreement or a "strawman" ranking to be presented at the working-level meeting on 30 November 1983.

21 November - XP/CC sent APIS elements the "strawman" ranking of proposed new initiatives for the FY86-90 POM. Representatives to the 30 November working group meeting were to review the ranking and be prepared to defend requirements and assist in establishing ranking among the requirements on the list.

28 November - XP/CC sent APIS elements a revised MO/XP "strawman" ranking, with changes based on feedback following an informal review of the draft POM initiatives by AP/IN's representative to the HQ USAF Program Review Committee. The revised list was to be the starting point for the ranking process at the working-level meeting on 30 November 1983.

30 November - The working group representing those APIS organizations with initiatives being considered ranked the new initiatives for the FY86-90 POM. The concerned directors, with the exception of INC, subsequently concurred in the proposed ranking. The INC issue was resolved on 6 December between Col. Sherman and Col. Wish.

2 December - APIS/CV sent out the data call and guidance to APIS/IND, INC, INS and APSAC/CC for the FY 86-90 General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP).

13 December - APIS/CC sent to APIS elements the command ranking of FY86-90 Program Objective Memorandum (POM) initiatives for Programs 8 and 9, with a description of each initiative. Program 3 requirements were being developed and were to be ranked separately.

15 December - APIS/CV sent to the PE8475 PEM (AF/MPPE) the Program Decision Packages for INC's FY86 POM initiatives. Supporting documentation for the package was included.

29 December - AF/INTSH sent APIS/AC/XP a copy of the latest Air Force GDIP ranking listing.
The Programming Branch consolidated AFIS reviews of statements of operational need (SONs); it reviewed 54 SONs and provided substantive comments to originators of 17 of them.\(^1\)

Revised Objective Plan

On 24 August the Programming Branch initiated action to update the AFIS Objective Plan by 24 October. Revised annexes had been received from all AFIS elements except those AFIS/INO activities affected by an AF/INO reorganization, which were in the planning stage. Publication of the Objective Plan was held up pending the outcome of the AF/INO reorganization, which had not been approved by the end of 1983.\(^2\)

PLANS

Planning Documents

The Plans Branch updated and produced thirteen basic planning documents:\(^3\)

1. AFIS OPLAN P-132  18 Jul 83, Change 1 to MAJCOMs and AF/IN-AFIS.
2. AFIS OPLAN P-133  20 Jun 83, to MAJCOMs and AF/IN-AFIS.
3. AFIS OPLAN P-134  25 Feb 83 to MAJCOMs and AF/IN-AFIS.
4. AFIS OPLAN P-135  16 May 83, Change 1 to MAJCOMs and AF/IN-AFIS.
5. AFIS OPLAN P-136  19 Jul 83, Change 1 to MAJCOMs and AF/IN-AFIS.
6. AFIS Support Plan—Defense Intelligence Agency, 1 Nov 83, to MAJCOMs and AF/IN-AFIS.
7. AFIS MOD-PLAN 28-5  1 Jul 83 to MAJCOMs and AF/IN-AFIS.
8. AFIS CONCEPT/AFIS SUPPORT PLAN 30 Dec 83 to MAJCOMs and AF/IN-AFIS.
9. AFIS Emergency Action Procedures  2 Sep 83 to AFIS.
10. AFISR 355-1 Disaster Preparedness, Planning and Organization 18 Dec 83 to AFIS.
11. AFISR 355-2 Disaster Preparedness, AFIS Notification System 18 Aug 83 to AFIS.
12. AFIS EXPLAN 01-83  15 March 83 to MAJCOMs and AF/IN-AFIS.
13. AFIS EXPLAN 0024  15 Sep 83 to MAJCOMs and AF/INS-AFIS.

\(^1\)List AFIS/XP, "Statements of Operational Need (SONs) on which AFIS Comments were Provided to Originator during 1983," n.d., Appendix 2.

\(^2\)Historical Data Rpt AFIS/XP, Jan-Dec 83, SD 429.

\(^3\)For these plans see SDS 445 through 457. See also Ltr and 1 Atch AFIS/XP to AF/INXX et al, "AFIS Plans Listing and Summary," 1 Nov 83, SD 458.
The branch also maintained the wartime allocations of reservist intelligence individual mobilization augmentee (IMA) authorizations for MAJCOM contingency planning. In addition, a regular function of the plans branch was staffing the review of numerous regulations, manuals, memoranda of understanding, host-tenant agreements, and operational plans from various Air Force and AFIS organizations. Directorate and division comments to these documents were consolidated and provided to the requesters. The division wrote EXPLAINS for RIDGE RUNNER and PRESSURE POINT 84.

Update of TPFDL

An integral part of plans update was the maintenance of the Time-Phased Force Deployments Lists (TPFDL) for reservist IMA allocations to the MAJCOMs for wartime planning. In 1983 this became a major project of the plans branch program analyst through update of the Manpower Force Packaging System (MANFOR) and through extensive analysis of the support Force Sizing (FORSIZE). Before the Plans program analyst left AFIS, Mr. Earl G. Gongloff was authorized access to the Worldwide Military Command and Control System (WWMCCS) Intercomputer Network, and in April 1983, this enabled him to update the MANFOR data of the Contingency Operations/Mobility, Planning and Execution System (COMPES) for the 1983 FORSIZE Exercise. These changes brought the MANFOR to currency for the first time since 1981.

FORSIZE and MANREQ Exercise

The FY83 Support Force Sizing (FORSIZE) and Wartime Manpower Planning (MANREQ) Exercise was conducted, and the Phase II Narrative Report was submitted on 27 May 1983. The FORSIZE/MANREQ exercise identified and documented the total Wartime Manpower force structure for inplace and deployment requirements. Support force availability for the War and Mobilization Plan, Volume 3, Part II was validated through this exercise. This validated requirement data was used by the Air Staff for Program Objective Memorandum (POM) planning and manpower program initiatives in support of the total Air Force wartime manpower planning system.

Although the manpower initiatives from the 1983 FORSIZE/MANREQ were concluded, they were not authorized by December 1983. Nevertheless, the first phase of the 1984 FORSIZE

---

1 Historical Data Rprt AFIS/XP, Jan-Dec 83, SD 428.
3 Ltr and 11 Atchs AFIS/XP to AF/MPC2 et al, "FY83 Phase II Narrative Report, Support Force Sizing (FORSIZE) and Wartime Manpower Planning (MANREQ) Exercises" 27 May 83, SD 460.
EXERCISE was underway in November with the FORSIZE Time Phased Force Deployment Data (TPFDD) Refinement Conference. Maj. Mary Houghton attended the conference on 30 November 1983 at Site "R", Fort Ritchie, Maryland. Mr. Gongloff, who returned to AFIS in December 1983, began the cycle of follow-up actions for Refinement Conference initiatives.¹

TRIPS BY PLANS PERSONNEL

Several trips were made in 1983. In preparation for the Pacific Special Activities Area (PSAA) Management Effectiveness Inspection (MEI), Lt. Col. Guy attended the Air Force Inspector General School in July 1983. He traveled to the RIDGE RUNNER Exercise 12 September. He and Maj. (Select) Houghton attended the Person nel and Readiness Conference at the Air National Guard Facility, Gulfport, Mississippi, from 26-30 September. Lt. Col. Guy attended the SPACECOM Intelligence Conference from 5-8 December. No trip reports were required.²

From 3-27 October, Lt. Col. Guy participated in the AFIS/IG Management Effectiveness Inspection of the Headquarters Air Force Intelligence Command at the Headquarters Air Force Intelligence Command. The planning functions of the organization ranged from and were a direct result of the emphasis and expertise dedicated to planning.³

¹Historical Data Rprt [ ], AFIS/XP, Jan-Dec 83, SD 428.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
MISSION

The Office of the Inspector General (IG) was responsible to the APIS commander for the optimum effectiveness of the Air Force inspection, safety, investigative, and complaint programs within APIS. It reported directly to the commander the management effectiveness of individual units and command-wide functions, as observed during inspections. It also acted as the management advisor for all command or comparable level activities.1

ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL

The IG office consisted of three people:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>NAME AND RANK</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>Lt. Col. C. Wayne</td>
<td>31 Aug 82</td>
<td>Through Dec 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burridge</td>
<td>Maj. Raymond C.</td>
<td>6 Aug 82</td>
<td>Through Dec 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>7 Oct 80</td>
<td>Through Dec 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt Edward C.</td>
<td>NCOIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The office was fully manned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>NUMBER ASSIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFICERS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENLISTED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVILIANS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This IG segment was written by Lt. Col. C. Wayne Burridge. The APIS/BO added the footnotes and made some editorial changes. See Ltr with 1 Atch AFIS/IG to APIS/BO, "Directorate and Staff Agency History Inputs (APIS/CV Ltr, 6 Dec 83)," 25 Jan 84, SD 461.

1For responsibilities assigned see AFR 23-1 Chapter Section F, 15 Jul 82, SD 2. See also the semiannual reports on APIS/IG activities, Ltr and 1 Atch AFIS/IG to HQ APISC/IGF, "Semiannual Report on Audit, Inspection and Investigative Operations . . . .," 1 Apr 83, SD 462; Ltr and 1 Atch AFIS/IG to HQ APISC/IGF, "Information Requirements of the Office of the Inspector General . . . .," 3 Oct 83, SD 463.
INSPECTIONS

Management Effectiveness Inspections

Management Effectiveness Inspections (MEIs) were conducted at AFIS subordinate organizations every 18-24 months. These inspections, conducted according to AFR 123-4, "The Inspection System," examined all aspects of the activity's function. This included inspecting organizational leadership and management, as reflected in mission and functional area performance, installation support, people programs, service to customers, and compliance with directives. During 1983, MEIs were conducted at the following locations:

1. 14-18 March 1983. The overall management of [redacted] was rated as [redacted].

   c. Mrs. Mildred L. Carter, AFIS/DA, Unit Administration.
   d. CMSgt William R. Strickland, AFIS Senior Enlisted Advisor.
   e. MSgt John C. Heldman, Information Security.

2. 9-18 May 1983. AFIS/IG inspectors visited [redacted]. The overall management of the [redacted] program was rated as [redacted].


3. 11-28 October 1983. MEIs were conducted at [redacted].

---


2 Ibid.

3 MEI Report [redacted], AFIS/IG, 9-18 May 1983, 10 Jun 83, SD 465.
11-14 October 1983; and 24-28 October 1983. The overall management of activities was rated as 1. APIS/IG inspector personnel and augmenters for this inspection were:


e. MSgt Larry K. Wallace, APIS/DA, Unit Administration.

Intelligence Oversight Inspections

Intelligence oversight was monitored by the APIS/IG to ensure APIS compliance with Executive Order (EO) 12333, "United States Intelligence Activities." APIS/IG performed this task during MEIs by observing unit activities governed by 1) the EO; 2) Department of Defense Regulation 5240.1-R, "Procedures Governing Activities of DOD Intelligence Components That Affect United States Person," 3) AFR 123-3, "Intelligence Oversight," and 4) AFR 200-19, "Conduct of Intelligence Activities." During 1983, oversight inspections were conducted during MEIs at:

1. 11-18 March 1983.

2. 9-18 May 1983.

3. 11-14 October 1983.

4. 17-21 October 1983.

5. 24-28 October 1983.

Reports of oversight inspection activities were prepared by APIS/IG each quarter of 1983 and forwarded to HQ Air Force Inspection and Safety Center/IGIQ, Norton AFB, CA, according to AFR 200-19, "Conduct of Intelligence Activities." These reports listed current activities and proposed future inspections. No activites that raised questions of legality or propriety were detected or reported during 1983.2

Over-the-Shoulder Inspections

Over-the-Shoulder Inspections (OTSI) were inspections performed by inspectors from APIS/IG to evaluate the effectiveness of an APIS organization's self-inspection program. Evaluations

1MEI Report APIS/IG, 11-28 Oct 83; 18 Nov 83, SD 467.

2Ltr APIS/IG to HQ AFISC/IGIQ, "Quarterly Oversight Inspection Activities . . . ; Apr 83, 30 Jun 83, 16 Sep 83, 21 Dec 83, SD 468.
included mission-oriented inspection standards, checklist utilization, and team management. OTSIs were performed during 1983 at the following AFIS elements:

1. [Redacted], 20 January 1983 The inspector for this OTSI was Maj. Raymond C. Compton. The overall self-inspection of this division was rated as [Redacted].

2. [Redacted], 22 and 24 February 1983 The inspector for this OTSI was Lt. Col. C. Wayne Burrige. The overall self-inspection of this directorate was rated as [Redacted].

3. [Redacted], 24–25 March 1983 The inspector for this OTSI was Maj. Raymond C. Compton. The overall self-inspection of this directorate was rated as [Redacted].

4. [Redacted], 26–27 April 1983 The inspector for this OTSI was Lt. Col. C. Wayne Burrige. The overall self-inspection of this division was rated as [Redacted].

5. [Redacted], 26 May 1983 The inspector for this OTSI was Maj. Raymond C. Compton. The overall self-inspection for this division was rated as [Redacted].

6. [Redacted], 3–4 August 1983 The inspector for this OTSI was Maj. Raymond C. Compton. The overall self-inspection of this division was rated as [Redacted].

7. [Redacted], 19 August 1983 The inspector for this OTSI was Maj. Raymond C. Compton. The overall self-inspection of this division was rated as [Redacted].

8. [Redacted], 20 September 1983 The inspector for this

1Ltr AFIS/IG to [Redacted] “Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSIs) of...” 18 Feb 83, SD 469.
3Ltr AFIS/IG to [Redacted] “Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSIs) of the [Redacted] Self-Inspection Program,” 15 Apr 83, SD 471.
4Ltr AFIS/IG to [Redacted] “Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSIs) of the [Redacted] Self-Inspection Program,” 24 May 83, SD 472.
6Ltr AFIS/IG to [Redacted] “Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSIs) of the [Redacted] Self-Inspection Program,” 21 Sep 83, SD 474.
CTSI was Lt. Col. C. Wayne Burridge. The overall self-inspection of this directorate was rated as [redacted].

9. [redacted] 7 December 1983 The inspector for this CTSI was Lt. Col. C. Wayne Burridge. The overall self-inspection for this division was rated as [redacted].

COMPLAINTS AND INQUIRIES

Numerous complaints were investigated by AFIS/IG during 1983. Due to the privileged, personnel nature of the information contained in these complaints, copies of the investigation reports were not included in this history. However, complete files on the complaints were maintained in AFIS/IG. Areas of complaint and inquiry included:

a. Problems with the Army-Air Force Exchange System Portrait Shop
b. Awards and decorations disapprovals (2)
c. Job harassment
d. Concerns about Letters of Evaluation
e. Improper attaché behavior
f. Pay record difficulties
g. Availability of security clearance messages

SPECIAL INQUIRY

Based on a request from the assistant chief of staff, intelligence (ACS/I), AFIS/IG performed a special inquiry into the management of personnel within AFIS/INS. The inquiry was performed by Lt. Col. C. Wayne Burridge and Maj. Raymond C. Compton during the period 23 June - 29 July 1983. According to the report of inquiry, "The inquiry included a review of applicable directives, files, and personnel folders. Interviews ranging from 30 minutes to three hours were conducted with 68 present or former military and civilian employees of AFIS/INS. These interviews, conducted with both supervisory and working-level personnel, permitted each individual to air grievances in a confidential forum and also allowed the inquiry officer to understand the working dynamics within AFIS/INS. All individuals interviewed were exceptionally forthcoming and candid in their comments."3

1 Ltr [redacted], AFIS/IG to [redacted], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSI) of the [redacted] Self Inspection Program," 4 Nov 83, SD 476.
2 Ltr [redacted], AFIS/IG to [redacted], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSI) of the [redacted] Self-Inspection Program," 21 Dec 83, SD 477.
FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE (FW&A) PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

AFIS/IG implemented AFR 123-2, "Air Force Fraud, Waste, and Abuse (FW&A) Prevention and Detection," within the command. In conjunction with this program, AFIS/IG publicized FW&A prevention by placing notices in the AFIS Weekly Bulletin each quarter to advise AFIS members of the opportunity to report suspected FW&A activities to AFIS/IG for investigation. During 1983, AFIS/IG also distributed FW&A crossfeed information and newsletters from the Air Force Inspection and Safety Center (AFISC) to all AFIS elements. Monthly reports on AFIS FW&A prevention activities were submitted to AFISC/IGF.¹

During 1983, four FW&A conference periods were held in conjunction with MEIs of subordinate AFIS organizations. No FW&A disclosures were received through these conferences.

Two cases of alleged FW&A were referred to AFIS/IG for investigation. These cases included allegations of:

1. Abuse of position in processing suggestion awards.
2. Possible misappropriation of government funds.

Both cases were investigated by AFIS/IG, but were not substantiated. Because of the privileged nature of the files on these cases, files were maintained in AFIS/IG.

GROUND SAFETY

AFIS/IG was charged by AFIS/CC to manage all aspects of the AFIS command-wide ground safety program. This included the implementation of AFR 127-2, "The US Air Force Mishap Prevention Program," AFR 127-4, "Investigating and Reporting US Air Force Mishaps," and AFR 127-12, "Air Force Occupational Safety and Health Programs," within the command. Additionally, AFIS/IG prepared seasonal safety letters and messages for the ACS/I and AFIS/CC and prepared and distributed ground safety information to all AFIS elements. Close coordination was maintained between AFIS/IG and the Safety Offices at Bolling Air Force Base, Fort Belvoir, and the Pentagon. Maj. Compton served as the command ground safety officer (additional duty) during this period.²

During 1983, AFIS personnel suffered the following reportable mishaps:³

¹For the monthly message reports, see MSG AFIS/IG, "Monthly Fraud, Waste and Abuse Prevention Activities (16 Dec 82 - 15 Jan 83)," 1720202 Jan 83, SD 479 and 12 Atch messages.
²For the twelve monthly AFIS safety reports see AF Form 740, "Ground Mishap and Safety Education Summary," AFIS/IG, HAF-IGF(M) 7113, Jan 83, SD 480, and 11 Atchs.
³Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF MISHAP</th>
<th>INJURY/DAMAGE</th>
<th>DAYS LOST</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major injured during karate meet, off-duty (1 Oct 83)</td>
<td>Broken hand; strained leg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt Col slipped on rough pavement while jogging, off-duty (16 Oct 83)</td>
<td>Fractured ankle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt injured playing touch football, off-duty (30 Oct 83)</td>
<td>Sprained ankle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This AFIS 1983 ground accident summary information was the following:¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>MILITARY MANHOURS</th>
<th>CIVILIAN MANHOURS</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT VEHICLE MILEAGE</th>
<th>MISHAPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>90,898</td>
<td>29,955</td>
<td>8,147</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>88,368</td>
<td>29,542</td>
<td>6,393</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>90,552</td>
<td>35,903</td>
<td>9,017</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>90,384</td>
<td>31,248</td>
<td>6,597</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>93,576</td>
<td>36,340</td>
<td>7,433</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>93,576</td>
<td>34,489</td>
<td>7,746</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>93,744</td>
<td>34,084</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>94,920</td>
<td>36,998</td>
<td>8,508</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>93,912</td>
<td>35,876</td>
<td>9,695</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>94,416</td>
<td>33,458</td>
<td>9,372</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>96,768</td>
<td>34,318</td>
<td>8,404</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>97,776</td>
<td>34,322</td>
<td>8,230</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,118,880</td>
<td>405,623</td>
<td>96,569</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRAINING**

AFIS/IG sponsored several individuals to attend the USAF Inspector General School conducted by the Air Force Inspection and Safety Center, Norton, AF, California. These individuals were identified by their element of assignment to augment AFIS/IG inspection teams. Those individuals attending the school during 1983 were:


¹Historical Data Rprt AFIS/XP, Jan-Dec 83, SD 461.

The Manpower and Organization Division (MO) managed the command manpower authorizations (both active and reserve forces), controlled organizational structure, conducted manpower surveys, and determined manpower requirements.¹

**ORGANIZATION**

The division consisted of two branches: 1) Organization and Requirements and 2) Resources and Productivity. On 3 January, the Engineering and Requirements Branch was redesignated the Organization and Requirements Branch to reflect the AFIS exemption from the Air Force manpower standards engineering programs and the division's increased emphasis on the command's (SQA's) structural needs and issues.²

**PERSONNEL**

Lt. Col. John S. Pollrod continued as chief of the division, a position he held from 16 August 1981. In December 1983, he was promoted to lieutenant colonel. Since 4 August 1979 MSgt William E. Emehizer was chief of the Organization and Requirements Branch. SMSgt Edward H. Ruter, the chief of the Resources and Productivity Branch, transferred to the Electronic Security Command at Kelly AFB, Texas on 21 September 1983. He had been with MO since 1 July 1978 and was replaced by MSgt Arnold Less, who had been with MO since 18 December 1981.

The manning strength of the division was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>NUMBER Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES**

¹The AFIS/MO segment was written by MSgt William E. Emehizer and reviewed by Lt. Col. John S. Pollrod. The AFIS/HO added footnotes, did some editing, and quoted some documents. See Ltr ⁰ and ¹ Arch ¹⁰, AFIS/MO to AFIS/HO, "Annual Unit History Report (CY1983) (AFIS/CV Ltr, 6 Dec 83)," 17 Feb 84, SD 481.
²AFISR 23-1 ⁰ Section H, 15 Jul 82, SD 2.
³Historical Data Rpt ⁰ AFIS/MO, Jan-Dec 83, SD 481.
New Regulations Published

In accordance with the MO mission, the division published two new AFIS regulations: AFISR 26-1, "Authorization Change Request Procedures," 5 October 1981, and AFISR 26-2 "Organization Policy and Management," 18 November 1983. The former provided guidance and procedures for requesting changes in manpower authorizations. The latter outlined responsibilities for controlling organizational structures and formal mission statements within AFIS.

Installation of CRT Computer Remote Terminal

Installation of a cathode ray tube (CRT) computer remote terminal in March greatly enhanced the division's ability to responsibly manage AFIS's allocated resources. Decreased dependence on off-site (Bolling ABF and Andrews ABF) equipment and related manual procedures provided greater flexibility and responsiveness in meeting the resource and organization requirements of AFIS. Direct computer interface transactions replaced those involving card key punching, mailing transaction cards to Bolling ABF, computer batch processing, return mailing, and transaction editing. What formerly involved two, three or more days was accomplished in two to four hours. Installation of an on-site printer in mid-January 1984 was expected to provide near complete management freedom. The capability to produce hard copy on-site was to end MO's dependence on the facilities and equipment at Bolling and Andrews.

Manpower Authorization and Allocation

Extensive resource management actions enabled the division to accommodate AFIS's growing manpower authorization requirements. Two primary means were employed in meeting those requirements: 1) allocation of newly approved resources and 2) redistribution of existing resources.

The Air Force Special Activities Center (AFSAC) was provided for fiscal year 1983, 11 officers, 1 enlisted, and 3 civilians; for fiscal year 1984, AFSAC was provided 9 officers, 6 enlisted, and 6 civilians. The Directorate of Intelligence Data Management (IND) received 10 new enlisted positions in the fiscal year 1984 Air Force General Defense Intelligence Program.

