

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Event: Continental United States Air Defense Region (CONR) field site visit
Type of event: Interview with Major Jim Millovich and Major Robert Del Toro
Date: Wednesday, February 04, 2004
Special Access Issues: Clearance check
Prepared by: Geoffrey Brown
Team Number: 8
Location: CONR HQ Building
Participants - Non-Commission: Major Mathew Duffin, Staff JAG
Participants - Commission: Team 8: John Azzarello, Geoffrey Brown. John Farmer,
Miles Kara, Kevin Shaeffer

Note: Please refer to the recorded interview for further details.

Background:

Del Toro is currently the Deputy Director for Intelligence with First Air Force (1st AF). He has been with Tyndall, Air Force Base (Tyndall AFB) for nine years and prior to that he was an airborne intelligence officer; prior to that he was an intelligence officer for the F-15 and the F-4E. On September 11, 2001 (9/11) he was in the Battle Cab as the Intelligence Officer.

Millovich is currently the Chief of Live Exercises for 1st AF. He was at Western Air Defense Sector (WADS) prior to coming to CONR in 2002. He is primarily responsible for live exercises, but does participate in some simulated exercises. On 9/11 he was waiting to transition to CONR from WADS. He was working with the exercise division at WADS on 9/11, and is Senior Director qualified.

Pre-9/11:

Del Toro explained that the North American Aerospace Defense (NORAD) exercise scenarios were written at NORAD. If it was a CONR based exercise it would be written at CONR. Sector only exercises are written at the sector level.

Del Toro noted that exercises are designed for value-added training, and may not be directly linked to intelligence. Del Toro noted that the incorporation of real-world intelligence and threat scenarios into the value-added training can meet the needs of a sectors training objectives, but are not the drivers for the creation of an exercise. Del Toro noted that the training objectives themselves are always evolving based on what is scene as the necessary performance level to respond to real world strategic threats and emerging technologies.

UNCLASSIFIED
Commission Sensitive

Millovich noted that pre-9/11 from the Operations perspective there were certain objectives that the operations preparedness had to be evaluated for. He noted that sometimes the scenarios would be considered quite unlikely from an intelligence standpoint, but those scenarios would be exercised because they met training and evaluation objectives.

Post-9/11:

Del Toro agreed with Millovich, and explained to Commission staff that the purpose of intelligence in exercise scenarios is to drive the training and evaluation objectives for strategic aviation NORAD responsibilities. He told Commission staff that now they have more of a flexible approach towards looking at trans-national events and asymmetrical developed objectives.

Del Toro noted that he does not believe there was an air defense exercise that would establish defense over an urban area.

Hijacking training:

Del Toro noted that almost every exercise was built to respond to some type of general aviation event, and in large scale multi-day training exercises there would often be a hijack scenario.

Millovich commented that "at one point" almost every scenario they exercised included a hijack; but never in his knowledge was a scenario of a suicide hijack event. Del Toro explained that there was once a testing of a force protection ground-based air defense capability that built into an exercise including a general aviation threat to the Southeast Air Defense Sector (SEADS), but that event was built to test the force protection capacity of the base.

Exercise drivers:

Del Toro noted, for instance, that when new systems "come online", the operations personnel need to be tested to discover if they can meet the objective of responding to the new threat implied by the new system. He noted that scenarios could be described as testing operational planning; not testing the capacity to respond directly to intelligence. He further commented that it would be a mischaracterization to say that creative exercise scenarios can be linked to real world intelligence of a threat.

9/11:

Del Toro was in the Battle Cab for the Vigilant Guardian exercise and the real-world Russian exercise. He had connections via intelligence logs to multiple other intelligence offices.

Commission Sensitive
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED
Commission Sensitive

Del Toro noted that his entries into the Intel Chat Log were based on his situational awareness of the information flowing into and through the CONR Battle Cab. His intent was to keep his peers in the other intelligence officers "up to speed" as best he could with his understanding of ongoing events and actions at CONR.

Del Toro noted that the Intel Chat Log is meant as a conversation between intelligence officers from which they can discern the truth from all the information, as best they can, and pass that estimate to their commanding officer. He commented that often non-intelligence personnel will look at the intelligence chat log and take what is written as the intelligence projection, when the projection is really what is discerned from that conversation-based information.

Del Toro noted that if intelligence was not in a finished intelligence brief, then it would not reach the desk of a NORAD intelligence officer. CONR intelligence can be viewed as a "consumer" intelligence client. He further explained that they would often make a scenario that attempted to beat the training objectives of the operators.

Post-9/11:

Del Toro noted that ultimately over the last two years there has been a larger emphasis on sharing intelligence information that was traditionally only for law enforcement personnel.

Commission Sensitive
UNCLASSIFIED