1 AFISR 26-1 "Authorization Change Request Procedures," 5 Oct 83, SD 482.
2 AFISR 26-2 "Organization Policy and Management," 18 Nov 83, SD 483.
3 Historical Data Rpt AFIS/MO, Jan-Dec 83, SD 481.
4 LtR and J Atch AFIS/MO to AFSAC/CC, "PY83 and PY84 AFSAC Manpower Additions," 25 Feb 83, SD 484.
5 LtR AFIS/IND to AFIS/MO et al, "New FY84 Manpower Authorizations," 17 Jan 83, SD 485.
five manpower authorizations were transferred from the Strategic Air Command (SAC) to support the Tactical Air Intelligence System (TAIS). The positions were the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FC</th>
<th>OCC</th>
<th>POSITION NR</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>AFSC</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>353705</td>
<td>INDR</td>
<td>0005040</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>CS016</td>
<td>31335B</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354114</td>
<td>INZY(INYS)</td>
<td>0005032</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>8016</td>
<td>91212G</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354114</td>
<td>INZY(INYS)</td>
<td>0005033</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>8016</td>
<td>91212G</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354114</td>
<td>INZY(INXY)</td>
<td>0005034</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>8016</td>
<td>91212G</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354114</td>
<td>INZY(INYR)</td>
<td>0005035</td>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>8035</td>
<td>91212G</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Pool" for Manpower Trade-Offs

The continuing need to provide dedicated resources to specific taskings led to the establishment of a "lowest-priority" listing from within AFIS's existing resources. Each function nominated a resource which, if deleted, would least impact upon the unit's overall mission, recognizing that the identification did not deny the genuine need for the resource. The "pool" thus established of lowest-priority positions was subsequently drawn

---

2 Ltr AFIS/MO to AFIS/IND, "New Authorizations to Support the Tactical Air Intelligence System (TAIS)." 21 Jul 83, SD 489; Memo for Record AFIS/MO, Maj Pollard, "Reprogramming of GDIP Billets for Record," 8 June 83, SD 490; Ltr AF/INY to AFIS/MO, "Allocation of Five Manpower Authorizations Transferred from SAC," 23 Jun 83, SD 491; Ltr AF/MPP to AFIS/MO, "General Defense Intelligence Program Adjustment," 30 Jun 83, SD 492; Ltr AFIS/MO to AF/INY, AFIS/IND, "Allocation of Five Manpower Authorizations Transferred from SAC (Your Ltr, 23 Jun)," 7 Jul 83, SD 493. See also Ltr with 1 Atch AFIS/MO to AFIS/CV et al, "FY85 POM Results (Program 8 and 9)," 11 May 83, SD 494; Ltr with 1 Atch AFIS/MO to AFIS/DP, "Manpower Authorization Change Request (Your Ltr, 28 Oct 83)," 15 Nov 83, SD 495.
upon to fund 1) AF/INW requirements for the Reconnaissance Plans Branch (AF/XOX)¹ and 2) AFIS/INOZD requirements for Intel Graphics Service.²

Three Elements Reorganized

Several functional managers adapted to shifting and increasing mission responsibilities and taskings via reorganization. Approval and implementation of reorganizations in the Directorate of Security and Communications Management,³ the Directorate of Joint Services Support,⁴ and Headquarters AFSCAC⁵ was to provide functional managers the capability for achieving greater managerial flexibility, maximal utilization of resources, and more efficient/effective mission accomplishment.

Exemption from Functional Reviews

On 25 April, the deputy director of HQ USAF Manpower and Organization (AF/MPM) exempted AFIS from functional reviews.⁶ AFIS/MO had requested the exemption in February. According to Major Polirod:⁷

Most Headquarters AFIS functions have been identified for exemption because mission activities are not conducive to standards development. For a proper perspective, it is necessary to understand that AFIS is

¹Staff Summary Sheet with 9 Atch. AFIS/MO to AFIS/CC et al, "Manpower Billets for Reconnaissance Plans Branch (AF/XOX)," 20 Jun 83, SD 496; Ltr AFIS/MO to AFIS/RE, "Transfer of Authorization," 16 Jul 83, SD 497; Ltr AFIS/MO to AF/INW, "Intelligence Support for Reconnaissance Plans Branch (AF/INW Ltr, 8 Jun 83)," 20 Jul 83, SD 498.
³See Chapter 5.
⁴See Chapter 4.
⁶Ltr AF/MPM to AFIS/MO, "Command Functional Review Schedule," 25 Apr 83, SD 504.
⁷Ltr AFIS/MO to AFMRA/MEM, "Command Functional Review Schedule," 3 Feb 83, SD 505; Ltr with 2 Atch (AFIS/MO Ltr, 6 Sep 82 w/Atch, AFISR 23-2 and AFIS/MO Ltr, 3 Feb 83), AFIS/MO to AFMRA/MEM, "Command Functional Review Schedule (Your Ltr, 6 Dec 82)," 4 Feb 83, SD 506; Ltr and 3 Atch. AFIS/MO to AFMRA/MEM, "Command Functional Review Schedule," 3 Feb 83, SD 507.
to AF/IN as AFMC is to AF/ME. Both SOAs provide specialized support to the Air Staff and to functional communities worldwide. The nature and character of the tasks performed, i.e., high level functional agent and delegated staff responsibilities, historically and realistically do not lend themselves to standards development.

In addition to SOA headquarters activities, AFIS has one subordinate element which is the Air Force Special Activities Center (AFSAC). Again, the nature of AFSAC's mission, coupled with its worldwide dispersal, makes ME standards development impractical. This subject was previously addressed with AF/MPME and based on discussions between myself and LTC Leffler, we were of the impression that the AFSAC exemption request would be favorably considered based upon its merits.

Manpower Studies

Having obtained exemption from the institutionalized Air Force Manpower Standard Development Program, MO reduced its authorized strength by one and made that resource available to satisfy a higher priority requirement within AFIS. MO continued to conduct manpower studies directed toward establishing a credible baseline of functional requirements. The finalization of the Personnel Security Division, AFIS/INSH, and the HQ APSAC studies provided for the internal realignment of responsibilities and resources to meet functional taskings from within existing capabilities. This was significant in that new responsibilities were absorbed without seeking new resources. Equally important, these studies lent credence to the value of tailoring the manpower standard study program to the particular needs of AFIS. Having acquired a prospective yield from this departure from the AF program, a similar effort was initiated in the Administrative Division, AFIS/DA.¹

Special Concerns

The Air Force role in the intelligence community as directed by the ACS/I was greatly expanded as a result of the current world situation. The ACS/I required greater numbers of resources to maintain current intelligence policy, direction, analysis, and production efforts and to identify and exploit the growing areas of intelligence potential. Coupled with congressionally imposed Air Staff strength ceilings, the existing (and projected) austere budget led to the practice of looking to AFIS for delegation of mission elements and satisfaction of needed resource builds.² "This practice," according to AFIS/MO, "added to the scope of the AFIS mission responsibilities while reducing

¹Ltr and 1 Atch AFIS/MO to AFIS/DA, "Study Memorandum," 6 Dec 83, SD 508.
²Historical Data Report AFIS/MO, Jan-Dec 83, SD 481.
the resources available to meet currently assigned responsibilities. Existing SOA resources were severely strained. The anticipated perpetuation of the practice, lack of projected resource gains, and the possibility of an Air Force imposed SOA strength reduction not only posed serious short term resource management problems for AFIS, but also presented the possibility of an eventual atrophy of the SOA overhead. Acquisition of sorely needed resources must therefore continue to be one of the highest priority efforts. At the same time, there had to be a renewal of efforts to optimize the utilization of existing resources commensurate with AF/IN and AFIS mission priorities.¹

¹Ibid.
ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION*

MISSION

The Administrative Division (DA) was charged with providing efficient and economic administrative management systems which were essential to operating and managing Air Force intelligence activities. Its assigned responsibilities were the following:

a. Establishes and implements policies, procedures, systems and standards that relate to publications and forms management, including their reproduction and distribution. (Publication management, forms management, publications and forms distribution, and maintaining standard publication libraries.)

b. Establishes and implements policies and standards according to Congressional Joint Committee standards on printing, regulations and government paper specification. (Printing management, including maintaining printing budget, micropublishing management, duplicating management, and copying management.)

c. Establishes and implements policies according to the Public Printing and Documents Act, Freedom of Information Act, and Privacy Act. Also, implements regulations from the General Services Administration, Office of Management and Budget, the Attorney General of the United States, and the General Accounting Office. (Authenticating documents, documentation management, giving access to and releasing documents under the Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act, For Official Use Only (FOUO) markings, protecting and handling, scheduling fees, and microfilming systems management.)

d. Establishes and implements policies, procedures, and standards that relate to administrative communications management, integrated Air Force addressing system, administrative orders, terminology standardization and abbreviation control, and postal liaison.

e. Evaluates administrative systems (manual or automated) that apply to administrative and executive management mission. Develops plans for new or refines current administrative systems to increase their mission efficiency and reduce operational cost.

*This Administration segment was written by Susan P. Cooksey and the DA staff. The AFIS/HQ did footnoting, minor editing, and the quoting of some documents.

1AFISR 23-1, Section D, Administrative Division (DA), 15 July 82, SD 2.
The Administrative Division consisted of four branches and five sections as follows: 1

Administrative Communications Branch (DAA)
Publication Management Branch (DAP)
Command Publications Distribution Center (DAPDC)
Publications Development Section (DAPF)
Forms Management Section (DAPFS)
Reprographics Section (DAPRS)
Documentation Management Branch (DAD)
Freedom of Information Section (DADF)
Systems Management Branch (DAS)

OMB Recommendations to Eliminate Printing Facility

On 15 November, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) completed its review of data on the justification for continued existence of printing plants and duplicating centers throughout the Air Force. The AFIS duplicating facility was included in the survey. OMB recommended that on 1 October 1984, AFIS cease use of its printing press for the 111,000 classified production units and transfer that workload to a copier. The unclassified work, 333,000 units, was recommended for transference to the Fort Belvoir centralized facility through an inter-service support agreement. 2

On 6 November, the Reprographics Section responded to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, defending the existence of the AFIS reprographics facility. The thrust of the letter stated that the facility was established to provide support for quick response on sensitive intelligence material during crisis situations. It was not prudent to release that material for reproduction outside the intelligence community. 3

In mid-December, the AFIS Logistics Division was informed of the OMB recommendation to transfer the unclassified AFIS printing work to the Fort Belvoir Army Field Print Plant or other printing facility as deemed appropriate. The proposal raised several concerns with Col. Lynn Thompson, the chief of Logistics. He stated: 4

1 For detailed mission statements of the branches see Historical Data Rpt. AFIS/DA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 509.
3 Ibid.
4 Lt Col AFIS/CG to AFIS/CV et al., "Air Force Reprographics Program (AFIS/DAP Point Paper 15 Dec 83)," 20 Dec 83, SD 511.
Has AFIS/DA ascertained whether Fort Belvoir printing facilities can accommodate the additional volume of work (333,000 units) and the various types of printing to support AFIS?

The Host Tenant Support Agreement (HTSA) with Fort Belvoir is general in nature and could be interpreted to include this additional workload. However, in the recent negotiation of the Agreement the implied intent was that AFIS would only be requesting a light to modest workload that primarily involved producing slides, charts, etc., on a reimbursable basis.

If Fort Belvoir is not capable of this increased workload in their current printing plant configuration, then AF/DAFR should incorporate this factor in defending the existence of the AFIS facility. Could this lead to AFIS being directed to transfer manpower positions to USA to support the Fort Belvoir plant?

The colonel requested that the Administrative Division provide answers to his questions so that Logistics could use them during the annual review and update of the host tenant support agreement. By the end of the reporting period for this history, no decision had yet been made about the continued operation of the AFIS printing facility.

PERSONNEL

Key Personnel

Throughout the year, CMSgt Robert R. O'Toole continued as chief of Administration, and MSgt George Whiteside was the assistant chief, who retired in February and was replaced by SMSgt Martin P. Gardner. The chief of the Administrative Communications Branch was TSgt Henderson A. Joseph, who assumed responsibility for the branch on 8 March 1983. SMSgt Gardner was also the chief of the Documentation Management Branch; he replaced Mildred Carter, who transferred to the Justice Department in November 1983. MSgt Larry K. Wallace was chief of the Publications Management Branch since May 1983. TSgt Deborah G. Groves was command systems manager since October 1982.¹

Manning Strength

As of 31 December, Administration had the following manpower:²

¹Request For Information APIS Editorial Assistant with DA Personnel, 13 Jul 83.
²For position numbers, specialty codes, and names see Historical Data Rprt AFIS/DA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 509.
NUMBER AUTHORIZED  NUMBER ASSIGNED

OFFICERS 0 0
ENLISTED 9 9
CIVILIANS 3 2
TOTAL 12 11

During 1983, one billet was transferred from chief master sergeant 70200 to a major 7046. A vacant GS-118-6 secretarial position was deferred by AFIS/MO. Administration did acquire a temporary GS-122-03 clerk-typist position.

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Orders

The Administrative Communications Branch authenticated all special orders and those temporary duty travel (TDY) orders for AFIS located at Fort Belvoir. The branch issued 339 T-Series orders, which concerned TDY, 7 G-Series orders, which concerned assumption of command, and 110 Reserve orders.

Directives

The branch promulgated the following directives:

AFIS Supplement 1 to AFR 10-1, Preparing Correspondence, 7 Dec 83.
AFIS Supplement 1 to AFR 10-7, Administrative Orders, 20 Jul 83.
AFIS Supplement 1 to AFR 13-1, Management of the Air Force Writing Program, 8 June 83.
AFISR 182-1, Administrative Communications Distribution, 30 Nov 83.
AFIS/DAA OI 7-1, Procedural Guide for Subaccount Representative, 1 Sep 83.

Metered Mail

In July, the branch received a new electronic weight scale, which upgraded operational capabilities to properly meter packages for correct postage fees. During 1983, $35,481.11 was spent for metered mail.

1Ltr , AFIS/MO to AFIS/DP, "Conversion of AFIS/DA Billet to Major 7046," 19 Sep 83, SD 512.
3For all G-Series orders from CYB3 see SD 514. See also Historical Data Rprt , AFIS/DA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 509.
4See SDs 515 to 519.
OMS Test Program

The Administrative Communications Branch of the HQ USAF Directorate of Administration (DAQA) approved the testing of the Official Mail Stamp (OMS) Program by the AFIS Directorate of Intelligence Reserve Forces (AFIS/RE). The program allowed small organizations to use stamps instead of metered mail to carry out their official mail functions. In March, the DAQA, in conjunction with the United States Postal Service, was still in the process of selecting evaluation criteria by which to evaluate the program. Some of the proposed criteria concerned ordering procedures, adequacy of instructions, use of the stamps, security, inventory control, and training.\textsuperscript{1} During the year, the Reserves directorate used stamps totaling $7,136.00.\textsuperscript{2}

Telephone Work Orders

The Administrative Communications Branch processed 53 telephone work order requests (18 for new installation, 27 relocation, and 8 miscellaneous). All were completed. The United States Army Communications Command Center (USACC), Fort Belvoir, began work on 12 underground cables for Buildings 1919 through 1930. As of 31 December, the work was still underway.\textsuperscript{3}

Cost-Effective Long Distance Telephone Calls

During September, the branch completed a comprehensive study of the AFIS compound telephone system at Fort Belvoir. A letter subsequently was sent to the telephone subscribers to inform them of ways to make cost effective long distance calls over official communications systems. All calls were to originate from class "A" telephones and were to be for official use only. The use of four types of systems was discussed in the letter: 1) Federal Telecommunication System (FTS), 2) Automatic Voice Network (AVON), 3) Least Cost Routing (LCR), and 4) Message Business Lines (MBL).\textsuperscript{4}

PUBLICATIONS MANAGEMENT

Publications Processed and Pamphlets Reviewed

The Publications Management Branch processed 12 API regulations, 1 API pamphlet, 11 API supplements, and 9 AF/IN

\textsuperscript{1}AF 202, Quarterly Official Mail Stamp Requisition/Use Report, HAP-DAA, 31 Mar and 30 Sep 83, SD 521.
\textsuperscript{2}Ltr HQ USAF DAQA to ALMAJCOM-SQA/DAA, "Evaluation Criteria for OMS Test Program," 29 Mar 83, SD 522.
\textsuperscript{3}Historical Data Rprt AFIS/DA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 509.
\textsuperscript{4}See Ltr APIIS/DAA to All Compound Personnel, "Procedure for Making Cost Efficient Long Distance Telephone Calls over Official Communications Systems," 21 Sep 83, SD 523.
operating instructions. It also conducted the fiscal year 1983 pamphlet review. Pamphlets to be reviewed included classified and unclassified publications printed on a one-edition basis, usually published to inform, motivate, increase knowledge, or improve performance. A review of the branch's record set files and the FY82 Pamphlet Inventory indicated that no pamphlets as described for review were published or scheduled for publication during FY83.2

Forms Processed and Reprographics Jobs

The forms Management Branch processed 8 AFIS command forms and 27 AFIS office forms.3 The Reprographics Branch accomplished the following:4

Jobs Received: 718
Originals Received: 6,964
Total Units Produced: 592,344
Total Sheets Collated: 233,315
Cost: $28,572

Copier Management

Under the Copier Management Program, 4,788,471 copies were produced at a cost of $112,501 for FY83.5

DOCUMENTATION MANAGEMENT

Documentation Holdings

The Documentation Management Branch reported to HQ USAF the following documentation holdings and disposition statistics during CY83:6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AFIS</th>
<th>AFSAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Hand, 1 Jan 82</td>
<td>1,859 9/12 ft³</td>
<td>847 5/12 ft³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>1,171 3/12 ft³</td>
<td>464 10/12 ft³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Hand, 31 Dec 82</td>
<td>1,023 5/12 ft³</td>
<td>1,455 5/12 ft³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1See Staff Summary Sheets AFIS/DAF to AFIS/CV et al, 4 Mar, 12 May, 16 May, 21 Jun, 8 Jul, 20 Jul (2), 5 Aug, 20 Sep, 28 Sep, 18 Nov, 25 Nov 83, SD 524.
2Staff Summary Sheet AFIS/DAF to AFIS/CV et al, "FY83 Pamphlet Review," 29 Jun 83, SD 525.
3Historical Data Rprt AFIS/DA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 509.
4Ibid.
5AF 893, Annual Copier Inventory, Cost, and Production Report, AFIS/DAFR, HAF-DAP (A&Q) 8104. 1 Oct 82 - 30 Sep 83, SD 526.
6Annual Report of Documentation Holdings AFIS/DAD to USAF/DAQD, HAF-DAD (A) 7112 (G5), 1 Jan 82 - 31 Dec 82, SD 527.
The decrease in AFIS holdings was attributed to the reduction of approximately 190 cubic feet of documents to microfilm and the general records cleanup efforts. The increase in AFSC holdings was due to the transfer of personnel records into the AFSC detachments. These offices of record established files to support the relocation of the unit personnel records.¹

**Offices of Record**

Within AFIS, there were 41 offices of record as of 31 December 1983. During the year, staff assistance visits were made to the following offices: AC, DP, DPC, INC, INGA, INOL, INOF, INU (vice INR), INUA (vice INRA), INR, INC, INO, INT, LG, IG, CVE, FA, RE, XP, MD, DAP, DA, DAA, DAD, CCQ, INS, INSD, and INSC.²

**Directives Promulgated**

During CY 1983, the following directives were promulgated:³

AFIS Supplement 1 to AFR 12-1, Air Force Documentation Management Program, 15 Feb 83.
AFIS Supplement 1 to AFR 12-20, Maintenance of Current Documentation, 15 Feb 83.
AFIS Supplement 1 to AFR 12-35, Air Force Privacy Act Program, 8 Jul 83.
AFIS Supplement 1 to AFR 12-40, Micrographics Management, 31 Oct 83.

**Privacy Act**

As of 31 December 1983, AFIS managed 27 separate systems of record affected by the Privacy Act. Counting multiple occurrences of these systems, AFIS maintained a total of 166 systems. Two of these were partially exempt from provisions of the Privacy Act.⁴

Under the Privacy Act, the following statistics on the activity of the two exempted systems were reported to HQ USAF for CY 1982:

Requests received against exempt system F03501 MPC B, Effectiveness/Performance Reporting: 0

Requests received against exempt system F205 APIS A, SCI Informational Personnel Security Records: 33

¹Historical Data Rprt — APIS/DA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 509.
²Ibid.
³See SDs 528 and 529.
⁴Privacy Act Listing — APIS/DA, 31 Dec 83, SD 530.
These statistics were reported to HQ USAF under RCS DD-A(A&AR) 1379.¹

Freedom of Information Act

In 1983, the branch received 62 requests for information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). As of 31 December, action was completed on 60 of them. Action was completed on an additional 7 requests which were received in 1982. Statistical data follows:²

- Completed requests: 67
- Cases denied or partially denied: 8
- Cases transferred outside the AF: 11
- Cases in which no record could be located: 15
- Cases returned for inadequate description: 11
- Cases returned for procedure violation: 3
- Cases withdrawn by the requester: 1
- Total manhour costs: $13,164
- Other operating costs: $978

SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

Word Processing Studies

The Systems Management Branch performed nine word processing feasibility studies. Studies were accomplished in the following directorates:

- AFIS/INH - Feb 83
- AFIS/IG, LG, XP - Mar 83
- AFIS/DA - Sep 83
- AFIS/HO - Oct 83
- AFIS/INS - Oct 83
- AFIS/INT - Nov 83
- AFSAC/INO - Nov 83
- AFSAC/DA, LG, INX - Nov 83

The purpose of the studies was to determine the need for new or additional keyboards. These studies covered the entire directorate.³ Studies done in February and March were extremely difficult and time consuming due to the fact that Air Force headquarters was in the process of revising the way studies should

³ For an inventory listing of AFIS word processing equipment see Appendix 3, and for a listing for AFSAC see Appendix 4. See Appendix 5 for the AFIS wordprocessing status as of Dec 83.
be accomplished. The Administrative Division was also a participant in the compound-wide Xerox Information processing survey in October 83.

SECURITY

On 23 March, the AFIS commander appointed the chief of the Administrative Division the Information Security Program Manager (ISPM) for AFIS activities located at Fort Belvoir. As a result of this additional assignment, the following ISPM Operating Instructions were promulgated:

ISPM OI 205-1, Security, 1 Oct 83.
ISPM OI 205-2, Security Manager's Responsibilities, 12 Sep 83.
ISPM OI 205-3, Safeguarding and Storage, 26 Oct 83.
ISPM OI 205-4, Use and Protection of For Official Use Only Material, 7 Nov 83.
ISPM OI 205-5, Top Secret Control, 20 Sep 83.
ISPM OI 205-6, Special Access - Control of CNWCI, 8 Dec 83.
ISPM OI 205-7, Special Access - The SIOP, 8 Dec 83.
ISPM OI 205-8, Special Access - Safeguarding NATO Classified Information, 8 Dec 83.
ISPM OI 205-9, Control of RODCA Material, 9 Dec 83.
ISPM OI 205-10, Transmission or Transporting of Classified Information, 21 Sep 83.

TRAINING

During 1983, the following formal training courses were attended by AFIS/DA personnel:

11-12 Aug 83, 5th Annual Symposium on Freedom of Information and Privacy Act. (Carter)
19 May 83, Freedom of Information Act, Role of the Manager. (Carter, Cooksey)
5 May 83, Freedom of Information Act, Exemptions 6 and 7. (Carter, Cooksey)
12 May 83, Freedom of Information Act, Exemption 5. (Carter, Cooksey)

Additional Duties

Personnel in the division performed twenty-six tasks throughout the year categorized as "additional duty." Twenty-one of them were prescribed by specific directives.

---

1Ltr [AFIS/CC to AFIS/INS et al, "Information Security Program Manager Designations," 23 Mar 83, SD 533.
2For the OIs see SD 534.
3Historical Data Rprt [AFIS/DA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 509.
4List "AFIS/DA Additional Duties/Titles" DA VA 11-2, Dec 83, SD 533.
PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE

MISSION

The chief of Public Affairs was responsible to the commander for operating the AFIS public affairs program. This included planning for and managing the internal information, community relations, media relations, and security review programs for AFIS.¹

The office's assigned responsibilities were the following:²

1. Prepares informational materials concerned with internal AFIS objectives.

2. Assists in all efforts to promote a supportive community relationship within the AF/IN-AFIS community and the surrounding DC military and civilian community.

3. Actively promotes a working relationship with both military and civilian media sources.

4. Maintains a working relationship with members of the local news media community, both military and civilian.

ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL

The AFIS/PA office consisted of one person, TSgt Barry L. Bahler, who was the chief of the office since 12 February 1982.

FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

The Intelligencer

During the year, TSgt Bahler continued to publish The Intelligencer, a funded Class II Air Force newspaper, published monthly for personnel of the Air Force Intelligence Service. The 1983 editions were the following:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FEATURE STORY</th>
<th>PAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Air Force Intelligence Reserve Program</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Directorate of Attache Affairs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Directorate of Estimates</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(This was the first Intelligencer to feature an AF/IN directorate.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Directorate of Evasion and Escape/Prisoner of War</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹AFISR 23-1 Section J, 15 Jul 82, SD 2.
²Ibid.
³The Intelligencer, AFIS/PA, Jan-Dec 83, SD 536.
There was no October edition of The Intelligencer, because the typesetter in the TRADOC unit on Fort Belvoir, who worked on the APIS paper, quit his job, and TRADOC did not replace him, in anticipation of the Army’s having to contract out for such labor. TSgt Bahler prepared the October–November Intelligencer on a word processor. He also coordinated with three APIS staff agencies, LG, AC, and DA, to find a substitute printing process. The decision was made to contract out the printing job, rather than to rely on government presses, because these were located too far from Fort Belvoir. (The Office of Special Investigations, for example, had its paper printed in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania). The distance precluded the inclusion of up-to-date news in the product and last minute alterations.1

In December, The Intelligencer was typed onto computerized equipment, loaned by the Alexandria Gazette to the Public Affairs Office at Bolling Air Force Base. The Gazette, which held contracts with five Department of Defense units, agreed to transfer the December Intelligencer to a disc at no charge to APIS. TRADOC was then given a master copy and printed it.2

By the end of December, the procurement office at Andrews AFB was assisting APIS with finding a private contractor

1Interview with TSgt Bahler, APIS/PA, 20 Jul 93.
2Ibid.
for the publication of The Intelligencer. The contract was to be
let for eight months, February through September, the end of the
fiscal year.¹

**Press Coverage of RIDGE RUNNER**

In the summer and autumn, TSgt Bahler worked with the
Joint Services Support Directorate for "press" coverage of the
directorate's RIDGE RUNNER Exercise.² The decision was made to
have representatives from AIRMAN magazine cover the exercise,
rather than film crews from "Air Force Now," because the magazine
reached more Air Force personnel.³

On 31 August, AFSC/NIC confirmed the press coverage.
The AFIS Public Affairs Office was informed of the following:⁴

This confirms earlier telecons and finalizes plans for MSgt Alan Prochoroff, 575-54-4999, AIRMAN
associate editor, Secret clearance, and SSgt William W.
Thompson III, 265-19-6230, AIRMAN chief of photography,
Top Secret clearance, to visit Kingwood, WV and Wash DC
to conduct interviews, gather information, and take
photographs for future AIRMAN Magazine articles.

Planned coverage includes, at Kingwood, WV:
Operation RIDGE RUNNER, an Air Force Intelligence
Service joint-service exercise that teaches/shapes escape and evasion techniques; and a profile of Lt. Col.
Roger Locher, who evaded capture for 23 days behind enemy lines in North Vietnam. Lt. Col. Locher is
presently assigned to Hq USAF, Plans and Operations,
Force Development Branch.

Please advise all persons to be interviewed that a tape recorder will be used to insure accuracy of
their comments when story is written at a later date. All stories will be cleared before publication by
SAP/PAS IAW security review procedures.

As the official magazine of the Air Force, AIRMAN must portray military members in the best
possible manner. All persons to be interviewed and/or photographed must meet all aspects of AFR 35-10 and AFR
35-11 covering weight, dress, and appearance standards.

¹Ibid. ¹²
²For a detailed explanation of RIDGE RUNNER see Chapter IV.
³Intvw ⁴ AFIS Historian with TSgt Bahler, AFIS/PA, 20 Jul
64.
⁴Msg ⁵ AFSC/NIC to AF/KOJPT, "Proposed AIRMAN Magazine
Trip," 3123002 Aug 63, SD 537.
We pay particular attention to haircut and moustache compliance. In addition, request all persons and situations to be photographed be in compliance with current safety standards and tech orders. Photography will only be used on individuals who are well within these limits.

For two weeks in September, TSgt Bahler accompanied the writer and the photographer as they watched and recorded the exercise. Their article was to appear in AIRMAN Magazine in 1984.1

Revision of EXPLAN 01-83

Prior to the commencement of the RIDGE RUNNER exercise, TSgt Bahler coordinated with the Joint Services Support Directorate and the Plans Division to revise the AFIS Exercise Plan for RIDGE RUNNER 83, pertaining to the release of information about the exercise. The revised statement in the plan was the following:2

The Public Affairs Officer, Air Force Intelligence Service (AFIS/PA) will serve as the single point of contact for all media coverage, including photography. Request for specific coverage will be submitted, in writing, to AFIS/PA sufficiently in advance of the media event to permit evaluation and clearance/denial by the Exercise Director. Those media personnel authorized to cover the exercise will be assigned escorts by the Exercise Director. Escorts will ensure that clearance has been obtained and that classified portions of the exercise are neither observed nor photographed. Media representatives will be required to wear a distinguishing identity card at all times during the course of the exercise. The Exercise Director will provide specific guidance to the AFIS/PA not later than 45 days prior to the opening date of the Exercise.

The older statement in the EXPLAN 01-83 had stated the following:3

The exercise director (See Annex E) will serve as the public affairs officer in these matters. Media coverage, including photography, is permissible as long as no classified material or information is exposed. In addition, the activities of media representatives will

---

1Intvw —— AFIS Historian with TSgt Bahler, AFIS/PA, 20 Jul 84.
2Ltr —— and 1 Atch —— AFIS/XP to Annex 2 (Distribution). Change 1 to AFIS EXPLAN 01-83," 14 Jun 83, SD 538.
in no way be allowed to interfere with the smooth flow of exercise activities, nor will any support be provided to the media if any expense to the government will be involved. All personnel will be cleared into and out of the exercise area by the exercise director, and all written and photographic material will be examined prior to release. Personnel not willing to submit to these ground rules will not be allowed access. All exercise staff members, observers and students will monitor the presence of media members and report to the exercise director any uncoordinated activities.

It was the belief of the Public Affairs Office that the older statement created conditions that were unenforceable. 1

Photographic Support

During the year, the Public Affairs Office assumed a wider role in providing photographic support to AP/IN and AFIS. According to TSgt Bahler, he gradually assumed the additional duty as staff photographer. This occurred because he was often seen with a camera, taking pictures for The Intelligencer. By the latter part of the year, he had many events scheduled on his calendar for photographic support. For example, in September, out of 22 working days, 7 included photo taskings. In November, out of 22 working days, 8 included photo taskings. 2

In April, the Public Affairs Office ordered the following: 3

Considering 20 rolls of film per package, the following is ordered:

- 3 packages of KODAK Tri-X (B&W), 20 frame rolls
- 1 package of KODAK Plus-X (B&W), 20 frame rolls
- 3 packages of KODAK 1000 (Color), 12 frame rolls
- 3 packages of KODAK 400 (Color), 24 frame rolls

TSgt Bahler took color film for developing to the 1361st Audiovisual Squadron at Fern Street and black and white film went to the Detachment of the 1361st at Bolling AFB. The film was used for such events as the Christmas Party/Ball, retirement ceremonies, visits by distinguished persons, the AF/IN-AFIS picnic, Clean-Up Days, awards ceremonies, and special events. These photos were taken primarily to support The Intelligencer. 4

1Intw ⚑ ⚑ APIS Historian with TSgt Bahler, AFIS/PA, 20 Jul 84.
2Ibid.
3Ltr ⚑ ⚑ APIS/PA to APIS/INOZD, "35mm Print Film Requisition," 14 Apr 83, SD 540.
4Intw ⚑ ⚑ APIS Historian with TSgt Bahler, AFIS/PA, 20 Jul 84.
Submission for Air Force Magazine

In February, TSgt Bahler submitted the AFTS section for the May 1983 Air Force Magazine almanac issue. Included in the submission were the updated AFIS "fact sheet" and photographs of the commander and senior enlisted advisor. The chief of the Collateral Security and Administrative Support Division (LNSA) concurred with the fact sheet as written. The tasking for this project came from the AFOPA/MP.\(^1\)

News Releases

During the year, the Public Affairs Office made 29 "hometown" news releases and 26 "news" releases. The latter consisted of such information as monthly notices of awards and decorations to the Air Force Times; the Freedoms Foundation award-winning essay by Lt. Col. Alden Guy, APIS/XP, to the Arlington Journal; a photograph for The Manpower and Organization Newsletter; and an APSAC recruitment advertisement to the Air Force News Service.\(^2\)


\(^2\)Intvw 286A APIS Historian with TSgt Bahler, APIS/PA, 20 Jul 84.
LOGISTICS DIVISION

MISSION

The AFIS Logistics Division (AFIS/LG) was responsible for providing logistics support to all AFIS elements in the areas of facilities, supply, transportation, vehicle support, host-tent support agreements, memoranda of understanding, and all facets of logistics planning.\(^1\)

It served as the AFIS office of primary responsibility for matters that pertained to planning, developing, presenting, and substantiating logistics plans, programs, and concepts. It was involved with logistics planning in support of compatibility of AFIS plans with the war and contingency plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Air Force, and major commands. The division chaired the AFIS Facilities Working Group and was represented on the Facilities Utilization Board. It also validated AFIS requirements for transportation support and monitored the use and allocation of the AFIS motor vehicle fleet.\(^2\)

ORGANIZATION

The division remained organized into two branches: 1) Transportation and 2) Logistics Plans. The former managed the AFIS vehicle fleet. The latter was responsible for all AFIS logistical planning with a focus on contingency wartime planning.\(^3\)

A major change this year involved the addition of a temporary hire position, clerk-typist, GS-322-3, to provide administrative support. Also, the position of vehicle operations supervisor was changed from Air Force specialty code (AFSC) 60370 to 60350, for compatibility with the position's responsibilities. Shortly thereafter, the AFIS Manpower and Organization Division, after conducting a management advisory study, recommended that the two transportation positions, AFSC 60350, be converted to administrative positions, AFSCs 70230A and 70230B, in order for LG to provide the AFIS Administrative Division with courier and mail distribution duties. At the end of this reporting period, the AFIS commander was considering the recommendation.\(^4\)

PERSONNEL

Key Personnel

Lt. Col. Lynn Thompson continued as head of the division, a position he held since 1 October 1982. MSgt John

\(^1\) For the detailed mission statement of LG see AFISR 23-1, 15 Jul 82, Section G, SD 2.
\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Ibid.
\(^4\) Historical Data Rprt (\textsuperscript{3}), AFIS/LG, Jan-Dec 83.
Howard was the chief of the Logistics Plans Branch, since May 1982, while MSGt Delamor G. Chapman was the chief of the Transportation Branch, since July 1982. SSgt Harold R. Johnson was the vehicle operator and dispatcher, and Georgina Armstrong was the temporary hire for administrative support.

### Manpower Strength

The manpower strength of the division was the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>NUMBER ASSIGNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (Temporary Hire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSPORTATION

As of 31 December, the APIS vehicle fleet consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEHICLE MAKE</th>
<th>VEHICLE TYPE</th>
<th>REGISTRATION NUMBER</th>
<th>MILEAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Sedan</td>
<td>80B3264</td>
<td>40446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Unmarked Sedan</td>
<td>80B3276</td>
<td>53143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Unmarked Sedan</td>
<td>80B3277</td>
<td>52443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Sedan</td>
<td>76B8728</td>
<td>53349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Station Wagon</td>
<td>78B5386</td>
<td>51935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Carryall</td>
<td>90B298</td>
<td>35182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevrolet</td>
<td>Carryall</td>
<td>81B4398</td>
<td>31409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Pickup 4 Ton</td>
<td>79B1029</td>
<td>31762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Unmarked Sedan</td>
<td>83B5806</td>
<td>8682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Received new in August 1983.*

In 1983 there were fewer vicinity travel control numbers issued, 1,033, than in 1982, a total of 1,242. This partly contributed to the lesser amount of fuel being used in 1983 than in 1982. Three groups of foreign distinguished visitors were transported by LG: an Italian delegation 5-6 May, a Korean group, 15 September, and a Japanese contingent 12-15 November. The division also supported the APSAC deployment to Grenada and the RIDGE RUNNER Exercise.

### FACILITIES UPGRADE AND MAINTENANCE

As of 19 July, the MFR-Unfunded Requirements (MFP9) were the following:

---

1. Historical Data Rprt, APIS/LG, Jan-Dec 83.
2. Ibid.
3. Ltr APIS/LG to Col Morris, "MFR-Unfunded Requirements (MFP9)," 19 Jul 83.
a. Buildings 1923, 24, 25, 26, Carpeting - $27K: Carpet was on order; money was to be obligated in FY 83 for purchase; assuming 90 days for delivery, installation was not to occur until FY 84.

b. Buildings 1919, 20, 27, 28 Carpeting - $20K: The work order was submitted to USA/DEH; it was reasonable to assume that carpet was to be ordered and funds obligated in FY 83; there was, however, no guaranty on how quickly the Army would process paperwork; installation in FY 84.

c. Building 1925 Circuits and Alarm - $11K: The work order was on hold pending arrival of new equipment for INR; also required some new interior modifications to accommodate equipment location in new building; design delegated to INR; doubtful money would be obligated in FY 83; expected completion in FY 84.

d. Buildings 1919, 20, 30, Renovation - $80K total: USA/DEH planned to complete work orders with a civilian contract (FACO). The current FACO contract expired on 30 Jun 83, and a new contract was expected to be negotiated by late Aug or Sep 83. DEH was planning to have a new contract and obligate AFIS money in FY 83 for completion of projects in FY 84. FACO contracts were difficult to negotiate, thus, Col. Thompson had some doubt on whether the Army would be able to obligate funds in FY 83; expected completion in FY 84.

e. Building 1923 thru 1930 Central Air Conditioners - $43K: AFIS funds were transferred to Army; highly probable that DEH would procure items and obligate FY 83 funds; installation planned in FY 84.

f. Building 1927 Architectural and Engineering Design - $10K: Expect Army to obligate funds in FY 83 for interior design of building 1927 renovation. Anticipated actual renovation to begin in FY 84.

g. Buildings 1925-26 Central Heat - $80K: Army planned to obligate funds and complete project in FY 83.

h. All Buildings, Electric Meters - $11K: Army planned to obligate funds and complete project in FY 83.

According to Col. Thompson, "Most of the projects have some uncertainties in specific planning dates which stem from our tenant status on Fort Belvoir. I consider the working relationship between AFIS and DEH very good, however, AFIS has no control over the efficiencies in management which effect the timely processing of paperwork to initiate a project with in-house Army resources or a civilian contract. Although there is considerable coordination remaining to insure obligation of FY 83 funds, my assessment is that we have received a fair share of Army
planning resources in the first half of FY 83 to initiate some of our facilities upgrade projects.\[^1\]

**PLANS**

- The division participated in Exercise Pressure Point 84 in November and offered the following critique:\[^2\]

  Emergency Notification System: LG experienced no difficulty in contacting/locating personnel during the telephone recall. There appeared to be a break-down in communication concerning the exact wording of the exercise message instructions being relayed during the recall. Suggest the instructions on the reverse side of the Emergency Notification Roster be revised to include a "fill-in-the-blanks" checklist or more specific options in written form that would involve checking off the correct response. This would assist personnel, who are often less than fully alert in the early morning, in relaying the specific instructions by merely reading from the pre-printed checklist rather than trying to copy or memorize the correct response. Also, more emphasis needs to be placed on distributing the Emergency Notification Rosters to insure all personnel receive copies printed on both sides. It appears that some internal office distribution takes place by only locally reproducing the side containing names which omits the instructions on the reverse side.

- The division received and updated the following plans during the year:\[^3\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFIS SUPPORT PLAN-DIA</td>
<td>Feb 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS MOB PLAN 28-5</td>
<td>Feb 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS OPLAN F-132</td>
<td>Apr 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS OPLAN F-133</td>
<td>Apr 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS OPLAN F-136</td>
<td>Apr 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONUS BASE OSE PLAN</td>
<td>Apr 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS EMERGENCY ACTION PROCEDURE</td>
<td>May 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS OPLAN 135</td>
<td>Jun 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS PRODUCTIVITY PLAN</td>
<td>Sep 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS OBJECTIVE PLAN</td>
<td>Sep 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS CONPLAN - AFIS SUPPORT</td>
<td>Oct 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAA OPLAN 5000/5001</td>
<td>Dec 83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In March, the division responded to a suggestion submitted through the Air Force Suggestion Program concerning contracting support for AFIS. In part the suggestion stated:\[^4\]

---

\[^1\]Ibid.

\[^2\]Ltr \[APIS/LG to AFIS/XP, "Exercise Pressure Point 84 Critique (CE Ltr, 29 Nov 83)," 1 Dec 83, US 543.

\[^3\]Historical Data Rpt \[APIS/LG, Jan-Dec 83. For list of AFIS Tenant-Support Agreements, see Appendix 6.

\[^4\]Suggestion \[M. Petrilak, 76ALD/LOC, AND 83-0242, 22 Dec 81.\]
Pursuant to AFR 11-4, Host-Tenant Support Responsibilities of U.S. Air Force Organizations, the Washington Area Contracting Center is currently tasked to provide contractual support to approximately 69 different DOD activities located throughout the National Capital Region (NCR). In one particular instance, the Contracting Center provides such support to HQ AFIS located at Ft. Belvoir, VA. Because the activity is located approximately 17 miles from Andrews AFB, the processing of required purchase request documents to the Contracting Center is a burdensome and time consuming process. Additionally, purchase requests are not submitted in the proper format (AFR 70-322), lack adequate purchase description, lack proper signatures and funding certification, are lost in distribution, and are submitted after-the-fact in some instances. As a result, the purchasing process is delayed, customer support is generally poor, the HQ AFIS mission is degraded and unauthorized contracting actions (UCAs) are common. In order to eliminate this intolerable situation, I suggest that the current agreement between HQ AFIS and Andrews AFB be changed to delete the contracting support requirement. HQ AFIS should enter into a Host-Tenant Support Agreement with the U.S. Army Procurement Office at Ft. Belvoir.

The division recommended against the adoption of the suggestion, and it was not implemented. In justification, the division's official response was the following:

Because the Contracting Center is located 17 miles from the customer's facility does not necessarily mean the processing of documents has to be a "burdensome and time consuming process." There is no specific requirement to hand carry documents to each location for processing. An administrative courier service operates daily from various locations that would accommodate delivery of purchase request documents for processing.

No matter which contracting center AFIS uses, the documents must still flow through the ACP function at Bolling AFB.

Moving the contracting function from Andrews AFB to Fort Belvoir would not, "eliminate the intolerable situation," noted in the suggestion. For example, documents lacking proper format, description and signatures can be corrected with customer training, not by moving the function to another location. It is also assumed that the number of documents submitted, "after the fact," could be significantly reduced with improved management techniques within customer's organization.

1Ltr 1014 AFIS/LG to 76 ALD/LGC, "Contracting Support for HQ AFIS (Your Ltr., 22 Feb 83)," 25 Mar 83, SD 544.
Moving contracting function to Port Belvoir would not improve support for AFIS elements located at Bolling AFB, Washington Navy Yard, and Fort Meade.

AFIS/LG does not have any data with which to evaluate personnel costs associated with processing purchase request documents at Andrews AFB.

HQ AFIS currently utilizes the contracting office at Port Belvoir for selective projects when it is considered a more efficient process than using the 76 ALD/LGC. It should also be noted that in discussions with the Chief of the Port Belvoir Contracting Office, he stated an increase in workload in his office may justify a request through USA channels to USAF Manpower that a billet from the USAF contracting office currently supporting AFIS be transferred to a USA position at Port Belvoir.¹

¹Ibid.
CHAPTER VIII

AFIS OPERATING LOCATIONS

N - San Antonio, Texas
RT - Fort Detrick, Maryland
AP - Kirtland AFB, New Mexico
F - Eglin AFB, Florida
S - Suitland, Maryland*
M - Alexandria, Virginia (See CY 1983 History for AP/INY)

*OC-S was established this year as the Air Force contingent to the Joint National Intelligence Dissemination System (JNIDS) Program Office. In March, authorized positions were approved for this operating location at Suitland, Maryland, effective FY 1984. Due to the late date for OC-S to become operational, the AFIS CY 1984 History will include the history of the unit for 1983-1984. For discussion of OC-S manpower authorizations, see Chapter VII, Manpower and Organization Division.
MISSION AND RESOURCES

Primary Mission

By USAF/ACS/I direction, AFIS/OL-N is responsible for:
1) ensuring that intelligence collection requirements regarding the communist world's ECM doctrine, concepts, tactics and techniques are current, complete and filed with the appropriate agency; 2) acquiring, analyzing and assessing current and projected communist world ECM doctrine and tactics and their capabilities to execute same; 3) evaluating the projected deployment and employment of new or modified communist world ECM systems to determine the threat to US systems under development or currently in the field; 4) producing finished intelligence scenarios, and estimates concerning current and projected communist world ECM doctrine and tactics; and 6) providing management assistance to producers and users of the USAF Electronic Combat Intelligence Support Data Base, and to agencies involved in development and operation of reprogrammable EW equipment. AFIS OL-N products such as threat assessments, scenarios, analyses, and estimates are developed from all-source data regarding communist ECM tactics, doctrine, concepts of operation, deployment and employment techniques, technical characteristics, ECCM capabilities, and related command and control systems.

Functional Statement

1. Provide intelligence personnel augmentation for dedicated all-source intelligence management and analytical support to the AFEWC EW mission. Establish and maintain a capability to develop tailored EW threat assessments to fulfill the requirements of the Air Force. Act as an AFIS review function for selected Scientific and Technical (S&T) EW analytical efforts/products to insure that Air Force operational EW requirements are considered.

2. Insure that information from operational documentation reports which have direct impact on both USAF and DOD intelligence positions are provided to the appropriate agencies within the intelligence community. Act as the AFEWC intelligence interface with Service, DOD, and national intelligence organizations.

3. Identify needs and accomplish preliminary documentation to support decompartmentation/sanitization of

*This segment on OL-N was prepared by 1Lt Judith A. Mitchell and was reviewed by Lt Col Wayne D. Hardell, Deputy Chief, AFIS/OL-N. See Lt Hardell and 1 Atch History APIS OL-N to HQ AFIS/NO. "Unit History 1983," 22 Feb 1983, SD 545. Some editing was done by the AFIS/NO.
intelligence data to be released in support of AFEWC EW activities/responsibilities. In support of the AFEWC "EW Flagging" concept, initiate any follow-up actions required to confirm threat/parametric changes.

4. Establish and maintain procedures for resolution of critical intelligence issues which impact on the AFEWC mission. In conjunction with the AFEWC Threat System Division, maintain a library of EW related threat information, and perform other EW intelligence support activities as required by AFIS.1

PERSONNEL

1. Number of authorized/assigned personnel by AFSC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>ASSIGNED</th>
<th>AFSC</th>
<th>CIVILIAN</th>
<th>MILITARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8096</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2275Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70270B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70250B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2825</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>201X0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Key Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>INCUMBENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinton M. Glenny</td>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Chief, AFIS OL-N</td>
<td>15 Aug 81 to Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne D. Bardell</td>
<td>LtC</td>
<td>Deputy Chief, AFIS OL-N</td>
<td>16 May 79 to Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David P. Enloe</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>Chief, Threat Analysis Div</td>
<td>28 May 82 to Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl A. Webb, Jr.</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>Chief, Programs Div</td>
<td>1 Oct 80 to Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUDGET

1. The annual operating budget for FY83 was $185.0 K with funds distribution as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDY</td>
<td>$42.8 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Pay</td>
<td>$114.0 K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1For the Monthly Activity Reports AFIS OL-N to AF/INW, Jan-Dec 83, see SD 546
Equipment and Supplies $ 4.3 K
Equipment Rental  $ 16.7 K

2. The ending balance for FY83 was 58.0 K.

ORGANIZATION

CHIEF, AFIS OL-N
(ESC/IN)*
COL GLENNY 8096

DEPUTY CHIEF
LT COL HARDELL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THREAT ANALYSIS DIV</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATION DIV</th>
<th>PROGRAMS DIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAJ ENLOE 2275Y</td>
<td>MSGT THOMAS 70270B</td>
<td>MAJ WEBB 2275Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ PECSOK (1) 2825</td>
<td>GS-6 REYES (4) 70450</td>
<td>CAPT NOBLE (5) 2275Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-12 MCCOY 8016</td>
<td>GS-5 GONZALEZ 70450</td>
<td>CAPT PERRY 08075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPT VALLANCE (2) 8075</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSGT COURTOIS 20570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPT HADDEN 8075</td>
<td></td>
<td>VACANT (6) 8075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1LT RADABAUGH (3) 8035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSGT THOMAS 20170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt MURPHY 20170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSgt BIGGS 20170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The chief, AFIS OL-N, also holds the position of the HQ ESC/DCS-IN. The deputy chief, AFIS OL-N, also holds the position of HQ ESC/INEE. Chief, EW Threat Division.

1. Capt Douglas G. Cisler, 2825, replaced Maj Peckock in August. He is working in the programs division.
2. Capt Stanley G. Silverman, 8075, replaced Capt Vallowce in August.
3. Capt Stephen R. Bowers, 8035, replaced Capt Radabaugh in October. He is working in the programs division.
6. 1Lt Judith A. Mitchell, 8071, filled a vacant slot in September. She is working in the threat division.

OPERATIONS

EW Threat Analysis Division

Threat Simulator Validation (SIMVAL) Program

Deleted per 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(1)
Soviet Optical, Electro-Optical and Infrared Systems

The purpose of this study is to provide a single source of EO/IR system intelligence for use by HQ Electronic Security Command (ESC), Air Force Electronic Warfare Center (AFEWC), and operational units. Included in the study are optical fire control systems for AAA, SAMs and aircraft, IR-guided air-to-air and surface-to-air missiles, infrared search/track systems of fighter aircraft, IR and TV imaging fire control systems for AAA, SAMs and

\footnote{Intelligence Production Requirement 83-044, AFIS OL-N for ESC/AFEWC, "Surface-to-Air Missiles (SAMs)," 11 Mar 83, SD 547; Intelligence Production Requirement 83-045, AFIS OL-N for ESC/AFEWC, "Anti-Aircraft Artillery (AAA)," 11 Mar 83, SD 548; Intelligence Production Requirement 83-046, AFIS OL-N for ESC/AFEWC, "Early Warning, Ground Controlled Intercept, Height Finder Radars (EW/GCI/HF)," 11 Mar 83, SD 549.}
aircraft, TV and IR aerial reconnaissance systems, ground-based and airborne laser rangefinders, laser target designators, laser-guided munitions, and high energy laser weapons. We sent survey forms to the original distribution list to determine needs, and limit distribution of the updated book to those who express a need for it. This document was in revision during 1983 with the final draft in review at PTD and MIA.\(^1\) AFIS OL-N plans to consolidate comments and republish the revised document in early 1984.

Electromagnetic Combat Threat Environment Description (EC TED)

Early in 1983 PTD personnel visited AFIS OL-N to review AFIS OL-N products and attend various briefings given by the AFEWC, ESC, and the JEWC. They were here to gather information for their update to the EC TED. In September we received the EC TED Preliminary Draft Review, and the Threat Analysis Division reviewed the document and provided verbal comments to visitors from PTD. We also reviewed the final draft version of the EC TED and provided written comments and corrections to AF/INW concerning the S/AO supplement to the EC TED.

APN-169C

Soviet Union Airborne Warning and Control (SUWACCS) Aircraft Assessment

AIM-7M Threat


\(^2\)Ltr and 1 Atch 2 MACOS/CC DTG 2621002 Oct 82, SATB (2Lt Goss) to AFIS OL-N, "Request for Intelligence Assessment." 2 Nov 83, SD 551.
Radio Electronic Combat Vulnerabilities Analysis (RVAN)

The APEWC was tasked to develop the methodology to support RVAN. The objective of the RVAN effort will be to identify and document vulnerabilities of electromagnetic dependent equipment and systems with the purpose of providing and supporting a risk assessment for the entire life of the system. The primary intent of RVAN is to support the development, acquisition, fielding, and modification of effective electromagnetic dependent equipment by early identification of vulnerabilities and documentation. As tasked by APEWC, we provided a recommended method for providing AF/IN approved intelligence support to RVAN. The EC TED, TAKs, and STAKs and the EW Intelligence Support Data Base are recommended inputs.

*See also Report "North Korean ECM Capabilities" AFIS OI-N, 83-1, Feb 83, SD 552.
We reviewed eleven complete ITDs and had discussions with GIT on the difficulties they encountered in working on the ITDs. APIS OL-N sent a letter to HQ USAF/INW concerning the problems users have in researching and using information from all three of the referenced documents. Before writing the letter, a comparison on one system, the SA-5, was done between data found in the EWIR, the IDIP and the system book. The five volumes of the ITDs are expected to be here in January 1984.

Engineering Readiness/Rapid Reprogramming Panel

The purpose of the engineering readiness initiative is to develop the capability to provide rapid reprogramming support to the operational commands for airborne weapon systems, command, control and communication systems, and ground EW simulators. The Air Force has developed such a capability to respond quickly to changing threat environments for airborne EW systems (RWR and ECM pods) through the Electronic Warfare
Integrated Reprogramming (EWIR) Concept. However, similar capabilities do not exist to react to enemy jamming and deception techniques that affect fire control and terrain-following radars, navigation systems, communications and command and control systems.

In 1982, HQ AFLC formed a working group to address the engineering readiness issue. The objective of the working group is to develop the capability to support user's needs for rapid reprogramming and preemptive engineering of embedded computer systems. The primary emphasis is on ECCM. AFIS OL-N is a member of this working group and provides guidance for intelligence support.

Currently, HQ AFLC is drafting a preliminary concept of operation for ECCM engineering readiness. This concept will be sent out to all the major commands involved and to HQ USAF for coordination. Once an acceptable concept is written and approved the ECCM concept may be included in APR 55-90, "Electronic Warfare Policy." AFIS OL-N will provide inputs to the intelligence support portion of this concept.

Area Reprogramming Capability (ARC)

The purpose of the ARC program is to provide using commands, both CONUS and in-theater, with the capability to respond rapidly to changes/anomalies in a hostile electronic threat environment. This will be done by creating mission data software changes in a wide range of electronic countermeasures (ECM) and radar warning receiver (RWR) systems, using the ARC system. The ARC is a software-intensive system that will provide threat data processing and analyses, mission data change capability, and internal evaluation and testing. It will give an analyst/operator maximum flexibility in determining and evaluating mission data changes and will allow these tasks to be accomplished in a time frame likely to be encountered in an emergency situation.

The ARC acquisition process will consist of two phases: I and II. Phase II consists of two subphases, IIA and IIB. Phase I and IIA represent a full scale development program. Phase I consists of full-scale development to design, develop, test and deliver four fixed-site ARC systems capable of reprogramming five Electronic Warfare (EW) systems. One system will remain in the contractor facility through Phase IIA; the others will be delivered to USAFTAC, HQ SAC, and Warner Robins ALC. Also part of Phase I is a feasibility study and system specification for a transportable (sheltered) ARC system, data, and a technical/cost proposal for Phase II efforts. Phase IIA consists of fullscale engineering to design, develop, test, and deliver one sheltered ARC.

Advanced Sensor Exploitation (ASE)
AFIS OL-N GOALS FOR 1984

**EW Threat Analysis Division**

1. **Provide increased threat assessment service to the APEWC.**
   a. EB 1-84 Electronic Combat Equipment Capabilities Analysis Update.
   b. Various threat assessments.
5. Provide Soviet tactical air defense C3 support to SIMVAL, AFIS OL-N 84-2.
6. Provide EC TED review support to AF/INYW.
7. Develop, coordinate, and submit various threat IPRs on ROE-Operating Procedures to support SIMVAL.
8. Provide space threat capabilities and trends to AFOTEC and APEWC.

**EC Intelligence Programs Division**

1. **Worldwide Exercise.**
   a. Coordinate national intelligence collection tasking by MAJCOMs.
   b. Develop scripted intelligence inputs.
   c. Provide training for exercise players and monitors.
   d. Complete the intelligence sections of the exercise plan.
   e. Conduct the exercise with maximum intelligence play.
   f. Publish detailed after-action report of successes, problems, solutions, and recommendations during the exercise.
2. **Worldwide Exercise.**
   a. Plan and coordinate the intelligence play.
   b. Write the intelligence section of the plan.
   c. Coordinate MAJCOM tasking of national intelligence collection.
3. Electronic Warfare Support Data Base: Continue efforts to expand the data base to include ECM, IR/EG and LASER data.

4. EWIR Audit Base (ADB): Develop software routines to automatically input ZLINT anomalies into the ADB and provide computer interfaces to the EW Flagging program and EWIR Data Base. Better define EWIR assessed limits definitions.

5. Analyst-to-Analyst Meetings: Coordinate and conduct meaningful exchanges at the S&T centers between the threat systems analysts and the MAJCOM EW reprogramming engineers.

6. Area Reprogramming Capability (ARC): Develop a viable, complete intelligence support concept for the ARC.

7. EW Systems Support: Continue to assist working groups handling present and future reprogrammable EW systems, including the Integrated EW System (INews) and ALQ-131 System Upgrade.


9. Help the Air Force develop the DIA Action Plan For Intelligence Support to EW and C³CM.

10. C³CM Applications Support: Provide support to USAF/INyw and AFWC/CB on COMPASS CALL, the USAF Central C³CM Support Data Base (COMPY SHIRE) and C³ Geographic Analytical Target Exploitation System (C³GATES) applications.

a. Help USAF/INyw and AFWC/CB to draft, coordinate, and finalize the Program Management Directive (PMD) for COMFY SHIRE.

b. Help USAF/INyw and AFWC/CB to draft, coordinate, and finalize the Program Management Plan (PMP) for COMFY SHIRE.

c. Work with USAF/INyw to redefine the National SIGINT Requirements List (NRSL) to support C³CM.

d. Help USAF/INyw to draft, coordinate, and finalize the Master Plan for Intelligence Support to C³CM.

e. Coordinate with USAF/INyw, HW TAC/DOFC, and HQ ESC, and finalize actions to satisfy 41 ESC COMFY SHIRE training requirements.

f. Assist USAF/INyw, HQ TAC/INYS, and TAWC/INW/ADA with development of C³GATES.
MISSION

AFIS/OL-ET - Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center (AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC) is charged with production, analysis, management, and liaison activities as described in Department of Defense Directive 6420.1, "Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center," December 9, 1982. Additional information on AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC is described in the 9 November 1982 letter from the Director, Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center (AFMIC-2A) to the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence; Headquarters United States Air Force (ACS/I).2

Since AFIS/OL-ET first became operational in August 1983, its mission has broadened. The clinical psychologist now covers all military applications of psychology, not just drug abuse and stress. The biophysicist also covers lasers and general biophysics. Both the clinical psychologist and physicist are also covering space medicine and serve as USAF Medical Intelligence Program Managers. These changes have occurred at the request of intelligence consumers and by the authority of the Chief, Weapons, Space and Technology Division; Headquarters United States Air Force (AF/INET) and by AFMIC-2A.

To reflect heightened interest in medical intelligence, AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC is completely revising Air Force regulation (AFR) 200-3, "The Medical Intelligence Program," 9 July 1965.3 A new draft of AFR 200-3 is currently being coordinated with the Office of the United States Air Force Surgeon General (AF/SG) and with the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence; Headquarters United States Air Force (AF/IN). The new regulation, if approved, will describe interrelationships among AFMIC, AF/IN, AF/SG, and all USAF major commands (MAJCOMs) and special operating agencies. It will also establish Medical Intelligence Coordinating Committees (MICC) at Air Staff and MAJCOM levels.4

---

*This segment on OL-ET was prepared by Capt Richard W. Bloom, AFIS/OL-ET. Some editing was done by AFIS/EO. See Ltr and 1 Atch Historical Data Report, AFMIC-2A to AFIS/EO, "Historical Data Report," 13 Feb 84, SD 555.

1DOD Directive 6420.1, "Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center," 9 Dec 82, SD 556.

2Ltr , Lt Col Walker to ACS/I, MG Marks, n.a., 9 Nov 82, SD 557.

3AFR 200-3, "The Medical Intelligence Program," 9 Jul 65, SD 558.

ORGANIZATION

With regard to AFIS/OL-ET APMIC's organization, the reporting official for both staff members is the Chief, Weapons, Space and Technology Division, Headquarters United States Air Force (AF/IMET). Both staff members work within the Studies and Analysis Division of APMIC (APMIC-SA) which, in turn, is commanded by the Director, APMIC (APMIC-ZA).1

APIS/OL-ET-APMIC became operational on 1 August 1983. To trace the rationale for its creation, we must return to congressional deliberations for the FY82 budget.

At that time there was close congressional scrutiny of the United States Army Medical Intelligence and Information Agency (USAMIIA). The House Appropriations Committee (HAC) wanted to eliminate a significant portion of USAMIIA activities and transfer the rest to another Army organization. HAC based its position on alleged administrative ambiguities, financial improprieties, and duplicative services.

On the other hand, the Senate Authorization Committee (SAC) wanted to continue the activities of USAMIIA. SAC based its position on the many service medical intelligence requirements that USAMIIA did and could satisfy.

In a Joint congressional Conference Report (No. 977-410, 15 Dec 1981), funding was approved for USAMIIA in the FY82 General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP). This report also stipulated many modifications for USAMIIA.2

At this point, the secretary of defense (SECDEF) assigned the assistant secretary of defense for health affairs (ASD/HA) to oversee the reorganization of USAMIIA in compliance with congressional wishes. One indirect result of this reorganization was that USAMIIA would include tri-service staff. Another was that USAMIIA soon became APMIC, as of 1 October 1982.

APMIC-ZA soon requested USAF personnel to help satisfy USAF medical intelligence requirements and ensure USAF representation on the APMIC staff. To satisfy this request, two officer authorizations from the USAF Foreign Technology Division (FID) were transferred to the Air Force Intelligence Service (APIS).3 The two officers filling these spaces were assigned to

---

1Organization Chart, AFIS/OL-ET-APMIC, 1983, SD 560.
3Ltr AF/NY to AF/MEPE, "Request for Transfer of Two GDIP Manpower Spaces," 19 Apr 83, SD 562; Ltr AFIS/MO to AF/NY, "Establishment of AFIS/OL-ET - Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center (Your Ltr, 27 Apr 83)," 29 April 83, SD 563.
AF/INET and attached to AFMIC. The two officers had areas of expertise (clinical psychology and biophysics) consonant with AFMIC and USAF medical intelligence requirements. They both arrived at AFMIC in August 1983 at which time, AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC became operational.\(^{1}\)

The two USAF spaces are in the process of being programmed and budgeted in the GOF cycle. When this is accomplished, the officers will be assigned to AFMIC, and AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC may cease to exist. Moreover, four new USAF slots have been requested by the AFMIC-2A for assignment to AFMIC.\(^{2}\) This request is currently being coordinated.

**BUDGET**

\(\text{AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC is not authorized funds. All resources necessary to support mission activities are provided by AFMIC. AF/INET has provided some TDY funds for USAF-related activities.}\)

**FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONS**

1. **AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC provided data on several crises in FY83 and the first quarter of FY84.**

   a. **A report on military drug abuse of Libyan forces had implications for the degree of support Libya could provide the Chadian rebels.**

   b. **Several analyses of Psychological Operation (PSYOP) technology facilitated evaluation of Nicaraguan PSYOP.**

   c. **A clinical psychological analysis of paranoid tendencies in the USSR’s Politburo decision making helped to elucidate occurrences before, during, and after the Korean Air Lines 007 shootdown.**

   d. **A psychological analysis of several Grenadian politico-military leaders was provided before and during U.S. intervention in Grenada.**

   e. **Several analyses on terrorism and counter-terrorism in the Mideast had directed relevance to the U.S. Lebanon mission. For example, one analysis predicted that the**

\(^{1}\text{Ltr AF/NY to AFIS/DP/MD, “Establishment of AFIS/OL-ET - Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center (AFMIC),” 27 Apr 83, SD 564; Memo Carey Sapp to INY, “Col O’Lear’s question “Why not just let them stay with FD?” 19 Apr 83, SD 565.}\)

\(^{2}\text{Ltr Col Walker, AFMIC-2A to ACS/I, “Assignment of Air Force Personnel to AFMIC,” d.d., SD 566.}\)}
Islamic Holy War Organization did not exist. (Most of the work on items a through e were orally transmitted to tri-service and interagency consumers.)

2. AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC has periodically provided analyses of different psychological types who engage in terrorism, common psychological biases which interfere with successful counterterrorism activities, and social psychological context variables which affect the incidence and prevalence of terrorism.

(NOTE: The following items, 3 through 11, are purposely vague on the advice of higher authorities.)

3,4,5. All briefings, reports, and support from AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC have been significant. All are state-of-the-art, and have had influences on assessment and countermeasures, research and development.

6. Participation in studies has been ongoing. No products are yet available. However, they will be significant.

7. AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC has contributed significant questions to many debriefings dealing with medical intelligence.

8. AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC has representatives on the Scientific and Technical Thermal Applications Group, and the Life Sciences Group. Both groups function under the Interagency Scientific and Technical Intelligence Committee (STIC).

9,10. No exercises, programs, areas, or commands have been monitored in 1993. This will change, if the revised AFR 200-3 is approved in its present form.

11. Several special projects are being monitored. However, AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC does not find it advisable to describe them in this report.

12. The concept of psychological intelligence as a subset of medical intelligence is being considerably broadened. Besides the traditional areas of human factors and military drug abuse, new components of psychological intelligence have included PSYOP, psychological aspects of deception and counterdeception, interrogation, "brainwashing," POW psychological phenomena,

---

1 See Msg APMIC-SA to CDSTRAC AFSS/1AX-P-C, "Terrorism" 307002 Jan 84, SD 567; Excerpt from Msg APMIC-ZA to Multiple Sources, "Lebanon: Perceptions of Radical Shites," 1620002 Dec 83, SD 558; Excerpt from Msg APMIC-ZA to AIG 6623, "Sample of AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC Consumers," 1620002 Dec 83, SD 569.

2 See for example Excerpt from Msg APMIC-ZA to Multiple Sources, n.d., SD 578.
psychiatric casualties, personality profiles of decisionmakers, national character, psychology of insurgency and counterinsurgency, psychological vulnerabilities of intelligence operators/intelligence analysts, intelligence and counterintelligence systems, strategic planners/crisis managers; mental health systems in the military; military applications of psychology. This broadened view of psychological intelligence has met significant resistance from some intelligence managers, but has gathered significant support, nevertheless.

13. As a result of the broadened concept of psychological intelligence, new collection requirements have been written to reflect this change. They're being included in G-OEG-42744-Medical Capability Study.

14. AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC does not have a board of advisors or advisory panel. It is open to suggestion from and pliant to AF/INET and APMIC-ZA.

15. AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC does not have an on-station commander. The two staff members discharge responsibilities for AF/INET and APMIC.

16. The new ACS/I has concurred in the need for AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC.

17. AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC has provided state-of-the-art analyses on military applications of nonionizing radiation and parapsychology. It also has provided analyses on recent political-military crises.

18. AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC has had total support from all organizations and all consumers since its inception. Of special note has been the support of the Office of the Surgeon General, Headquarters, United States Air Force, Medical Readiness Division (AF/SGHR).

19. The most significant accomplishment of FY83 and the first quarter of FY84 is providing the USAF with top-level medical intelligence capabilities. Before the advent of AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC, these capabilities were nonexistent.

20. All visitors to AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC are distinguished.

PERSONNEL AND MANPOWER

The organization and personnel of AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME &amp; RANK</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Richard W. Bloom</td>
<td>Medical Intelligence Program Manager</td>
<td>1 Aug 1983</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      | (Former Psychology Applications Officer)
|                      | DET 1, AFCOS (8Q USAF)         |            |            |
| Capt. Robert C. Downs | Medical Intelligence Program Manager | 1 Sep 1983 | Present    |
|                      | (Former Assistant Professor of Physics, USAFA) |            |            |

Morale and motivation are quite high at APIS/OL-ET-AFMIC. Positions are selectively manned by AF-INET and AFMIC and require specialized knowledge in an area pertinent to biomedical sciences. Promotion potential is perceived by staff as excellent.

**FACILITIES AND LOGISTICS**

APIS/OL-ET-AFMIC is located within AFMIC at Ft. Detrick, MD. AFMIC will have a new building ready for occupancy in late 1985. The AFMIC staff and APIS/OL-ET-AFMIC will then move into this new location.

**INSPECTIONS**

At present, APIS/OL-ET-AFMIC has no special oversight function. It was not involved in a major case involving the IG.

**TRAINING**

Training Provided by the Unit

APIS/OL-ET-AFMIC provides regular training in PSYOP and Crisis Response Management (CRM) to students at the USAF Special Operations School, Hurlburt Field, FL. Material is constantly upgraded to preserve the state-of-the-art quality of information. There are usually five PSYOP classes per year, each with about 30 to 40 students. Student evaluations tend to indicate one of two reactions. First, a perception that the training is outstanding, even exceptional by professional military education standards. The other perception is that the training may be too intensive and advanced without prior priming in relevant subject areas. PSYOP and CRM training is being periodically refashioned in reaction to these perceptions.

**Training of Unit Personnel**

In calendar year 1983, the APIS/OL-ET-AFMIC clinical psychologist was sent to the annual American Psychological Association Convention. Attendance at this meeting provided the latest training in many psychological areas. It also provide
opportunities for contacts with international colleagues who had information on military applications of psychology not yet picked up by U.S. intelligence collectors. The training and information obtained at the convention were invaluable to AFMIC psychology/biomedical requirements and figured in many analyses of foreign military applications of psychology.

The AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC physicist attended the following training sessions:

a. Field Laser Hazards Course, conducted by the USA Health Services Command.
b. Seminar on Scientific and Technical Intelligence conducted by the Defense Intelligence College.
c. Soviet Military Power Week conducted by the USAF Soviet Awareness Division.

OTHER SIGNIFICANT TOPICS

AFIS/OL-ET-AFMIC is opening up new areas and opportunities in medical intelligence for the USAF. The possibilities are infinite. To reap such potential takes significant commitment, motivation, energy, and skill. The two officers at this operating location spend large amounts of time "outside the job" increasing proficiencies, becoming primed for insightful analyses.
OPERATING LOCATION AF
AIR FORCE INTELLIGENCE SERVICE
KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO

MISSION

- Primary Mission - To provide AFOTEC with intelligence personnel augmentation for dedicated all-source intelligence management and analytical support.

- Subordinate Functions
  
a. Service as liaison between AFOTEC and other intelligence organizations to ensure all-source intelligence support to the AFOTEC mission.
  
b. Assist in the review of threat assessments/scenarios for adequacy, completeness and applicability.
  
c. Assist in the review of Threat Environment Descriptions (TEDs) for currency and completeness.
  
d. Identify needs and recommend intelligence support for AFOTEC.
  
e. Assist AFOTEC in maintaining a collateral intelligence library by identifying appropriate intelligence publications.

ORGANIZATION

- As an AFIS operating location, OL-AF reports directly to, and receives direction from, AFIS/CC. However, in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Assistant Chief of Staff/Intelligence (ACS/I) and AFOTEC/CC, OL-AF also reports to, and receives direction from, HQ USAF/INYW (Electronic Combat Intelligence Group). This organizational affiliation with the Air Staff (through HQ/INYW) facilitates the accomplishment of our mission by enabling us to deal directly with the Scientific and Technological (S&T) Centers of all three branches of the services.¹

- Because of the small size of OL-AF, no organization chart has been provided. With the exception of the unique duties and responsibilities inherent to the OL chief, all personnel within OL-AF perform the same tasks and have the same responsibilities.

¹This segment on OL-AF was prepared by Capt Wolfgang R. Kuhn and reviewed by Lt Col Donald N. Walker, Chief, OL-AF. See Ltr and 1 Atch 1983 History AFIS OL-AF to AFIS/HQ, "1983 Annual History." 17 Feb 83, SD 571.

¹Memorandum of Agreement, ACS/I and AFOTEC/CC, "Intelligence Support to Operational Test and Evaluation," MG Marks, 23 Feb 83 and MG Phillips, 30 Mar 83, SD 572.
The FY83 budget for OL-AF was $18K. This entire amount was dedicated to travel, and $8.4K was spent during the year. No other AFIS funding is necessary as AFOTEC is responsible for all equipment and supplies in accordance with the ACS/1-AFOTEC/CC MOA.

The FY84 appropriation was also $10K. However, $15K had been requested because of an expanding AFOTEC mission and increased manning for OL-AF. These changes have resulted in a proportional increase in our travel requirements. A supplemental appropriation will be required.

Support from AFIS/AC (especially SSgt Shariene Kagan) in obtaining fund cites for travel orders has been outstanding and worthy of mention.

FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONS

OL-AF provided support to AFOTEC on the following significant OT&E efforts:

Joint Tactical Fusion Program (JTTF)

During 1983, the Joint Tactical Fusion Program (JTTF) resolved many of the critical issues as it neared its March 1984 Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E) in Europe. Of major importance was the fact that all participating organizations have received formal tasking to assist with the JTTF/Limited Operational Capability Europe (LOCE) evaluation. Several meetings were held with representatives from AFOTEC, European Command (EUCOM), United States Air Forces Europe (USAFE), AFOTEC, DET 1 (Kapaun AFB, Germany) and various Army organizations to solidify planning for a thorough test effort. Milestones for the year included:

18-20 Jan 83 - Test Plan Working Group (TPWG) held at EUCOM/EUCJ (Vaehingen, GE). JTTF-LOCE concept of operations and employment objectives were thoroughly discussed along with the need for a 'joint' test as directed by the under secretary of defense for research and engineering (USD&I).

7 Mar 83 - Decision not to publish separate Test Program Outline (TPO) for LOCE and the follow-on Enemy Situation Correlation Element (ENSC).  

Apr 83 - AFOTEC/CC message to USAF/IN/RDS/EOO and EUCOM urging action on the program as an AFOTEC-led Air Force only

For Monthly Activity Reports on AFIS/OL-AF to AFIS/INW, Jan-Jun, Aug-Dec, 83, see SD 573.
evaluation under the guidance of U.S. Commander-in-Chief, Europe (USCINCUC). NOTE: At this time the Dept of Army had not yet formally directed the Army's AFOTEC counterpart, HQ Operational Test & Evaluation Agency (OTEA), to support the European Test Effort.

2 May 83 - Department of Army directs OTEA and EUCOM support for LOCE.

16-19 May - JTPF/ENSCE functional requirements review discussed delivery dates of systems. Army will receive first system in Jun 86. Air Force will get one of the next five - hopefully, the second system.

9 Jun 83 - Meeting held at AFOTEC with all local players to discuss exactly whom test planning stood. Major points were: EUCOM had requested the use of the Tactical Simulator (TACSIM) for LOCE testing in Mar 84; next TPGW scheduled for Aug 83; AF initial ENSCE planned for 86.

11 Jul 83 - CL-AF review of the JTPF/ENSCE baseline functional capabilities description. No major points of conflict noted.

14-15 Jul 83 - JTPF/ENSCE Product Assurance and Test Working Group (PATWG) conference held. Clarified organizational responsibilities and assigned action items/Offices of Primary Responsibility (OPRs) to support development of a draft Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP) by mid-September 1983.

Oct 83 - JTPF test manager TDY to Europe to set-up for Spring 1984 test. EUCOM backing was much stronger than was evident during previous visits. APIS CL-AF participation during exercise will be from 12 Mar - 4 Apr in the Correlation Center (CORCEN) at Ramstein AFB, GE.

9 Nov 83 - CL-AF reviewed the updated version of the JTPF test plan. No major comments/recommendations.

1 Dec 83 - Lt Col Walker/Maj Puseman attended pre-execution briefing. One more trip to Europe planned by key AFOTEC staff to finalize test preparations prior to March test.

Final Comment: JTPF/LOCE test manager appears to have planning well organized from an AFOTEC perspective and has overcome slow responses for support from the European community. March 1984 test should greatly improve the chances for the follow-on ENSCE system to become an effective tool in supporting operational commander.

High Velocity and Anti-radiation Missile (HARM)

CL-AF support to this joint service program consisted of several sub-projects: 1) First, we were tasked to provide
surface-to-air missile (SAM) operator tactics and operating procedures during anti-radiation missile (ARM) attack. Support for this undertaking was provided by AFIN/OL-N. This is a continuing task with analysis to continue in CTB4. 2) The second task in support of HARM testing was to provide infrared (IR) signatures for ground based systems which could be potential targets for HARM targeting. This was satisfied by contacting the U.S. Army’s Missile Intelligence Agency (MIA) to obtain the IR signatures data base. OL-AF actions under these taskings were very typical of OL-AF routine activities, as our support consisted primarily of interacting with other intelligence agencies as opposed to actually performing analysis or extracting information from finished intelligence products.

**Precision Location Strike System (PLSS)**

Threat support to PLSS test planning continued from 1982. The specific tasks were initiated at the request of AFOTEC/XF/TE to fill gaps in existing threat data. The first action involved obtaining more indepth information on the broadband jamming threat to PLSS communication links. Satisfaction of this task involved extensive interaction between OL-AF, HQ USAF/INEX, and DIA. DIA was able to provide the required information in a manner timely enough to satisfy OT&E requirements. The second task OL-AF received in support of PLSS test planning in 1983 was to attempt to obtain Command (USAFE, PACAF, TAC) Standing Electronic Intelligence (ELINT) Requirements. The AFOTEC DDR requested information on the various commands’ requirements for collecting ELINT data, including the timeliness and accuracy necessary, and the reporting criteria, so that a comparison could be made between existing collectors and PLSS. This task was satisfied by once again interacting with DIA. The final task levied on OL-AF by the AFOTEC PLSS DDR involved requests for additional information on land-based, airborne, and shipborne jammers which could have an impact on PLSS data links. Existing data was not substantial enough to enable testers to simulate the threat environment. Satisfaction of this task involved extensive interaction between OL-AF and FTD, and was finally completed after FTD provided us with a 61-page summary of required information.

**Space Systems**

There were a great variety of space systems undergoing OT&E test planning in 1983, involving: satellites, remote sensors, ground facilities, and control centers. OL-AF support to this test planning involved many separate activities, including interaction with other intelligence agencies and some analysis. Additionally, OL-AF points of contact were used to bring AFOTEC (primarily NPQ) into the space intelligence planning process. AFOTEC became actively involved in the coordination of several space intelligence plans and became a participant in HQ USAF/INY’s Project Delphi, an intelligence-operations interface study.
Air Force Regulation 200-13
(Threat Support to the Acquisition Process)

The lack of a regulation addressing intelligence support to the acquisition process was cited in the OL-AP CY82 history as a problem area affecting our ability to effectively support AFOTEC. Because of the AFOTEC/KPO and OL-AP efforts, along with support from HQ USAF/INW/INEG, we were able to come up with a draft regulation which satisfied our requirements and was within AFSC's intelligence capabilities. While the regulation has not yet been published, we anticipate improvements in intelligence support to the acquisition community.

Self-Improvement Survey

Another problem area highlighted in the CY82 OL-AP history was the relative unawareness of the AFOTEC staff of the existence and mission of OL-AP. Through a self-improvement survey initiated by OL-AP and circulated throughout the AFOTEC staff, and articles in the AFOTEC Newsletter, we were able to streamline the requests/tasking cycle and clarify many of the previous misunderstandings among the parties concerned.

Specific Problem Areas. The requirement to track the status of Threat Assessments Reports (TARs) and Threat Environment Descriptions (TEDs) and provide this information to AFOTEC has not yet been satisfactorily resolved. While OL-AP involvement in AFSC's Director of Intelligence conference and frequent coordination with HQ USAF/INEG have helped somewhat, a problem still exists in AFOTEC being made aware of TAR/TED status, and more significantly, being automatically included on distribution. OL-AP will continue to initiate efforts in CY84 to improve this deficiency; however, higher echelon support may be necessary to resolve the problem completely.

PERSONNEL AND MANPOWER

Three officers are authorized/assigned to APIS/OL-AP:¹

a. Lt Col Donald N. Walker (8096), Chief, APIS OL-AP. Assigned March 1981 to present.


c. Capt Wolfgang R. Kuhn (8075), Intelligence Applications Officer. Assigned August 1983 to present.

¹Unit Personnel Management Roster, APIS/OL-AP, 9 Feb 84, SD 574.
the billet remaining unmanned for ten months. This was primarily
due to the uniqueness of the position requiring an officer not only
experienced in intelligence, but also familiar with staff work and
acquisition process. The current 80XX overabundance of inexperi-
enced lieutenants added to this problem.

FACILITIES AND LOGISTICS

All APIS/QL-AP facilities and supplies are provided by
AFOTEC in accordance with the APOTEC-APIS MOA.

INSPECTIONS

No IG inspections of QL-AP were conducted in 1983. Two
semi-annual self-inspections were conducted in accordance with
AFISR 123-1, and results were filed locally and forwarded to
APIS/IG.

TRAINING

All local training is provided by AFOTEC on an "as
required basis." All three QL-AP officers received training in
1983 on the operation of AFOTEC desk computers.

Lt. Col. Walker and Maj. Puseman attended the SAC
Ballistic Missile Staff Officer Course at Vandenberg AFB, CA.
Capt. Kuhn was involved in the 80XX Utilization and Training
Conferences, and participated in the Electronic Combat
Intelligence Officer curriculum development conference.
MISSION

Primary Mission - AFIS/OL-F continues to provide all-source Intelligence EW/C^3M support to the Tactical Air Warfare Center (TAWC) commander. The OL serves as an analytical adjunct to the director of intelligence, TAWC, pending the realization of an internal TAC/TAWC capability. The OL assists the TAWC staff in the analysis and use of all-source threat data which impact the TAWC mission. When directed by HQ USAF/INW, the OL provides other intelligence support as required.

Subordinate Functions:

- Provide scientific and technical intelligence of foreign weapons systems: command, control, communications, and intelligence (C^3I); C^3 countermeasures (C^3CM) and their employment by foreign armed services.
- Coordinate with USAFTAWC/IN to provide the center with special access program administration.
- Document EW integrated reprogramming system support procedures.
- Manage the initiation, processing, and satisfaction of operational and technical intelligence center analysts.
- Manage all EW-related analyst-to-analyst exchanges between USAFTAWC EW systems analysts and national scientific/technical intelligence center analysts.
- Identify and document requirements for decompartmentation of intelligence data.
- Receive, process, and analyze all-source intelligence, including ELINT data, to confirm EW threat and parametric changes.
- Recommend intelligence ADP/communications support requirement.
- Maintain intelligence quick reaction capability for support of EW contingencies and exercises.
- Provide direct technical intelligence support to OT&E/FOST involving foreign material exploitation.
- Provide training support to TAF aircrews and intelligence officers.

ORGANIZATION

Organizationally, AFIS OL-F works directly for the Air Staff (AF/INW) in support of USAFTAWC requirements.

*This segment on OL-F was prepared by MSgt Patrick F. Kanary with the assistance of the entire OL-F staff. It was reviewed by Lt. Col. Thomas J. Smith, Chief, AFIS/OL-F. See Ltr and 2 Atch, AFIS OL-F History (1963) and Supporting Docs List APIS/OL-F to AFIS/EO, 17 Feb 84, SD 575.
OPERATIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Electronic Warfare Integrated Reprogramming (EWIR) Data Base

Computer Aided Electronic Warfare Information System (CAEWIS)

CAEWIS Installation at Warner Robins Air Logistics Center (WR-ALC). AFIS OL-F assisted the USAF/TAWC Office of Data Automation to install CAEWIS at WR-ALC in May 1983. AFIS OL-F's involvement included pre-installation coordination with USAF/INYW and AFIS/IND, and system checkout at WR-ALC.

AFIS OL-F served as the user coordinator for contract development of enhanced CAEWIS software. The requirement was developed by OL-F in 1982. The enhancements included query improvements and graphic capabilities along with overall "user friendliness" improvements. Numerous visits were made to Rome Air Development Center and the contractor's facility to insure requirements were met. The enhancements were installed by the contractor and checked out by AFIS OL-F in December 1983.

AFIS OL-F completed development of a tailored EWIR file called the F-15 Threat List for the F-15 Tactical Electronic Warfare System (TEWS). This file includes EWIR data tailored to the F-15 TEWS along with F-15 TEWS system specific data. The F-15 TL provides a small subset of the EWIR data enabling the system
engineers to more readily identify threat anomalies and implement reprogramming action. The F-15TL has gained wide acceptance by other users and development of other tailored system files is planned for 1984.

Intelligence Computer Terminals.

USAF TAWC received one of two color graphics terminals in 1981. TAWC is installing a Chromatics 7900 in the old TAWC vault to support COMPASS CALL jamming strategy development. The COMPASS CALL vault is being Tempest shielded. Meanwhile AFIS OL-F helped TAWC/AD write sole-source justification for a second Chromatics 7900 to assist in program development to support CAEWIS FOC/ARC intelligence support. The other unit is to be placed in the computer room of TAWC's new CAEWIS vault for program development. Pending ARC developments, TAWC would then ask to Tempest shield part or all of the new vault's analyst room. This will eliminate the need for individual Tempest control for the basic unit and for peripheral units as well. As of year's end, AFIS/IND agreed to provide at least $25K to help provide GSA shielding for the CAEWIS Chromatics and necessary peripherals in the CAEWIS vault.

Electronic Warfare (EW) Intelligence Requirements
Blue/Gray Requirements. OL-F represented TAWC at DIA's Blue/Gray Requirements meeting which grew out of the April '83 General Officers Blue/Gray Steering Group Meeting. The Blue/Gray action officer sessions were called to outline the best approach to develop or consolidate existing DOD holdings into a worldwide electronic data baseline encompassing communist and non-communist communications emitters. The first meeting (June '83) focused on developing and consolidating requirements for non-communist bloc (Blue/Gray) non-communications emitters (ELINT). The group made a preliminary cut at reviewing and prioritizing service inputs. Suggested baseline was Blue/Gray Task 15 document written by SRC for NSA. (NOTE: TAWC/OL-F methodology using the emitter versus EW system matrix approach for Red/Blue/Gray emitters formed the basis for the Task 15 study and was the prime driver in the DIA effort.) The main issues included how to get requirements formally on the books and validated by DIA, how to arrive at Blue/Gray definitions acceptable to all, and who should collect, process, and analyze Blue/Gray data. At the 6 July meeting, OL-F and AF/INW helped DIA develop the concept of intel support to EW and C3CM presented at 12 July General Officers' meeting (for details, ref DIA/DCT's msg dtg 271622Z JUL 83 (S). Subj: Minutes of Blue/Gray General Officer Steering Group (U)). The Phase I concept proposed the baseline and format (EWIR/KILLING); the execution production agents (AF/EOC for U.S., S6TI centers for foreign, NSA for B/G ELINT); data dissemination (FTD/NSA); coordination on US capabilities (JEWG); and overall coordination (DIA). The generals agreed with Phase I in principle, but wanted to study the proposal vis-a-vis ongoing service initiatives and resources. Primary requirement affecting TAWC was to assist DIA in reprioritizing hundreds of Blue/Gray emitters (made up from AF IPR and SRC study). As a result, OL-F provided DIA and AF/INW with an updated prioritization of TAWC's Blue/Gray requirements. The list included 267 signals divided into three priority categories, plus an additional 182 emitters which were not categorized because too little was known about them. The lists were part of the overall Red/Blue/Gray emitter requirements update prepared by OL-F for the EWIR Intelligence Production Requirement (IPR) and AFEWC Blue/Gray taskings. The lists and accompanying threat emitter-vs-EW systems matrices were passed to HQ TAC and distributed throughout the intelligence community in November and December 1983.

Area Reprogramming Capability (ARC). AFIS OL-F worked with potential ARC users and developers during 1983 to insure comprehensive intelligence support to ARC. AFIS OL-F was instrumental in persuading ARC users/developers to include the C3EWIS Final Operational Capability (FOC) system specification in the ARC Threat Data Processing (TDP) function. This will provide ARC with the essential intelligence front-end. OL-F worked closely with Aeronautical Systems Division (ASD) to insure modular design and transportability were emphasized so that non-ARC users could obtain the EWIR Data Base manipulation capability in TDP. In addition, AFIS OL-F wrote the TAC intelligence support appendix for the ARC Preliminary System Operational Concept (PSOC). The
TAC intelligence PSOC will also serve as a baseline for theatre intelligence PSOC's.
Command, Control and Communications. Geographic Analytical Target Exploitation System (C³GATES). C³GATES is being developed to provide an automated method of retrieving, manipulating, and displaying intelligence and geographic data in support of the Compass Call jamming strategies. TRW has been awarded the contract for developing the software for use in the Chromatics 7900 system to perform the strategies.

A kickoff meeting was held at TAWC during the first week of July to discuss methodologies in developing a jamming strategy. Between 31 Jul 83 thru 6 Aug 83 a conference was held at ESC. Specific data elements were identified within ECS's COMFY SHIRE data base required to perform jamming strategies.

On 7-8 Oct 83 the preliminary design review (PDR) was conducted at the TRW facility in Huntsville, Alabama. The final acceptance test was scheduled for the first week of Jun 84.

The critical design review (CDR) was held 6-8 Dec 83 at the TRW facility. TAC, USAFE, and PACAF were represented at the CDR and were requested to provide inputs to C³GATES. It was agreed that no changes would be made in current contract with TRW; however, a Phase II software development package would be submitted under an engineering change proposal (ECP) and recommendations from theaters would be included.

Green Flag
Electronic Combat Training Courses

Tactical Fighter Electronic Combat Instructor Course (TFECIC). AFIS OL-F continued to support the TFECIC in 1983; four classes were graduated with a total of 103 students. These instructor duties are severely conflicting with the analyst ability to support other TAWC/AFIS OL-F functions/tasks. TAWC/EWA was notified of our concern that 7 classes a year (this includes other IAF sponsored courses) are too much for one individual to handle since this instructor duty is in addition to an already high work load at this center. Any further tasking will require reassignment of other support TAWC/EW IOT&E/FME projects. Throughout the year AFIS OL-F received many requests for training slots from organizations such as PTD who are not involved in training fighter air crews. OL-F recommended that those individuals be contacted on a person-to-person basis or have them come to TAWC for a familiarization tour of TAWC/EW/BWR/CAEMIS.

1984 Training Schedule for Electronic Combat Courses

**TAC Fighter EC Instructor Course (pilots only)**

- **Class 84-02 (A-10)** 23 Jan - 10 Feb 84
- **84-03 (F-15)** 7 May - 25 May 84
- **84-04 (F-4/111)** 20 Aug - 7 Sep 84

**Wing Commanders EC Conf (D-6/Cdrs only)**

- **A)** 21 Feb - 24 Feb 84
- **B)** 28 Feb - 2 Mar 84

**Wing Electronic Combat Managers Course (Wing EC Staff/IG)**

- **Class 84-01** 13 Feb - 17 Feb 84
- **84-02** 25 Jun - 29 Jun 84
- **84-03** 6 Aug - 10 Aug 84
Electronic Combat Intel Orientation CRS (Intel)

Class 85-01
85-02
28 Nov - 2 Dec (Ongoing)
(Fall 84 TBD)

Electronic Combat Seminar

Class 84-01
84-02
5 Dec - 9 Dec (Ongoing)
(Fall 84 TBD)

ECIO Training Program

ATC, Randolph convened a course planning conference 15-17 Aug 83 to prepare a course outline for EC-Intel. By the end of the meeting all reference to "Intelligence" (i.e., 80xx) was deleted and the 6-plus week Electronic Combat Support Officer (EC2O) Course was on its way (in 1986) to Goodfellow AFB, TX.

Despite numerous recommendations to orient the course toward existing functional intelligence support needs, the MAJCOM(s) representatives (PACAF, USAFE, TAC, MAC, SAC) chose to dilute operational intel (EWIR, reprogramming, ALR/ALQ specific, etc) offering, instead, EWO level electronics and theory.

At one point, ATC (representatives) claimed that ATC could not teach a systems specific curriculum-only generalized topics—and that each MAJCOM must develop its own specialized training to supplement the basic EC2O.

ATC intends to solicit the MAJCOM's for instructional support to shorten the FY86/87 delay for course start. This request in addition to the added MAJCOM specific training requirement raise serious doubt that ATC is helping AF/IN at all.

Given the sudden but predictable "Operational EWO" emphasis it may be time to integrate the EC2O into SOS and fund MAJCOM level-systems specific EC Intel as soon as possible.

As a result of the Aug 83 conference, ATC/Goodfellow has been formally tasked to develop the EC "Support (previously Intel) Officers" Training Course. Mr. Miller, ATC EW training coordinator, requested a meeting with AFIS OL-F personnel and TAWC/EWAT personnel to discuss the TFECIC/WE/CIC, etc., and arrange tech support to Goodfellow course developers.

Mr. Miller was amazed that the TFECIC/WE/CIC, etc., were so technically oriented. Apparently very few ATC folks have current operational EC/EW exposure.

Mr. Turner, EC2O course developer, will spend several weeks (tentatively) at Eglin beginning late Jan 84 to attend both TFECIC and EC2O. Mr. Miller has asked that AFIS OL-F personnel be
available to visit and brief ATC/Goodfellow instructors early next quarter to expedite the ECTC curriculum development.

Wing Commanders EC Training Support

TAC/CC in tasking to TAWC began another EC training program, this time for TAF wing commanders. The one week "immersion" course included both threat (current) and aspects of intelligence support to TAF/EC requirement. TAWC/IN has all actions at present. The first class was tentatively planned for late Jan 84 and expected to be given twice annually.

Wing Electronic Managers Course

The first session of the WEMC commenced 26 Sep 83 at TAWC/EWA facilities at AGOS, Hurlburt Field. The 5-day managers course intended to familiarize wing EC officers with EC unique logistics, managerial, and support requirements. Twenty-three officers attended the WEMC including staff observers from 12 AF, 9 AF, and EWO training element (ATC) at Mathe. AFIS OL-P personnel presented a briefing addressing the EWIR DB/ARC concepts and fielded questions from the class; they provided assistance to various representatives encountering problems using EWIR, etc. This marked the first time "EWIR-ARC" information had been briefed to wing/squadron EC officers attending the TAWC/EW EC training programs. Generally the information was well received. Depending on the end of course critiques some version of the "EWIR DB/ARC" briefing may be added to the ECTC and TPECIC syllabus.

ECCM Awareness

Electronic Warfare Training—DIA/CIA
EC TED Technical Support

Mr. Moix, FTD/TQIV ECTED coordinator, visited AGOS, Hurlburt Field, to discuss our use of the ECTED and determine improvement areas for future additions. After several hours, Mr. Moix agreed to review certain editing procedures at FTD which at present delete ELINT notations and certain EC technical parameters. It appeared that FTD lacked current operational knowledge of TAF EC-noting that he was "shocked" at the technical level observed at the TECIC course - much more engineering than he expected. We agreed to exchange more information - perhaps a briefing at FTD/TQI at some later date to improve the ECTED development.

FO USAF/RD Special Project Support

AFIS OL-F sent a representative to act as tech intel advisor. A 6-12 month support requirement was estimated. There was no unclas-non-SAR code name for this project. All communication was restricted to uniquely eyes only - special orcon.
Conference discussion at AF/INE, Bolling AFB, DC, 25-26 Oct 83, with representatives of TAC/ASD centered on program status, threat definition, data base requirements and "direction." TAC/IN was newly briefed and tried to catch up. They chaired a program "threat working group" to prepare the baseline threat definitions.

Data base issues such as EWIRDB compatibilities, USAF/PACAF technical intel support/system interface - computer interface, etc., have yet to be defined. TAC/IN is not presently prepared to deal with these issues.

TAWC/EWA internal review surfaced problem areas involving contractor/ASD/test facilities/money/OT&E/etc., which must be resolved ASAP. TAWC/EWA intended to host a meeting of all key elements at Eglin o/a Dec 83. Despite TAC/DOOF assurances things are not so well with this program and may be getting worse.

A meeting among intel organizations was planned 8-9 Dec 83 at Bolling AFB. It was unclear who was to convene the meeting, presumably TAC/IN.

As a result of their last general officer review of the project, TAWC/EWS tasked by TAWC/CT to expand TAWC involvement to the extent that future programs/interfaces/data bases and testing be reviewed and shortfalls identified to the SPO. A 40 element manpower package was approved at TAWC to support the program.

The second threat working group met at AF/INE Bolling AFB, VA, 9 Dec 83. The meeting was jointly chaired by TAC/IN and Systems SPO, ASD. The meeting was intended to further delineate support responsibilities within the intel community. Due to insufficient time and complexities of subjects, very little was
accomplished. Further gatherings should be limited to no more than 10 (preferable 5-6) action officers. A recommendation was made that TAC/IN host future meetings at TAC. A test plan meeting will be held at TAWC o/a 11-12 Jan 84 among contractor and test personnel in an attempt to identify proven capabilities/limitations thus far in the program. The contractor "written" RFSS test report will be discussed.

TAF TD&E Program Support

TAWC/EW submitted a program implementation description (PID) for a full-scale tactics/doctrine test and evaluation (TD&E) to AFSC/INJ. The entire request was refused. TAWC/EWA requested assistance to resolve the problems. OL-F arranged a meeting among the test planners and range personnel 3 Aug 83. TAWC/EWA prepared a position paper for the TAC staff defining the options available at several test facilities including AFSC/INJ.

Foreign Material Exploitation S&T Requirements

Special Activities Security Meeting

A special activities security meeting was hosted by AFSC/INJ to discuss operating and security aspects of special access programs administered by OL-F. An OL-F representative attended the meeting on behalf of both AFIS OL-F and USAFTAWC/IN. A new security guide was explained. Copies were distributed soon after. Upon briefing USAFTAWC/IN, it was felt a briefing should be presented to all cleared personnel in the center on new procedures. Upon receipt of official security guide, the briefing was accomplished.
F-15 Electronic Warfare Support
AFEWC/SAVF and the ASD F-15/APG-63 Program Office announced a meeting at AFEWC/SAVR 9 Aug 83 to discuss the "threat philosophies" relevant to the APG-63. AFEWC/SAVR was the group who refused to accept TAEC offers of assistance in reviewing a draft of the F-15 ECCM vulnerability assessment several months ago to the extent of ignoring a four-page review/comments. The AFEWC report was published with only two words changed.

Soviet Communication Usage
XM-06 Flight Testing

OCL-F personnel were trained on MAXI to review message traffic, work files and build briefings. Once individual requirements were established, profiles were built to eliminate review of unnecessary traffic and provide more tailored assistance.

A MAXI user group conference was held in Washington 22-25 Mar 81. USAFATWPC presented a 30-minute briefing. A member of APIS OCL-F was appointed USAFATWPC and APIS OCL-F representative and presented a system overview briefing on behalf of TAWC.

CANUKUS Air Intel Conference

CANUKUS Conference was far less than expected. The delegates were provided adequate but far below standard conference support including administrative support. The lack of facilities despite DIA's best efforts continually distracted from the conference.
Support For Visiting Swiss Air Force Chief of Staff

Thanks to quick action and superb support from Maj Phillips, USAF/INW, on 20 Sep 83, OL-F was able to provide TAWC Commander, Maj Gen Swalm, with background data in anticipation of questions from visiting Swiss Air Force Chief of Staff, Lt Gen Mook. Gen Mook received extensive EW related briefings and tours while visiting.

-RESOURCES

The number of authorized/assigned personnel in OL-F by AFSC were the following: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>ASSIGNED</th>
<th>AFSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C2275Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C8075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Civilian</td>
<td>0 (Vacant)</td>
<td>8075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Civilian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Enlisted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Enlisted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Enlisted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Civilian (Temp)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are USAFA/TAWC personnel assigned to APIS OL-F:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>ASSIGNED</th>
<th>AFSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Civilian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Enlisted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1For key personnel, see Roster of Key Personnel APIS OL-F, 31 Dec 83, SD 576.
Budget and Funds

The Authorized AFIS OL-F FY83 budget was $124,500 to support civilian pay, travel and supplies and equipment. As of 30 Sep 83, APIS OL-F had $10,311 remaining.

Facilities and Equipment

APIS OL-F receives office space and administrative/security support from USAPTWMC. All other supplies and furnishings support is provided by the Armament R&D Organization (host organization).
APPENDIX I

LINEAGE AND HONORS DATA

UNIT DESIGNATION: Air Force Intelligence Service (AFIS)

PREVIOUS DESIGNATION: Same

HIGHER HEADQUARTERS: Headquarters United States Air Force

COMMANDER: Brigadier General Paul H. Martin, 15 Feb 83 - Present

VICE COMMANDER: Colonel William B. Sherman, 1 Nov 82 - Present

ASSIGNED UNITS: Air Force Special Activities Center (AFSAC)
Operating Location - AF, Kirtland AFB, New Mexico
Operating Location - F, Eglin AFB, Florida
Operating Location - N, Kelly AFB, Texas
Operating Location - M, Alexandria, Virginia
Operating Location - ET, Fort Detrick, Maryland
Operating Location - S, Suitland, Maryland

ASSIGNED UNITS GAINED OR LOST:
Operating Location - ET, Fort Detrick, Maryland
Operating Location - S, Suitland, Maryland

UNITS ATTACHED: None

ATTACHED UNITS GAINED OR LOST: None

STATION: Fort Belvoir, Virginia

AIRCRAFT FLOWN: None

AWARDS AND DECORATIONS: Air Force Organizational Excellence Award for period: 1 Feb 80 - 31 Jan 82 (Auth: 80, Hq USAF, GB-455, 14 Jul 82)

EMBLEM: Same
APPENDIX II
STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONAL NEED (SONs)
ON WHICH AFIS COMMENTS WERE PROVIDED TO ORIGINATORS DURING 1983

1. AAC 02-83, Ground Launched Missile System for Alaska. Ref AFIS/XP ltr. 5 Oct 83.
2. AFCC 06-82, Automatic Flight Inspection System. Ref AFIS/XP ltr. 10 Jan 83.
3. ATC 01-83, General Intelligence Training Integration (SENTINEL ASPEN). Ref AFIS/XP ltr. 16 Feb 83.
5. ESC 06-83, Jam-Resistant, Secure Communications. Ref AFIS/XP ltr. 15 Aug 83.
6. SAC 18-82, Strategic Aircraft Conventional Standoff Capability (CSC). Ref AFIS/XP ltr. 11 Apr 83.
7. SAC 01-83, Advanced Single RV ICBM. Ref AFIS/XP ltr. 15 Jun 83.

17. TAF 313-82, Special Operations Advanced Vertical Lift Aircraft-JVX. Ref AFIS/XP ltr, 3 Mar 83.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL NO.</th>
<th>SERIAL NO.</th>
<th>FUNCTIONAL MANAGER</th>
<th>EQUIPMENT LOCATION</th>
<th>INSTALLATION DATE</th>
<th>EQUIPMENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B601 IPS</td>
<td>968-116230</td>
<td>Charles Steeno, SSGt AFIS/AC, 664-6251</td>
<td>AFIS/AC, Bldg 1930 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>2 Dec 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B601 IPS</td>
<td>1996-020245</td>
<td>Deborah Groves, TSgt AFIS/OM, 664-3103</td>
<td>AFIS/OM, Bldg 1925 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>Nov 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B601 IPS</td>
<td>968017226</td>
<td>Karl Owens, Jr. GS-11 AFIS/OM, 664-4100</td>
<td>AFIS/OM, Bldg 1925 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>Jun 78</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B601 IPS</td>
<td>159-911-703</td>
<td>Winston Murphy, SSGt AFIS/NO, 664-6271</td>
<td>AFIS/NO, Bldg 1930 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>23 Jul 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B601 IPS</td>
<td>968-010-261</td>
<td>Dennis Haycraft, SSGt AFIS/REA, 664-4764</td>
<td>AFIS/REA, Bldg 1929 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>15 Oct 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B601 IPS</td>
<td>968-015-962</td>
<td>C. Bourassa, GS-12 AFIS/XP, 664-1281</td>
<td>AFIS/XP, Bldg 1930 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>15 Oct 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B601 IPS</td>
<td>968-116-270</td>
<td>C. Bourassa, GS-12 AFIS/XP, 664-1281</td>
<td>AFIS/XP, Bldg 1930 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>28 Jul 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71202Y</td>
<td>618G</td>
<td>James Gurbin, TSgt AFIS/10D, 767-4395</td>
<td>AFIS/10D, Bldg 5681 Boeing AFB</td>
<td>Nov 80</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71202Y</td>
<td>508S</td>
<td>James Gurbin, TSgt AFIS/10D, 767-4395</td>
<td>AFIS/10D, Bldg 5681 Boeing AFB</td>
<td>Nov 80</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71202Y</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>James Gurbin, TSgt AFIS/10D, 767-4395</td>
<td>AFIS/10D, Bldg 5681 Boeing AFB</td>
<td>Nov 80</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71303</td>
<td>ESN-15139</td>
<td>Jackie Marlin, SSGt AFIS/INDA, 767-4695</td>
<td>AFIS/INDA Boeing AFB</td>
<td>Sep 82</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71303</td>
<td>ESMT-17060</td>
<td>Larry Stasikowski, TSgt INO/WYN, 863-3103</td>
<td>INO/WYN Washington Navy Yard (NOA)</td>
<td>Feb 82</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71202</td>
<td>5043</td>
<td>Roland Sorensen, TSgt AFIS/INDA, 897-5960</td>
<td>AFIS/INDA Boeing AFB, Provider</td>
<td>Oct 80</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL NO.</td>
<td>SERIAL NO.</td>
<td>FUNCTIONAL MANAGER</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT LOCATION</td>
<td>INSTALLATION DATE</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>6182</td>
<td>Steve Parker, SSgt</td>
<td>AFIS/INDO, 818g B20</td>
<td>Jul 83</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>1-14717</td>
<td>Steve Parker, SSgt</td>
<td>AFIS/INDO, 818g B20</td>
<td>Jul 83</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>Robert Santona, MSgt</td>
<td>AFIS/INL, 87-5640</td>
<td>Oct 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>24102</td>
<td>Robert Santona, MSgt</td>
<td>AFIS/INL, 87-5640</td>
<td>Oct 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3028</td>
<td>T-17746</td>
<td>Samuel Taylor, Maj</td>
<td>HQ AFIS.INL. 767-4220</td>
<td>Jul 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>T-9195</td>
<td>Samuel Taylor, Maj</td>
<td>HQ AFIS/INL. 767-4220</td>
<td>Jul 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>T-12666</td>
<td>Samuel Taylor, Maj</td>
<td>HQ AFIS/INL. 767-4220</td>
<td>Jul 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>9443</td>
<td>John Degen, SMSgt</td>
<td>AFIS/INL. 695-7455</td>
<td>Nov 81</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>19007</td>
<td>Booker Stull, MSgt</td>
<td>AFIS/INL. 695-2683</td>
<td>Feb 82</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>8993</td>
<td>Booker Stull, MSgt</td>
<td>AFIS/INL. 695-2683</td>
<td>Nov 81</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>VFL30677</td>
<td>James Porter, CMSgt</td>
<td>MSA FANX 111. Rm B211/2 FL Meade, MD 20755</td>
<td>26 Jan 82</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>VF14894</td>
<td>James Porter, CMSgt</td>
<td>MSA FANX 111. Rm B211/2 FL Meade, MD 20755</td>
<td>29 Apr 82</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFL3037</td>
<td>TP40329</td>
<td>James Porter, CMSgt</td>
<td>MSA FANX 111. Rm B211/2 FL Meade, MD 20755</td>
<td>29 Apr 82</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL NO.</td>
<td>SERIAL NO.</td>
<td>FUNCTIONAL MANAGER</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT LOCATION</td>
<td>INSTALLATION DATE</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002CL</td>
<td>2021-86468</td>
<td>Michael Mosley, MSGT</td>
<td>AFIS/INCF, 767-4416</td>
<td>13 May 82</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002CL</td>
<td>210876</td>
<td>Michael Mosley, MSGT</td>
<td>AFIS/INCF, 767-4416</td>
<td>13 May 82</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002CL</td>
<td>SPR-002205</td>
<td>Michael Mosley, MSGT</td>
<td>AFIS/INCF, 767-4418</td>
<td>13 Oct 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002CL</td>
<td>SPR-002224</td>
<td>Michael Mosley, MSGT</td>
<td>AFIS/INCF, 767-4418</td>
<td>13 Oct 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2002</td>
<td>SPK-008373</td>
<td>Stephen Broyles, MAJ</td>
<td>AFIS/DP, Bldg 1926</td>
<td>May 83</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2002</td>
<td>SPK-008330</td>
<td>Stephen Broyles, MAJ</td>
<td>AFIS/DP, Bldg 1925</td>
<td>May 81</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2002</td>
<td>SPK-994105</td>
<td>Stephen Broyles, MAJ</td>
<td>AFIS/DP, Bldg 1926</td>
<td>May 83</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2002</td>
<td>SPK-004904</td>
<td>Stephen Broyles, MAJ</td>
<td>AFIS/DP, Bldg 1926</td>
<td>May 83</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5479</td>
<td>Linda Mulhern, TSgt</td>
<td>AFIS/INHP, 864-4036</td>
<td>19 Jul 83</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>B100</td>
<td>Clayton Davis, MSGT</td>
<td>AFIS/OCN, 945-2645</td>
<td>30 Jun 80</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>R100</td>
<td>Clayton Davis, MSGT</td>
<td>AFIS/OCN, 945-2645</td>
<td>17 Nov 81</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>8000F</td>
<td>Dwight McCormick, TSgt</td>
<td>AFIS/OCN, 8915-5704</td>
<td>18 Jun 81</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: A request is currently pending with AFNRC to interface with the ARDS.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE No.</th>
<th>SERIAL NO.</th>
<th>FUNCTIONAL MANAGER</th>
<th>EQUIPMENT LOCATION</th>
<th>INSTALLATION DATE</th>
<th>EQUIPMENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8601 IPS</td>
<td>988-025-466</td>
<td>Wendell Newson, SMgt</td>
<td>AFSC/INDO, Bloq 1227</td>
<td>24 Mar 82</td>
<td>Dunned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8601 IPS</td>
<td>2503-017264</td>
<td>Robert Newell, TSgt</td>
<td>AFSC/INDO, Bloq 1224</td>
<td>22 Mar 82</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8601 IPS</td>
<td>268-01-7202</td>
<td>John Hesslman, MSgt</td>
<td>DSC 21 (DOS), Bloq 1428</td>
<td>Feb 81</td>
<td>Dunned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>509202546</td>
<td>James Schindel, MSgt</td>
<td>DET 22 AFSC,</td>
<td>Feb 83</td>
<td>Dunned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AV187-22D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81001</td>
<td>10137</td>
<td>John Restford, Lt Col</td>
<td>HQ PSAA/CC, 449-8242</td>
<td>13 Dec 82</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hickman AFB, UT</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: 36 month lease to purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81001</td>
<td>19177</td>
<td>Richard McCann, TSgt</td>
<td>Det 31/INSS</td>
<td>25 Jan 83</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yokota AFB, Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81001</td>
<td>25077</td>
<td>Richard McCann, TSgt</td>
<td>Det 31/INSS</td>
<td>26 Oct 83</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yokota AFB, Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81001</td>
<td>15441</td>
<td>Edward Smole, SMgt</td>
<td>Youngsan Army Garrison Post</td>
<td>Jan 83</td>
<td>Rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seoul, Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX IV
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL NO.</th>
<th>SERIAL NO.</th>
<th>FUNCTIONAL MANAGER</th>
<th>EQUIPMENT LOCATION</th>
<th>INSTALLATION DATE</th>
<th>EQUIPMENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2700 Magna I</td>
<td>336010</td>
<td>Charles Porter, TSgt AFIS/CCF, 664-4077</td>
<td>AFIS/CCF, Bldg 1926 Ft Belvoir</td>
<td>26 Oct 85</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD45 Magna II</td>
<td>028209</td>
<td>Nicholas Fresher, MSgt AFIS/CY, 664-5641</td>
<td>AFIS/CY, Bldg 1920 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>9 May 83</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2750 Magna II</td>
<td>902230</td>
<td>Stephen Brayles, Maj AFIS/DP, 664-1676</td>
<td>AFIS/DP, Bldg 1976 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>Apr 82</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700 Magna I</td>
<td>733038</td>
<td>Booker Stull, MSgt AFIS/INSC, 696-2883</td>
<td>AFIS/INSC, BD 951 Pentagon</td>
<td>Dec 77</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700 Magna I</td>
<td>716022</td>
<td>Clinton Walker, SMSGt AFIS/INSB, 695-7455</td>
<td>AFIS/INSB, BD 951 Pentagon</td>
<td>Dec 77</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2750 Magna II</td>
<td>905204</td>
<td>Clinton Walker, SMSGt AFIS/INSB, 695-7455</td>
<td>AFIS/INSB, BD 951 Pentagon</td>
<td>Dec 77</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISC IBM Selectric Card II</td>
<td>14-0529935</td>
<td>Richard Shear, CMSgt AFIS/INU, 664-4755</td>
<td>AFIS/INU, Bldg 1925 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exxon, Level 4</td>
<td>04-090961</td>
<td>Stephen Brayles, Maj AFIS/DP, 664-1676</td>
<td>AFIS/DP, Bldg 1976 Fort Belvoir</td>
<td>Dec 85</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTORATE</td>
<td># OF KEYBOARDS AUTHORIZED</td>
<td>KEYBOARDS ON HAND</td>
<td>OWNED</td>
<td>RENTED</td>
<td>DATE OF FEASIBILITY STUDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sep 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*IG, LG, &amp; XP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mar 83 (Rental in process for purchase.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Oct 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*INH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feb 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None (Rental in process for purchase.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Oct 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Old AFR 4-2 Study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
<th># OF KEYBOARDS AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>KEYBOARDS ON HAND</th>
<th>OWNED</th>
<th>RENTED</th>
<th>DATE OF FEASIBILITY STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INQ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nov 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Oct 83 (3 of 6 will be turned in.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INOI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTORATE</th>
<th># OF KEYBOARDS AUTHORIZED</th>
<th>KEYBOARDS ON HAND</th>
<th>OWNED</th>
<th>RENTED</th>
<th>DATE OF FEASIBILITY STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INQ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nov 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA, INX, &amp; LG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nov 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det 22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ ESAA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ PSAA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det 31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det 32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS 26 55 39 16 9
### HOST TENANT SUPPORT AGREEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMAND</th>
<th>HOST UNIT</th>
<th>AFIS TENANT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REVIEW</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATC</td>
<td>Lowry Tech Cntr</td>
<td>DTS-4</td>
<td>Aug 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>435 MAW</td>
<td>DTS-5</td>
<td>Mar 83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSC</td>
<td>ESMC</td>
<td>DTS-7 Flt A</td>
<td>May 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>1 TFW</td>
<td>DTS-12</td>
<td>Jan 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>60th MAW</td>
<td>DTS-24</td>
<td>Feb 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APLC</td>
<td>OGDEN ALC</td>
<td>DTS-31</td>
<td>Jan 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>31 TFW</td>
<td>DTS-35</td>
<td>Jun 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRES</td>
<td>934 TAG</td>
<td>DTS-40</td>
<td>Feb 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACECOM</td>
<td>1 SW</td>
<td>DTS-43</td>
<td>Feb 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSC</td>
<td>6594 ABS</td>
<td>DTS-48</td>
<td>Jan 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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139. Ltr, AFIS/INTA to AP/INTXX, “AFPIS 36-1 Revision (ROCXX Restructure) (Your Ltr, 22 Apr 83),” 26 Apr 83.

140. ACS/I to AF/MP, “Initial Assignment of USAFA Graduates as Cartographic Geodetic Officers.” 7 Jun 83 and 2 Atchs.

141. Ltr, AF/MP to AF/IN, “Initial Assignment of USAFA Graduates as Cartographic Geodetic Officers (Your Ltr, 7 Jun 83),” 29 Aug 83.


144. Msg [ ], AFIS/INTA to ESC/IGN et al, "Target Intelligence Officer's Course." 231730Z Nov 83 and 1 Atch [ ].


146. Ltr [ ], AFIS/INT to AFIS/XP. "USAF War and Mobilization Plan (WMF-1)," 9 Dec 83.

147. Ltr [ ], AFSC/CV to ACS/1, n.s., 14 Mar 83.

CHAPTER IV
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149. Ltr  af, AF/INR to INU, "FY 1984 Congressional Action Item/Report (XGP Ltr, 21 Sep 83)." 30 Sep 83.


153. Ltr  af, and 1 Atch  af, AFISC/IGAI to 7602d AINTELG/CC, "Report of Management Effectiveness Inspection (MEI) of Headquarters, 7602d Air Intelligence Group (7602d AINTELG) (PN 79-901I)" af, 10 Mar 80.


158. Memo  af, Gen J. Vessey, Jr., USA to Gen Gabriel, "Code of Conduct Training," 1 Apr 83, as Tab 2 of Staff Summary sheet af. AFIS/INU to AFIS/CV et al, "DOD Directive 1300.7 Changes," 10 Nov 84.


162. AFIS Weekly Bulletin No. 36, Item 1, 23 Sep 83.

164. Memo, Maj Gen Shaud, Director of Plans, DCS/P&O, to AF/IN (Mein Pfautz), "Evasion and Escape (E&E) Executive Agent (EA)," 15 Aug 83.

165. Memo, ACS/I to AF/LIA (Maj Gen Shaud), "Evasion and Escape (E&E) Executive Agent (EA) - Information Memorandum, 6 Sep 83.

166. Historical Data Rprt, AFIS/INU, Jan-Dec 83.

167. The Intelligencer, APIS/PA, Apr 83.


169. Rprt, "SEER Related Intelligence Produced by AND/OR Available from INU," 1 Jan 84.


171. Memo, Director, Legislation and Legal Policy, OASD, to Director AFIS/INU, "Code of Conduct Historian/Librarian," 7 Jun 83.


173. After Action Rprt, Exercise Ridge Runner 83, by Claude Watkins, AFIS/INU.


180. Memo for Record  and Atch  by MSgt Lovelady, AFIS/INUAA, "Trip Report - Fort Bragg, NC - 5-7 Dec 83," 25 Jan 84.


182. AFISR 23-1 by, 15 Feb 84, Section E.


184. Organizational Chart of AFIS/INC by.

185. List of Key Personnel of AFIS/INC by.

186. Biographical Summary Sheet of Colonel Wish by.


188. Ltr by, AFIS/INC to AFIS/DP, "FY86-90 Joint Programming/Budget Data Call," 3 Nov 83.


193. Ltr by, Maj Gen Marks, ACS/I, to 76 NSI/A, "Upgrade of Soviet Awareness Equipment Display"  by, 9 May 83.


196. Memo by, Assistant Director, Intelligence Division, FBI, to Maj Gen Plautz, ACS/I, "Soviet Awareness School," 19 Sep 83.

198. Ltr Col Regis J. Carr, Jr. to Col Wish, AFIS/INC, n.s., 18 Mar 83.

199. Ltr Col Wish to Col Regis J. Carr, Jr., TNW Inc., "Request for 'Red Eagle Road Show' (Your Ltr, 18 Mar 83)," 14 Apr 83.


205. Msg AFIS/INC to USADO Moscow, AIRA, "Country Clearance Request," 221602Z May 83.


207. Memo Col Wish, INC/CC, to AF/IN, "Internal Information Coverage of Soviet Threat (AFSINC-CLE Ltr, 15 Feb 1983) - INFORMATION MEMORANDUM," 1 Mar 83.


209. Soviet Press Selected Translations, AFIS/INC, AFRP 200-1, Jan-Dec 83; Soviet Military Concepts, AFIS/INC, No. 6-82, No. 4-82.

210. List of Sales Figures on all titles within the SET and SCA series are "Sales of Soviet Military Thought." Books, FY 1983, 6 Dec 80.

211. Ltr Col Wish to AF/IN, "Letter of Appreciation to Canadian Chief, Intelligence and Security," 14 Feb 83.


214. Ltr Brig Gen Abel to William F. Buckley, Jr., Editor, National Review Incorporated, n.s., 14 Jul 83.
215. Historical Data Rprt, AFIS/INC, Jan-Dec 83.


217. Ltr, AFIS/INC to AFI/CT, n.s., 28 Jun 81.

218. Ltr, Col Wish to Elizabeth K. Womaldorph, Coordination for Maps and Publications, Department of State, n.s., 7 Jul 83.


221. Ltr, INH to AF/IN (Col Morris, Br Gen Martin, Maj Gen Pfautz), "Realignment of Air Force Intelligence Assistant Billets Within DAS," 28 Jul 83.

222. DIA Form 665, Control No. U-368-83/RHR-3C, 22 Nov 83.


224. DA Form 4283, 2 Nov 81, Serial No. 00052, Bldg 1923.

225. Biographical Sketch of Col Steimmiller.

226. Organizational Chart of INH.

227. List of INH Key Personnel.


229. Mid-Tour Reports, Air Attaches to AFIS/INH, 1983 (24 Reports).

230. "Officers Interviewed by ACS/I Selection Panel." Historical Data Rprt, AFIS/INH, Jan-Dec 83.

231. List of NCOs selected.

232. Ltr, INH to AFIS/CY, AFIS/CC, ACS/I, "Visit to Africa/Middle East Defense Attache Offices (DAOs)," 21 Jul 83.

233. Ltr, Director, DIA, Lt Gen J. A. Williams, to All Defense Attaches, "Role of the Defense Attaches," 23 Nov 81.


235. Newsletter, Attache Affairs, Dec 83.

236. List, Promotion cycles for CMS\'s in 1983, AFIS/INH.
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239. Ltr and Atch, AFIS/WO to AFIS/INS Exec et al., "Realignment of AFIS/INSA Authorizations and Functions (AF/INS Exec Memo, 20 May 83)." 23 May 83.

240. Memo, Chief, INSB, to All AFIS/INSB Personnel, "Reorganization of INSB," 9 Nov 83.


242. Historical Data Appt, AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83.


244. Ltr with 1 Atch, AFIS/WO to AFIS/INS, "AFIS/INSO Reorganization (Your Ltr, 6 Jun 83)," 20 Jun 83.

245. Ltr with 1 Atch, AFIS/WO to AFIS/INSO, AFIS/INSO Reorganization (Your Ltr, 6 Jun 83)," 12 Sep 83.


247. Ltr, AFIS/WO to AFIS/INS, "Manpower Requirements for the Fy 84-86 POM." 6 Feb 82.

248. Position Description, Chief, SS Ed Branch, n.d.

249. Biographical Sketch of Col Huey.


257. DD Form 1847-1, Jan 83 ☐, "Sensitive Compartmented Information Nondisclosure Agreement."

258. "Oath" or indoctrination memorandum ☐.


263. DISUM ☐, Col Huey, AFIS/INS, "Draft DOD Directive C-5200.xx 'SCI Programs,'" 8 Sep 83.


266. Draft Msg ☐ Deputy ACS/1 to EEO SAC et al., "Protection of Sensitive Intelligence," Sep 83.


269. Msg ☐, AFIS/INS to AFSSO/AU/IN, "Use of SCI in ACSC Curriculum," 28 Dec 83.

270. Staff Summary Sheet ☐, AFIS/INS, Col Huey to ACS/I et al., "Use of SCI in ACSC Curriculum," 14 Dec 83.

271. Ltr ☐ with 4 Attach ☐, AU/IN to AFIS/INS, "Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) in the Air Command and Staff College Curriculum," 19 Jul 83.


274. Historical Data Rprt, AFIS/INS, Jan-Dec 83.


276. AFIS SCI Security Management Course Outline (AFIS 002), Class Handout #1-1, AFIS/INS, 19 Sep 83.


279. Trip Rprt, AFIS/INSD to AFIS/INS, "CORONA SOUTH 83," 2 Mar 83.


281. Ltr, AFIS/INSD to SSOs, "HQ USAF Consolidated SIGINT Catalog (CONCAT)," 16 Aug 83.

282. Ltr, AFIS/INS to AF/INA et al., "Amendment to Space Services Request." 9 Jun 83.


284. Biographical Sketch of Col Oberst.

285. List of KE Key Personnel.

286. Mobilization Assistant’s position description.

287. FACTBOOK, Air Force Intelligence Reserve (AFIR), 1 Oct 83.

288. Manpower Strength Chart.


290. Ltr, Col Oberst, AFIS/RE to SIOs et al., "Air Force Intelligence Reserve (AFIR) Program." 29 Aug 83.
291. DTS's annual unit historical reports to AFIS/RE for calendar year 1983.

292. Historical Data Rprt, AFIS/RE, Jan-Dec 83.

293. FACT BOOK, Air Force Intelligence Reserve (AFIR), 1 Apr 83.

294. Ltr and Atch 6, DIA Deputy Director for Resources and Systems to ACS/1, "Air Force Reserve Support to DIA," 26 Oct 83.

295. Ltr and Atchs, ESAA/INRA, to All ESAA Activities, "Special Projects for Reserve Augmentees," 5 Dec 83.

296. Ltr AFIS/RE to MAC/IR, "Intelligence Reserve Support to MAC Airlift Wings (Associate)," 15 May 83.


298. Appendix 2 to Annex A to AFIS EXPLAN 0024, AFIS/RE, 15 Sep 83.


300. Memorandum, REOR, Capt Ourand, MAJCOM/IN Participation in Mobilization Exercises, n.d.

301. Chart of Officer AFSC Conversions.


303. Ltr AFIS/RE to ADs, ROAs, "Northeast/National Capital Area Workshop Issue Items," 14 Apr 83; Ltr, AFIS/RE to SE AD, "Issue Items, Southeast Area Workshop," 6 Jun 83.


305. Ltr, AFIS/RE to ARPC/DR, "IMA Travel Initiatives," 20 Jul 83.


310. Ltr —, AFIS/RE to ADs et al, "Retirement Recognition Policy," 23 May 83.

311. Ltr —, AFIS/RE to Retired Reserve Representatives, "AFIR Retired Reserve Representative (RPR) Program," 4 May 83.

312. Ltr —, AFIS/RE to AP/IN (Col Morris), "AFIS Reserve Program Title (Your Ltr, 1 Feb 83)," 8 Feb 83.

313. Ltr and Atchs —, AFIS/DPT to AFIS/RO, "Evaluation of Suggestion #BCL-0104, 'Consolidation of Personnel Function Within AFIS,'" 29 Feb 83.


315. Ltr —, ARPC/UR to AFIS/RE, "DIA Travel Initiatives (Your Ltr, 20 Jul 83), 27 Jul 83.


318. Ltr —, AFIS/CC to AP/IN and AFIS Staff, "Merit Pay and Incentive Awards Committees," 26 Oct 83.


322. Ltr —, AFIS/DPT to AFIS Staff, "Visit by CXPO Representative," 12 Feb 83.


324. Staff Summary Sheet —, AFIS/DP to ACS/L, "Air Staff Training (ASTRA) Program Selectees for FY84."
325. Ltr ☐, AFIS/DP to HQ AFPMC/MPCR64E, "Central American Joint Intelligence Team (CAJIT Manning)," 20 Jul 83.


328. Statistical Compilation ☐, AFIS/DP for AFPMC/PALACE SENTINEL Visit Sep 83, "80XX Manning Statistics."


331. Ltr ☐ ACS/I to All SIOs, "Intelligence Training Programs for FY84." 29 Aug 83.

332. Memo ☐, AF/IN Executive to AFIS/DP, "Manning the Area Specialist and DALASP Programs for AFIS/INH to AFIS/DP," 10 Apr 83.


334. Ltr ☐, AFIS/INH to AF/INX, "FY83/84 Area Specialist NPTT Quota." 15 Mar 83.

335. Ltr ☐, AFIS/DF to AF/HPP, "FY84 Graduate Education Program." 1 Jul 83.


337. Ltr ☐, AFPMC/CC to AF/X0X, "Foreign Area Officer Specialty," 27 Jul 83.

338. Ltr ☐, AF/IN to AF/IN Staff, "FY84 Area Specialist Selection Board," 29 Jul 83.

339. Minutes ☐, FY84 Area Specialist Selection Board, 29 Aug 83.


341. Ltr ☐, AF/HPP/CRFB to AFIS/DP, "Proposed Change to APR 36-1, Prefix L," 21 Sep 83.

342. Ltr ☐, AF/IN to Director of Central Intelligence, "DCLI Exceptional Intelligence Analyst Program" 30 Jun 83.
343. Ltr ☐, Director of Central Intelligence to National Foreign Intelligence Board. "DCI Exceptional Intelligence Analyst Program." 19 May 83.

344. Ltr ☐, AFIS/DPT to Program Sponsors. "Reports for DIC Exceptional Intelligence Analyst Program." 15 Sep 83.

345. Ltr ☐, CIA/AC to AP/IN, "FY84 Funds." 11 Oct 83.


347. Ltr ☐, AP/IN to DCI, "Nominations." 20 Oct 83.

348. Ltr ☐, AP/IN to DCI, "Nomination." 16 Nov 83.


350. Ltr ☐, DIA/AT-SA to AP/IN, "DALASP," 29 Sep 83.

351. Ltr ☐, AP/IN to AFIS/CV, "DALASP," 29 Mar 83.


353. Ltr ☐, AF/IN to All SI0s, "Non-Resident Foreign Language Training Program." 20 Apr 83.

354. Ltr ☐, AFIS/DP to Civilians in the ICDP, "DALASP," 8 Nov 83.

355. Staff Summary Sheet ☐, AFIS/DPT to AP/IN, "DALASP," 19 Dec 83.

356. Ltr ☐, AF/IN to Director, DIA, "Nominations for DALASP," 16 Nov 83.

357. Ltr ☐, AFIS/DPT to DIA/AT-SA, "DALASP," 12 Dec 83.

358. Ltr ☐, VP-A3 to AP/IN, "Quality of Analysis Program." 1 Aug 83.

359. Staff Summary Sheet ☐, AFIS/DPT to AP/IN, "Nominations for Quality of Analysis Program." 18 Nov 83.

360. Ltr ☐, AF/IN to Director, DIA, "Analyst Area Orientation and Familiarization Program." 30 Jun 83.

361. Ltr ☐, AFIS/DPT to AP/IN, "DALASP," 23 Aug 83.

362. Ltr ☐, AF/IN to Director, DIA, "Topics for DALASP," 27 Sep 83.
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363. Appendix A to Unit Personnel Boster (Personnel Totals, AFSAC, 16 Jan 84.)

364. History Input (Inform) Det. 21, AFSAC, Jan-Jun 83 (History Input Inform) Det. 21, AFSAC, Jul-Dec 83.


366. History Input (Inform) ESAA, AFSAC, Jan-Jun 83; History Input (Inform) ESAA, AFSAC, Jul-Dec 83.

367. History Input (Inform) PSAA, AFSAC, Jan-Jun 83; History Input (Inform) PSAA, AFSAC, Jul-Dec 83.

368. Ltr (Inform) and 1 Atch (Inform), INX Division CY83 History, Lt Col Rowe to AFSAC/CCE, "Plans, Resources, and Support Division History - CY 83," n.d.


370. Msg (Inform), USAFE/IN to AFSAC/CC, "ESAA OPLAN 4102" 2115152 Oct 83.

371. Ltr (Inform), AFSAC/INX to AF/INYSH. "Review of Draft PSAA OPLAN 5000/5001" 12 Jul 83.

372. Ltr (Inform) and 1 Atch (Inform), AFSAC/INX to AFSAC/INO, "Review of PSAA OPLAN 5000/5001" 19 Jul 83.


374. Ltr (Inform) and 1 Atch (Inform), AFSAC/CY to AF/INY, "HUMINT Architecture Plan (HAP)," 15 Mar 83.


378. [Redacted]
379. Ltr ☐, AFSC/INX to AFCC/DD, "Secure Voice Improvement Program (SVIP) Data Base (Your Ltr. 19 Jul 83)," 12 Oct 83.

380. Ltr ☐, AFSC/INX to AFCC/DD, "Secure Voice Requirements," ☐. 9 Sep 83.


383. Ltr ☐, AFSC/CV to AFIS/IG, "Reply to Management Effectiveness Inspection (MEI)," 3 Jun 83.

384. Ltr ☐, AFSC/INX to All Air Force DCD Representatives, "Management Effectiveness Inspection," ☐. 31 Mar 84.

385. Ltr ☐, AFSC/CC to CIA/DD, "Inspection of USAF Representatives to DCD" ☐. 4 Apr 83.

386. Ltr ☐, AFSC/CC to AFIS/IG, "Reply to Management Effectiveness Inspection (MEI)", ☐. 31 Aug 83.


388. Ltr ☐, AFSC/INX to AFSC/INX et al, "Trip Report" ☐. 6 Sep 83.

389. Ltr ☐, PSAA/CC to AFSC/INX/INXAB, "Interim Hq PSAA Response to AFIS/MEI" ☐. 28 Nov 83.


391. Ltr ☐, Det 21, AFSC/DOIF to Det 21, AFSC/DO et al, "Brim Frost 83 Exercise Trip Report" ☐. 28 Feb 83.

392. ESAA/INX to ESAA/CC, "WINTER 83 - After Action Report" ☐. 15 Mar 83.

393. Ltr ☐, AFSC/INX to AFSC/INX, "Exercise TEAM SPIRIT 83 Trip Report," 12 Apr 83.

394. Ltr ☐, Det 32, PSAA/INX to AFSC/INX, "Team Spirit ’83 Consolidated Critique" ☐. 26 Apr 83.

395. Ltr ☐, AFSC/INX to AFSC/INX, "Trip Report - AFSC Participation in USCENTCOM GALLANT KNIGHT 83 CPX" ☐. 5 Apr 83.

396. Ltr ☐, ESAA/CC to AFSC/CC/INX, "FTX FLINTLOCK 83 After Action Report" ☐. 1 Jul 83.
397. Memo [ ], v. 1 Atch [ ], AFSC/INX to Col Bane, "Exercise RIDGE RUNNER 83," 16 Jun 83.

398. Ltr [ ], AFSC/INX to AFSC/INX, "Trip Report, Ridge Runner (14-17 Sep 83)," 21 Sep 83.


400. Ltr [ ], v. 1 Atch [ ], AFSC/INX to AFSC/INX et al, "Trip Report - Exercise BOLD EAGLE 84" [ ], 24 Oct 83.

401. Msg [ ], USAF/INCR to USAF/IN, "After Action Report - Able Archer 83" [ ], 211245Z Dec 83.

402. DISUS Memo [ ], AFSC/INX to AFSC/CC, "ESAA Participation in USEUCOM Exercise ABLE ARCHER 83" [ ], 28 Dec 83.

403. Memo [ ], v. 3 Atch [ ], AFSC/INX to AFSC/CC, "Exercise PRESSURE POINT 84," 8 Dec 83.

404. Msg [ ], Det 32, PSAA/CC to AFSC/INOAB/INX, "POAL EAGLE EXERCISE" [ ], 150402Z Nov 83.

405. Msg [ ], Det 32, PSAA/CC to AFSC/CC et al, "VIP Visits to Exercise POAL EAGLE '83" [ ], 220503Z Nov 83.

406. Ltr [ ], v. 1 Atch [ ], PSAA/CC to AFSC/INX et al, "ULCHI-FOCUS LENS CPX Critique," 13 Sep 83.


410. Ltr [ ], v. 2 Atchs (INO History [ ] and INO Org Chart [ ]), AFSC/INO to AFSC/CT, "INO History Input (1 Jan - 31 Dec 83)," 23 May 84.

411. Ltr [ ], and 1 Atch [ ], AFSC/CC to All Area and Detachment Commanders et al, "AFSC Commanders' Conference Minutes," 19 Jul 83.

412. HUMINT HIGHLIGHTS [ ], CT1983, AFSC/INOC.

THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
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413. Ltr[ ], The Auditor General to Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff, "Project 3140114," m.d.

414. Memo[ ], and 1 Atch[ ], Deputy for Accounting and Internal Audit to Inspector General, DCC, 9 Dec 83.

415. Historical Data Rprt[ ], AFIS/AC, Jan-Dec 83.

416. Rprt[ ], and Abstract[ ], "AFIS Civilian Hiring Study," AFIS/AC, 9 Mar 83.

417. AFIS Operating Budget FY85[ ], RCS: DD COMP(AR)-1092, OAC40, 7 Jan 83.


419. Ltr[ ] and 1 Atch[ ] , AFIS/AC to All Members, "Financial Management Board Meeting," 22 Mar 83.

420. Ltr[ ] and 1 Atch[ ] , AFIS/AC to All Members, "Financial Management Board Meeting," 7 Jul 83.

421. Ltr[ ] and 2 Atchs[ ], "FY83 O&M Financial Program and FY85 POM Initiatives in Programs 8A and 9," 20 Nov 82.

422. AFIS Financial Plan[ ], RCS: DD COMP(AR)-1092, OAC40, 20 May 83.

423. AFIS Operating Budget FY86[ ], RCS: DD COMP(AR)-1092, OAC40, 30 Dec 83.


428. Historical Data Rprt[ ] , AFIS/XF, Jan-Dec 83.
429. Ltr AFIS/CV to AFIS/IND, INO, INS, AFSD/CC with 1 Atch
   "FY85-89 General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP)," 16 Jan
   83.

430. Ltr w. 3 Atchs, AFIS/CV to AF/INVR. "FY85-89
   Consolidated Intelligence Data Call (AF/INVR Ltr, 9 Dec 82)," 27
   Jan 83.

431. MSG, AF/INVR, "GDIP Offsets." Illeg. 21312 Feb 83.

432. Ltr w. 1 Atch, AFIS/XP to AFIS/IND, INO, AFSD/CC,
   "FY85-89 GDIP."

433. Ltr w. 1 Atch, AF/INVR Msg 1277382 Oct 83, AFIS/XP to
   AFIS/IND, INO, INS, INT, INDA, INCH, INOI, AFSD/INVR, "Third
   Annual Intelligence Programmers Workshop (Our Ltr, 12 Oct 83), 13
   Oct 83.

434. Staff Summary Sheet, AFIS/XP to AFIS/AC, MO, CV, "FY86-
   90 Joint Planning/Budget Data Call," 29 Sep 83.

435. Staff Summary Sheet w. 3 Tabs, AFIS/XP to AFIS/RE,
   MO, AC, CV, "FY86-90 PCM Submissions for INRA Funding," 10 Nov
   83.

436. Staff Summary Sheet w. 1 Tab, AFIS/XP to AFIS/AC,
   MO, CV, "Ranking of FY86-90 PCM Initiatives," 15 Nov 83.

437. Memo For Record, AFIS/XP, "AC/NO/XP Meeting ref Ranking
   of PCM Initiatives," 18 Nov 83.

438. Ltr w. 2 Atchs, AFIS/XP to AFIS Units. "Ranking of
   Proposed New Initiatives for FY86-90 PCM (AFIS/CV Ltr, 16 Nov 83),
   2 Nov 83.

439. Ltr w. 1 Atch, AFIS/XP to AFIS Units, "Ranking of
   Proposed New Initiatives for FY86-90 PCM (Our Ltr 21 Nov 83), 29
   Nov 83.

440. Ltr w. 1 Atch, AFIS/XP to AFIS Units, "Ranking of
   Proposed New Initiatives for FY86-90 PCM (Our Ltr 21 & 29 Nov
   83), 1 Dec 83.

441. Staff Summary Sheet w. 1 Atch. AFIS/XP to
   AFIS/AC/NO/CV, "FY86-90 GDIP Data Call," 2 Dec 83.

442. Staff Summary Sheet w. 2 Atchs, AFIS/XP to
   AFIS/AC/NO/CV/C, "Command Ranking of FY86-90 PCM Initiatives," 7
   Dec 83.

443. Staff Summary Sheet w. 1 Tab, AFIS/XP to
444. Msg 📦 to SDG, "FY86-90 CCP Data Call 📦," 0118002 Oct 83.


446. AFIS/XP Plan 📦, "AFIS OPLAN F-133," 20 Jun 83.


448. Ltr 📦, AFIS/XP, "Change 1 to AFIS Operation Plan F-135," 16 May 83.


450. AFIS/XP Plan 📦, "SUPPORT PLAN - DIA," 1 Nov 83.


454. AFISR 355-1 📦, "Disaster Preparedness, PLANNING AND ORGANIZATION," 1 Aug 83.


457. AFIS/XP Plan 📦, "EXERCISE PRESSURE POINT '84, AFIS EXPLAN 0024," 15 Sep 83.

458. Ltr 📦 and 1 Atch 📦, AFIS/XP to AF/MHY et al., "AFIS Plans Listing and Summary, 1 Nov 83.


460. Ltr and 11 Atchs 📦, AFIS/XP to AF/MHY et al., "FY83 Phase II Narrative Report, Support Force Sizing (FORSIZE) and Wartime Manpower Planning (MANREQ) Exercises 📦, 27 May 83.

461. Ltr 📦 with 1 Atch 📦, AFIS/IG to AFIS/HQ, "Directorate and Staff Agency History Inputs (AFIS/CV Ltr, 6 Dec 83)," 25 Jan 84.
462. Ltr [ ], and 1 Atch [ ], AFIS/IG to HQ AFISC/IGF, "Semiannual Report on Audit, Inspection and Investigative Operations . . .," 1 Apr 83.

463. Ltr [ ] and 1 Atch [ ], AFIS/IG to HQ AFISC/IGF, "Information Requirements of the Office of the Inspector General . . .," 3 Oct 83.


468. Ltr [ ], AFIS/IG to HQ AFISC/IGF, "Quarterly Oversight Inspection Activities . . .," 1 Apr 83, 30 Jun 83, 15 Sep 83, 21 Dec 83.

469. Ltr [ ], AFIS/IG to [ ], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSI) of [ ]" 18 Feb 83.

470. Ltr [ ], AFIS/IG to [ ], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSI) of the [ ] Self-Inspection Program," 24 Mar 83.

471. Ltr [ ], AFIS/IG to [ ], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSI) of the [ ] Self-Inspection Program," 15 Apr 83.

472. Ltr [ ], AFIS/IG to [ ], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSI) of the [ ] Self-Inspection Program," 24 May 83.

473. Ltr [ ], AFIS/IG to [ ], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSI) of the [ ] Self-Inspection Program," 20 Jul 83.

474. Ltr [ ], AFIS/IG to [ ], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSI) of the [ ] Self-Inspection Program," 21 Sep 83.

475. Ltr [ ], AFIS/IG to [ ], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection of the [ ] Self-Inspection Program," 7 Oct 83.

476. Ltr [ ], AFIS/IG to [ ], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSI) of the [ ] Self-Inspection Program," 4 Nov 83.

477. Ltr [ ], AFIS/IG to [ ], "Over-the-Shoulder Inspection (OTSI) of the [ ] Self-Inspection Program," 21 Dec 83.


480. AF Form 740, “Ground Mishap and Safety Education Summary,” AFIS/IG, HAP-IGF(M) 7113, Jan 83, and 11 Atch messages.

481. Ltr and 1 Atch, AFIS/NO to AFIS/NO, “Annual Unit History Report (Cy1983) (AFIS/CC Ltr, 6 Dec 83),” 17 Feb 84.


484. Ltr and 2 Atch, AFIS/NO to AFSC/CC, “FY83 and FY84 AFSC Manpower Additions,” 25 Feb 83.


487. Ltr, AFIS/NO to AF/INXY, “Manning for Joint National Intelligence Dissemination System (JNIDS) Program Office (Your Ltr, 4 Mar 83),” 22 Mar 83.


489. Ltr, AFIS/NO to AFIS/IND, “New Authorizations to Support the Tactical Air Intelligence System (TAIS),” 21 Jul 83.

490. Memo for Record, AFIS/NO, Maj Folllrod, “Reprogramming of GDIP Billets for Record,” 8 Jun 83.

491. Ltr, AF/INXY to AFIS/NO, “Allocation of Five Manpower Authorizations Transferred from SAC,” 23 Jun 83.

492. Ltr, AF/MPMP to AFIS/NO, “General Defense Intelligence Program Adjustment,” 30 Jun 83.

493. Ltr, AFIS/NO to AF/INXY, AFIS/IND, “Allocation of Five Manpower Authorizations Transferred from SAC (Your Ltr, 23 Jun),” 7 Jul 83.
494. Ltr with 1 Attch, AFIS/NO to AFIS/CV et al., "FY85 PCM Results (Program 8 and 9)," 11 May 83.

495. Ltr with 1 Attch, AFIS/NO to AFIS/DP, "Manpower Authorization Change Request (Your Ltr, 28 Oct 83)," 15 Nov 83.

496. Staff Summary Sheet, with 9 Atchs, AFIS/NO to AFIS/CC et al., "Manpower Billets for Reconnaissance Plans Branch (AP/XO)," 20 Jun 83.


498. Ltr, AFIS/NO to AP/IN, "Intelligence Support for Reconnaissance Plans Branch (AP/IN Ltr, 8 Jun 83)," 20 Jul 83.


500. Ltr, AFIS/NO to AFIS/INOA, "Manpower Billets for Intel Graphics Services (Our Staff Summary Sheet, 3 Aug 83)," 15 Aug 83.


505. Ltr, AFIS/NO to AFMEA/HEM, "Command Functional Review Schedule," 3 Feb 83.

506. Ltr, with 2 Atchs (AFIS/NO Ltr, 9 Sep 82 w/Atch, AFIY 21-2 and AFIS/NO Ltr, 3 Feb 83), AFIS/NO to AFMEA/HEM, "Command Functional Review Schedule (Your Ltr, 6 Dec 82)," 4 Feb 83.

507. Ltr, and 3 Atchs, AFIS/NO to AFMEA/HEM, "Command Functional Review Schedule," 3 Feb 83.

508. Ltr, and 1 Attch, AFIS/NO to AFIS/DA, "Study Memorandum," 6 Dec 83.

509. Historical Data Rpt, AFIS/DA, Jan-Dec 83.


512. Ltr, AFIS/MD to AFIS/DP. "Conversion of AFIS/DA Billet to Major 7046." 19 Sep 83.


515. AFIS SUPPLEMENT 1 to AFR 10-1. "Administrative Communications (Preparing Correspondence)." 7 Dec 83.

516. AFIS SUPPLEMENT 1 to AFR 10-7. "Administrative Communications (Administrative Orders)." 20 Jul 83.


519. AFIS SUPPLEMENT 1 to AFR 13-1, "Writing Improvement (Management of the Air Force Writing Program)." 8 Jun 83.


526. AP 893, Annual Copier Inventory, Cost, and Production Report, AFIS/DAPR, HAF-DAP (A&Q) 8104, 1 Oct 82 to 30 Sep 83.

527. Annual Report of Documentation Holdings, AFIS/DAD to USAF/DAO, HAF-DAD (A) 7112 (GS), 1 Jan 82 to 31 Dec 82.
526. AFIS SUPPLEMENT 1 to AFR 12-1, "Documentation (Air Force Documentation Management Program)," 15 Feb 83.

529. AFIS SUPPLEMENT 1 to AFR 12-40, "Documentation (Micrographics Management)," 31 Oct 83.

530. Privacy Act Listing ☐, AFIS/DA, 31 Dec 83.


532. AF Form 17 ☐, Freedom of Information (FOIA) Report, AFIS/DAD to USAF/DAQD ☐. RCS DD - PA (TRAA) 1365, 1 Jan - 30 Apr 83, 1 May - 31 Aug 83, 1 Sep - 31 Dec 83.


534. ISPM 01 205-1 - 205-10 ☐, published in 1983.


536. The Intelligencer ☐, AFIS/PA, Jan-Dec 83.


538. Ltr ☐ and 1 Atch ☐, AFIS/XP to Annex 2 (Distribution), Change 1 to AFIS EXPLAN 01-83, "14 Jun 83.


540. Ltr ☐, AFIS/PA to AFIS/IMKD, "35mm Print Film Requisition," 14 Apr 83.


543. Ltr ☐, AFIS/LS to AFIS/XF, "Exercise Pressure Point 84 Critique (LV Ltr, 29 Nov 83)," 1 Dec 83.

544. Ltr ☐, AFIS/LG to 76 ALD/LGC, "Contracting Support for HQ AFIS (Your Ltr, 22 Feb 83)," 25 Mar 83.
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546. Monthly Activity Reports [Omitted]. AFIS/OL-N to AF/IMW, Jan-Dec 83.


549. Intelligence Production Requirement [Omitted]. RS3-0045, AFIS OL-N for ESC/AFEWG, "Early Warning, Ground Controlled Intercept, Height Finder Radars (EW/GCI/HF)," 11 Mar 83.


551. Ltr [Omitted], and 1 Atch [Omitted]. 2 MACOS/CC DTG 2621002 Oct 82, SATB (2 Lt GOSS) to AFIS OL-N, "Request for Intelligence Assessment," 2 Nov 83.


553. Ltr [Omitted], and 1 Atch [Omitted]. AFIS OL-N to AFEWG/SA, "Update to Warsaw Pact Air Operation Against NATO (11 Jul 83 Meeting to Update Scenario for Use with COMFY CHALLENGE Study)," 26 Jul 83.


557. Ltr [Omitted]. Lt Col Walker to AGS/I, MG Marks, n.n., 9 Nov 82.


562. Ltr ☐, AF/INY to AF/HQPG, "Request for Transfer of Two GUP Manpower Spaces," 19 Apr 83.

563. Ltr ☐, AFIS/MO to AF/INY, "Establishment of AFIS/OL-ET - Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center (Your Ltr. 27 Apr 83)," 29 April 83.

564. Ltr ☐, AF/INY to AFIS/TP/MO, "Establishment of AFIS/OL-ET - Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center (AFMIC)," 27 Apr 83.

565. Memo ☐, Carey Sapp to INY, "Col O'Leary's question - "Why not just let them stay with FTD for QERs?", 19 Apr 83.


567. Msg ☐, APMIC-SA to CDRITAC ARS/1AX-P-C, "Terrorism" 3017002 Jan 84.

568. Excerpt from Msg ☐, APMIC-ZA to Multiple Sources, "Lebanon: Perceptions of Radical Shiites," 1620002 Dec 83.


570. Excerpt from Msg ☐, "PRC Microwave Radiation Meter" ☐, APMIC-ZA to Multiple Sources, n.d.


573. Monthly Activity Reports ☐, AFIS/OL-AF to AFIS/TW, Jan-Jun, Any-Dec 83.

574. Unit Personal Management Roster, AFIS OL-AF, 9 Feb 84.

575. Ltr ☐ and 2 Atch, AFIS OL-F History (1983) ☐ and Supporting Docs List ☐, AFIS OL-F to AFIS/HO, 17 Feb 84.

576. Roster of Key Personnel ☐, AFIS OL-F, 31 Dec 83.

- END OF LIST -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Anti-Aircraft Artillery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>Alaska Air Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCCC</td>
<td>Airborne Battlefield Command and Control Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Airbase Survivability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Comptroller Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACDA</td>
<td>Arms Control and Disarmament Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACSC</td>
<td>Air Command and Staff College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS/I</td>
<td>Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Area Director, Armament Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Audit Data Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADCOM</td>
<td>Air Defense Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>Automated Data Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADPE</td>
<td>Automatic Data Processing Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADS</td>
<td>Automated Data Processing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADS</td>
<td>Automated Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA</td>
<td>Area Enlisted Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEDC</td>
<td>Arnold Engineering Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFAA</td>
<td>Air Force Audit Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFAITC</td>
<td>Armed Forces Air Intelligence Training Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFAM</td>
<td>Air Force Achievement Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB</td>
<td>Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCC</td>
<td>Air Force Commandation Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFEWMC</td>
<td>Air Force Electronic Warfare Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFEWES</td>
<td>Air Force Electronic Warfare Evaluation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIR</td>
<td>Air Force Intelligence Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIRAG</td>
<td>Air Force Intelligence Reserve Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIS</td>
<td>Air Force Intelligence Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFISC</td>
<td>Air Force Inspection and Safety Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFIT</td>
<td>Air Force Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLC</td>
<td>Air Force Logistics Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFMEEA</td>
<td>Air Force Management Engineering Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFMIC</td>
<td>Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFMPC</td>
<td>Air Force Manpower and Personnel Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFOSI</td>
<td>Air Force Office of Special Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>Air Force Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRES</td>
<td>Air Force Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSAC</td>
<td>Air Force Special Activities Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSARC</td>
<td>Air Force System Acquisition Review Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSC</td>
<td>Air Force Specialty Code; Air Force Systems Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSHRC</td>
<td>Albert F. Simpson Historical Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSSO</td>
<td>Air Force Special Security Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFTEC</td>
<td>Air Force Test and Evaluation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFWPRT</td>
<td>Air Force Wartime Manpower and Personnel Readiness Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGOS</td>
<td>Air Ground Operations School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Airborne Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRA</td>
<td>Air Attaché</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRES</td>
<td>Advanced Imagery Requirements and Exploitation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJCC</td>
<td>Alternate Joint Communications Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC</td>
<td>Air Logistics Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALO</td>
<td>Airlift Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANHS</td>
<td>Automated Message Handling System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANG</td>
<td>Air National Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOT</td>
<td>Area Operations and Training Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDS</td>
<td>Advanced Personnel Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>Area Personnel Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>Airman Performance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR(R)</td>
<td>Area Performance Report (Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPS</td>
<td>Area Requirements and Products Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>Area Reprogramming Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARFCOS</td>
<td>Armed Forces Courier Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIS</td>
<td>Advanced Range Instrumentation Ship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARPC</td>
<td>Air Reserve Personnel Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARPS</td>
<td>Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>Aeronautical Systems Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASE</td>
<td>Advanced Sensor Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASG</td>
<td>Administrative Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Area Specialist Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTIAC</td>
<td>Advanced Scientific and Technical Intelligence Analyst Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTRF</td>
<td>Air Staff Training Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAPS</td>
<td>Advanced Tactical Aircraft Protection System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTODIN</td>
<td>Automatic Digital Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWACS</td>
<td>Airborne Warning and Control System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWC</td>
<td>Air War College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAP</td>
<td>Basic Allowance for Quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETT</td>
<td>Battlefield Exploitation and Target Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BITEC</td>
<td>Base Information Transfer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>Board of Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIG GEN</td>
<td>Brigadier General (O-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEWSIS</td>
<td>Computer Aided Electronic Warfare Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPT</td>
<td>Captain (O-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATIS</td>
<td>Computer Aided Tactical Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWC</td>
<td>Combined Air Warfare Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPO</td>
<td>Consolidated Base Personnel Office Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>A Commercial Data Base Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA MODEL 204</td>
<td>Command, Control, and Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Command, Control, Communications and Countermeasures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3CM</td>
<td>Command, Control, Communications and Countermeasures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3I</td>
<td>Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3PO</td>
<td>Concealment, Camouflage and Deception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3PO TRG</td>
<td>Concealment, Camouflage and Deception Technical Review Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC&amp;C</td>
<td>Critical Collection Problems Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPO</td>
<td>Consolidated Civilian Personnel Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTEC</td>
<td>Command Control Technical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEG</td>
<td>Combat Effectiveness Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Counterintelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>Central Intelligence Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR</td>
<td>Continuing Collection Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISPPO</td>
<td>Combat Identification System Program Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Configuration Management - (Identification and Control of Software Changes/Developments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMDS</td>
<td>Command Manpower Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMSGT</td>
<td>Chief Master Sergeant (E-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNWDI</td>
<td>Critical Nuclear Weapons Design Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COIC</td>
<td>Combat Operation Intelligence Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COINS</td>
<td>Community On-Line Intelligence System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>Colonel (O-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMINT</td>
<td>Communications Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMRES</td>
<td>Contingency, Operation, Mobility, Planning and Execution System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSEC</td>
<td>Communications Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLANS</td>
<td>Concept Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONUS</td>
<td>Continental United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAS</td>
<td>Civilian Potential Appraisal System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPDC</td>
<td>Command Publications Distribution Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPO</td>
<td>Civilian Personnel Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>Contingency Planning Support and Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>Command Post Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIC</td>
<td>Critical Intelligence Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPO</td>
<td>Consolidated Reserve Personnel Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Cathode Ray Tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAF</td>
<td>Chief of Staff, Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Communications Support Processor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Central Security Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSP</td>
<td>Combined Services Support Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTF 168</td>
<td>Commander Task Force 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBIC</td>
<td>Common User Baseline for the Intelligence Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Vice Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Calendar Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Administrative Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACP</td>
<td>Deserving Airman Commissioning Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACS/T</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAESC</td>
<td>Duty Air Force Specialty Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAO</td>
<td>Defense Attache Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>Data Automation Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARPA</td>
<td>Defense Advanced Research Project Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS</td>
<td>Defense Attache System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATT</td>
<td>Defense Attache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBM</td>
<td>Data Base Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBMS</td>
<td>Data Base Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBW</td>
<td>Decimal Watt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>Defense Communications Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI</td>
<td>Director of Central Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIA</td>
<td>Defense Intelligence Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIACLSC</td>
<td>Defense Intelligence Agency On-Line System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIDHS</td>
<td>Deployable Intelligence Data Handling System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Defense Intelligence School; Defense Intelligence Service; Defense Investigative Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLAB</td>
<td>Defense Language Aptitude Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLI</td>
<td>Defense Language Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLIFLC</td>
<td>Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA</td>
<td>Defense Mapping Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DODAAD</td>
<td>Department of Defense Activity Address Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DODDIS</td>
<td>Department of Defense Intelligence Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Director of Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>Civilian Personnel Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRU</td>
<td>Direct Reporting Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSARC</td>
<td>Defense System Acquisition Review Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSB</td>
<td>Defense Service Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSDIC</td>
<td>Department of Defense Strategic Detracting and Interrogation Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Detracted Training Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYOB</td>
<td>Dynamic Order of Battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>Emergency Action Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Electronic Combat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCM</td>
<td>Electronic Counter-Countermeasures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>Electronic Countermeasures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIS</td>
<td>Electronic Combat Instructor School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECP</td>
<td>Electronic Combat (Instructor) Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Embedded Computer System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECETED</td>
<td>Electronic Combat Threat Environment Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGE</td>
<td>Evasion and Escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEI</td>
<td>Essential Elements of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Electronic Combat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELINT</td>
<td>Electronic Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELNOT</td>
<td>Electronic Intelligence Notation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELTEC</td>
<td>Technical Electronic Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPL</td>
<td>ELINT Parameter Limits List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERADCOM</td>
<td>Electronics Research and Development Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>Effective Radiated Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>European Special Activities Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>Electronic Security Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Electronic Support Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EW</td>
<td>Electronic Warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EW/CAS</td>
<td>Electronic Warfare in Close Air Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWIR</td>
<td>Electronic Warfare Integrated Reprogramming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWIRC</td>
<td>Electronic Warfare Integrated Reprogramming Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWIRDB</td>
<td>Electronic Warfare Integrated Reprogramming Data Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWOLS</td>
<td>Electronic Warfare Open Loop Simulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWRC</td>
<td>Electronic Warfare Reprogramming Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLANS</td>
<td>Exercise Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>Federal Aviation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANX</td>
<td>Friendship Annex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASCAP</td>
<td>Fast Capital Payback Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBIS</td>
<td>Foreign Broadcast Information Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEP</td>
<td>Front-End Processor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIAT</td>
<td>Functional Intelligence Augmentation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLT</td>
<td>Flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>Financial Management Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FME</td>
<td>Foreign Material Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMI</td>
<td>Functional Management Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>Final Operational Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOIA</td>
<td>Freedom of Information Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORSIZE</td>
<td>Force Sizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOT&amp;E</td>
<td>Follow-On Operational Test and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUO</td>
<td>For Official Use Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRD</td>
<td>Federal Research Division, Library of Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Financial Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTC</td>
<td>Foreign Science and Technology Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTD</td>
<td>Foreign Technology Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWA</td>
<td>Fraud, Waste and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWG</td>
<td>Financial Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>Government Accounting Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>Ground Control Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDIP</td>
<td>General Defense Intelligence Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEM</td>
<td>General Effectiveness Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLCM</td>
<td>Ground Launched Cruise Missile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>General Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMAS</td>
<td>General Manager Appraisal System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOOG  Government Controlled-Contractor Operated
GS  General Schedule; General Staff
GT  Green Flag
GSPG  Groups of Soviet Forces, Germany
GSU  Geographically Separated Unit
HAC  House Appropriation Committee
HAT  Human Resource Intelligence (HUMINT) Augmentation Team
HF  High Frequency
HUMINT Managers Training Course
HO  History Office
HOI  Headquarters Operating Instruction
HQ  Headquarters
HSS  Headquarters Squadron Section
HTSA  Host Tenant Support Agreement
HUMINT  Human Resource Intelligence
HZ  Hertz
IADS  Integrated Air Defense System
IAF  Indian Air Force
IAS  Interactive Applications System
ICBM  Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile
ICDP  Intelligence Career Development Program
ICM  Improved Intercept and Countermeasures
ICR  Intelligence Collection Requirement
IDBS  Intelligence Data Handling System
IDBS-80  Strategic Air Command (SAC) Intelligence Data Handling System for the 80s
IDBS-80  Intelligence Data Handling System
IDBSC-II  Communication II
IDT  Inactive Duty Training
IG  Inspector General
IMA  Individual Mobilization Augmentee
INF  Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces
INO  Directorate of Operational Intelligence
INDO  Intelligence Operational Instruction
INS  Directorate of Security and Communications Management
INTRO  Individualized Newcomer Treatment and Orientation Program
ITOTAE  Initial Operational Test and Evaluation
IPAC  Intelligence Center Pacific
IPAO  International Pact Organization
IPR  Intelligence Production Requirements
IPR  Intelligence Production Report
LIR  Intelligence Information Report
LRBM  Intermediate Range Ballistic Missile
IRF  Intelligence Reserve Forces
IRIS  Intelligence Reserve Information System
ISSA  Interservice Support Agreement
I&W  Indications and Warning
IWC  Indication Warning Center
JAROC  Joint Allied Refugee Operation Center
JCS  Joint Chiefs of Staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCSM</td>
<td>Joint Chiefs of Staff Memorandum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMEM/AS</td>
<td>Joint Munitions Effectiveness Manual/Air-to-Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPAS</td>
<td>Job Performance Appraisal System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSIW</td>
<td>Joint Service Interrogation Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTFPP</td>
<td>Joint Tactical Fusion Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTFTR</td>
<td>Joint Tactical Fusion Test Bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KB</td>
<td>Knowledgeability Brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLGB</td>
<td>Low Level Laser Guided Bomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Lines of Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCE</td>
<td>Limited Operational Capability Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCE</td>
<td>Letter of Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC</td>
<td>Lieutenant Colonel (O-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT COL</td>
<td>Lieutenant Colonel (O-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mobilization Augmentee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Military Airlift Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANFOR</td>
<td>Manpower Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ</td>
<td>Major (O-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJCOMK</td>
<td>Major Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASS</td>
<td>Missile and Space Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAW</td>
<td>Military Airlift Wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAI</td>
<td>Modular Architecture for Exchange Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Day</td>
<td>Mobilization Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC&amp;G</td>
<td>Mapping, Charting and Geodesy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEPFPAK</td>
<td>Manpower and Equipment Force Packaging System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI</td>
<td>Management Effectiveness Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP</td>
<td>Management Engineering Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFP</td>
<td>Major Force Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGST</td>
<td>Mobile Ground Terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIA</td>
<td>Missile Intelligence Agency; Missing-In-Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILSATCOM</td>
<td>Military Satellite Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILSTAR</td>
<td>Military Strategic, Tactical and Relay Satellite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIM</td>
<td>Master Interpretation Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Manpower and Organization Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOC</td>
<td>Military Operations Training Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>Military Personnel Appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPC</td>
<td>Military Personnel Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSPF</td>
<td>Mission Support Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSgt</td>
<td>Master Sergeant (E-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSM</td>
<td>Meritorious Service Medal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-X</td>
<td>Missile-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>National Archives Records Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>National Capital Area; National Command Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCB</td>
<td>Non-Communist Bloc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCO</td>
<td>Noncommissioned Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCOA</td>
<td>Noncommissioned Officer Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCOIC</td>
<td>Noncommissioned Officer in Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSCL</td>
<td>Noncommissioned Officer Leadership School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>National Capital Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDA</td>
<td>Nondisclosure Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFIB</td>
<td>National Foreign Intelligence Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>National Intelligence Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPNW</td>
<td>National Operations and Intelligence Watch Officers Net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPSC</td>
<td>National Military Command Center Information Processing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISC</td>
<td>Naval Intelligence Support Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NILSSTR</td>
<td>National Intelligence Systems to Support Tactical Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNIC</td>
<td>National Military Intelligence Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONEAD</td>
<td>Non-Extended Active Duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFIC</td>
<td>National Photographic Interpretation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Naval Postgraduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>National Security Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSC</td>
<td>National Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSRL</td>
<td>National SIGINT Requirements List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Order of Battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBRC</td>
<td>Operating Budget Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP</td>
<td>Office of Civilian Personnel Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>Officer Efficiency Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>Operating Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIC</td>
<td>Officer in Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIS</td>
<td>Office Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTT</td>
<td>On the Job Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Operating Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>Operations and Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>Office of Management and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMC</td>
<td>Occupational Measurement Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMSP</td>
<td>Official Mail Stamp Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPELINT</td>
<td>Operational Electronic Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPLAN</td>
<td>Operational Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>Office of Primary Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSAF</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary of the Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>Organizational Structure Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI</td>
<td>Office of Special Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT&amp;E</td>
<td>Operational Test and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTS</td>
<td>Officer Training School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSIG</td>
<td>Over the Shoulder Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Public Affairs Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACAF</td>
<td>Pacific Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS</td>
<td>Personnel Accounting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>Permanent Change of Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEM</td>
<td>Program Element Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFIAB</td>
<td>President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Photo Interpreter (Interpretation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>Probability of Kill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLESS</td>
<td>Precision Location Strike System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMD</td>
<td>Programmed Management Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>Professional Military Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMS</td>
<td>Pipeline Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Point of Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>Program Objective Memorandum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>Prisoner of War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>People's Republic of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRI</td>
<td>Periodic Request Investigation; Pulse Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYOP</td>
<td>Psychological Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Quality Circle; Quality Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QOFE</td>
<td>Qualitative Operational Test and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSI</td>
<td>Quality Salary Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADC</td>
<td>Rome Air Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Royal Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDAFFOR</td>
<td>Rapid Deployment Air Force Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDJTF</td>
<td>Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDTE</td>
<td>Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Radio Electronic Combat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDCOM</td>
<td>Readiness Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMADIS</td>
<td>Requirements Management and Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Radio Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIF</td>
<td>Reduction in Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Resource Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROFE</td>
<td>Reserve Officer Promotion Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>Reserve Officer Training Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Requirement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA</td>
<td>Reserve Personnel Appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGT</td>
<td>Reconnaissance Technical Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWR</td>
<td>Radar Warning Receiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Strategic Air Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGA</td>
<td>Studies Analysis and Gaming Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM</td>
<td>Surface to Air Missile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMI</td>
<td>Systems Acquisition Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>Special Activities Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBI</td>
<td>Special Background Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Sensitive Compartmented Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIF</td>
<td>Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>Source Directed Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI</td>
<td>Specific Emitter Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERE</td>
<td>Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Sergeant (E-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Special Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIADS</td>
<td>Soviet Integrated Air Defense System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGINT</td>
<td>Signal Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SII</td>
<td>Statement of Intelligence Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMVAL</td>
<td>Simulator Validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIO</td>
<td>Sensor Intelligence Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOP</td>
<td>Single Integrated Operation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMDC</td>
<td>Soviet Military Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMPD</td>
<td>Soviet Military Power Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWP</td>
<td>Soviet Military Power Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMHGT</td>
<td>Senior Master Sergeant (E-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNIE</td>
<td>Special National Intelligence Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;O</td>
<td>Separate Operating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLARS-1</td>
<td>Strategic Air Command (SAC) On-Line Analysis and Retrieval System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLIS</td>
<td>SIGINT On-Line Intelligence System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>Statement of Operational Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Squadron Officer School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOW</td>
<td>Statement of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACECOM</td>
<td>Space Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECAT</td>
<td>Special Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCER</td>
<td>Special Operational Electronic Intelligence Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>Senior Airman (E-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Syracuse Research Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRN</td>
<td>Socialist Republic of Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSGT</td>
<td>Staff Sergeant (E-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Special Security Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;T</td>
<td>Scientific and Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;T&amp;T</td>
<td>Scientific and Technical Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR</td>
<td>System Threat Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARK</td>
<td>Strategic Arms Reduction Talks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIAIC</td>
<td>Scientific and Technical Intelligence Analyst Introductory Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNS</td>
<td>System Update Missionization Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Tactical Air Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAF</td>
<td>Tactical Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAR</td>
<td>Threat Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASS</td>
<td>Soviet News Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAOEX</td>
<td>Target Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANC</td>
<td>Tactical Air Warfare Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDOE</td>
<td>Tactics/Doctrine Test and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDY</td>
<td>Temporary Duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEC</td>
<td>Technical, Educational and Career Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED</td>
<td>Threat Environment Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERE</td>
<td>Tactical Electronic Reconnaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESS</td>
<td>Tactical Air Warfare Center Electronic Warfare Integrated Reprogramming System; Technical Electronic Intelligence (ELINT) Support System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFFECIC</td>
<td>Tactical Fighter Electronic Combat Instructor Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TMO  Transportation Management Office
TFFDD  Time Phased Force Deployment Data
TR  Transportation Request
TSCA  Top Secret Control Account
TSCO  Top Secret Control Officer
TSGT  Technical Sergeant (E-6)
TSWG  Threat Simulator Working Group
TTW  Technical Training Wing
TWG  Threat Working Group
UHFOP  Unintentional Frequency Modulation on Pulse
UMD  Unit Manpower Document
US  Unified and Specified (in terms of command)
USA  United States of America; United States Army
USAF  United States Air Force
USAFE  United States Air Force in Europe
USAFINTEI  United States Air Force Intelligence
USAICS  U.S. Army Intelligence Center and School
USAMIA  U.S. Army Missile Intelligence Agency
USEC  Micro-Seconds
USN  United States Navy
UTC  Unit Type Code
UV  Unit Vacancy
WAPS  Weighed Airmen Promotion System
WNY  Washington Navy Yard
WR-ALC  Warner Robbins Air Logistics Center
WRM  War Readiness Material
WSSIC  Weapons and Space Systems Intelligence Committee
XP  Plans Division
ZULU  Greenwich Mean Time