BY THE U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Report To The Secretary Of Defense

Greater Coordination Required In Defense Planning For Intratheater Airlift Needs

Intratheater airlift--movement of passengers and cargo within combat theaters by air--provides the capability to move quickly, even between points separated by impassable terrain. For over a decade, Defense and the Congress have been concerned with inadequate intratheater airlift capabilities. However, little progress has been made.

The Defense structure for common use intratheater airlift is workable, but the numerous organizations involved and the transfers of operational control planned during war make strong coordination a key to success.

GAO found that Defense commands' planning for intratheater airlift varied from extensive to virtually nonexistent and that coordination was lacking. Efforts to improve capability have been unsuccessful. GAO recommendations aim toward improved oversight and coordination of common use intratheater airlift planning to aid in meeting airlift needs.

PLRD-81-42
JULY 9, 1981

Request for copies of GAO reports should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Document Handling and Information
Services Facility
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Md. 20760

Telephone (202) 275-6241

The first five copies of individual reports are free of charge. Additional copies of bound audit reports are $3.25 each. Additional copies of unbound report (i.e., letter reports) and most other publications are $1.00 each. There will be a 25% discount on all orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address. Sales orders must be prepaid on a cash, check, or money order basis. Check should be made out to the "Superintendent of Documents".

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

PROCUREMENT, LOGISTICS,
AND READINESS DIVISION

B-203466

The Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger
The Secretary of Defense

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This report discusses the Department of Defense's intratheater airlift. A supplement, which discusses classified intratheater airlift plans in the European and Pacific theaters, is being provided to you under separate cover. We did not request formal agency comments, but we did discuss the issues in this report with Defense officials associated with intratheater airlift.

This report contains recommendations to the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Commander in Chief, Military Airlift Command, on page 14. We would appreciate being informed of action taken on our recommendations.

We are sending copies of this report to the Director, Office of Management and Budget; the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; the Commander in Chief, Military Airlift Command; and the Chairmen of the appropriate congressional committees.

Sincerely yours,

Donald J. Horan

Donald J. Horan
Director

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
REPORT TO THE SECRETARY OF
DEFENSE

GREATER COORDINATION REQUIRED IN DEFENSE PLANNING FOR INTRA-THEATER AIRLIFT NEEDS

D I G E S T

Intratheater airlift provides an essential capability to move personnel and materiel quickly within combat theaters and between points which are separated by impassable terrain. Although the Department of Defense has a workable organization to manage such airlift and has made commendable progress in fostering planning efforts, GAO found that Defense planners still do not have adequate information to plan for wartime needs. Where planners have identified shortfalls, Defense efforts to address the problems have fallen short.

Airlift may be categorized as intertheater, common use intratheater, and specialized intratheater. Intertheater airlift (also called strategic airlift) involves long-range lift and is managed by the Air Force's Military Airlift Command. Intratheater airlift involves shorter distances, and its responsibilities are divided among Air Force and other military service commands.

GAO evaluated Defense's efforts to match intratheater airlift need and capability because of apparent problems and longstanding congressional interest. The evaluation dealt primarily with the common use intratheater airlift managed by the Military Airlift Command.

COMMON USE INTRATHEATER AIRLIFT PLANS ARE INCOMPLETE AND SHOULD BE BETTER COORDINATED

The Military Airlift Command, as the central manager for common use intratheater airlift provided to all military services, is responsible for planning for such needs. Individual services and unified theater commands determine and set priorities for movement requirements, and the Military Airlift Command determines how these requirements can be met. The Joint Chiefs of Staff sets overall priorities and provides direction to the Military Airlift Command.

The Military Airlift Command's tactical airlift squadrons have Lockheed C-130s, the primary Air Force asset for intratheater airlift. Augmentation by more C-130s and other aircraft is available from the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, and commercial airlines.

GAO found that planning for common use intratheater air movement and aircraft requirements varies from extensive to nearly nonexistent. In Europe, the theater command has studied such needs in detail. In the Pacific, only fragmentary data were available, but the theater command in Korea began further efforts during GAO's review. The Military Airlift Command has little overall data on intratheater airlift movement requirements. At Defense headquarters levels, priority on strategic needs results in little emphasis on intratheater planning.

Military services, unified commands, and Defense have made commendable progress in planning for intratheater airlift. However, they need to do more because their plans are not yet complete and coordination among theater and headquarters commands can be improved. Variations in planning, coupled with a lack of awareness by commands regarding what other organizations are doing, indicate a need to better coordinate common use intratheater airlift planning (see pp. 8 to 11).

Because of gaps in the planning process, Defense decisions on major airlift proposals have been based on partial data which leave unanswered basic questions regarding movement and aircraft requirements and relative priority of tactical versus strategic needs.

GAO did not request formal comments on this report from either Defense or the Air Force but did discuss the report's contents with Defense officials associated with intratheater airlift. Their views have been incorporated in the report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To better determine intratheater movement and aircraft requirements, GAO recommends that the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Commander in Chief, Military Airlift Command, improve oversight and coordination of common use intratheater airlift

planning, including greater participation by the Military Airlift Command in component and theater command efforts. They should

--improve methods to determine movement and aircraft requirements at the theater command levels and relate such requirements to capability;

--ensure consistent use of the most appropriate intratheater airlift planning methods within the Military Airlift Command, theater commands, and other services; and

--ensure that mobilization plans more adequately reflect intratheater movement requirements and capabilities.

Contents

ABBREVIATIONS

GAO	General Accounting Office
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
MAC	Military Airlift Command
USAFE	U.S. Air Forces, Europe

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Airlift may be categorized as intertheater (strategic), common use intratheater (tactical), and specialized intratheater. Intertheater airlift involves long-range lift between and among combat theaters and the United States and is managed by the Air Force's Military Airlift Command (MAC). Intratheater movements are shorter and are within a theater of operations. Responsibility for common use intratheater airlift--the subject of this report--centers on MAC.

Although MAC, as the owner and operator of common use active airlift forces, has a central role in the related planning and management, unified theater commands and the other military services have key roles in determining movement requirements. The unified theater commands discussed in this report include the European, Pacific, and Readiness commands.

The primary aircraft for common use within theaters is the Lockheed C-130, which is assigned to MAC Active Forces, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard. The Air Reserve Forces also have Fairchild C-123 and DeHavilland C-7 aircraft. Commercial aircraft, such as the Boeing 727 and 737 and the McDonnell Douglas DC-9 of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, can be used to supplement the Air Force's fleet.

The normal basing of military airlift for common use within theaters is shown in the following table.

Primary Aircraft Authorized in Operational Squadrons

	Asia/Western Pacific	United States and Panama	Europe and Mediterranean	Total
Active Forces				
C-130	32	a/170	16	218
Reserve Forces				
C-130	0	280	0	280
C-7/123	0	62	0	62

a/Sixteen aircraft are assigned to Europe on a rotating basis.

Courtesy of U.S. Air Force

The Lockheed C-130 Hercules is the basic intratheater transport in the United States airlift fleet. The first production C-130A flew in 1955, and its numerous variants have been in production for one-third of the entire history of powered flight. The C-130E can carry 92 passengers, 74 litter patients, or 45,000 lbs. of cargo. The current production model is the C-130H. SOURCE: U.S. AIR FORCE

Courtesy of U.S. Air Force

The Fairchild C-123 Provider is a light assault transport whose first production model flew in 1954. No longer in the active Air Force, the aircraft still fly in the Air Force Reserve. Carrying 58 passengers, 50 litter patients, or 21,000 lbs. of cargo, the C-123K can take off and land in austere airfields too small for the C-130. SOURCE: U.S. AIR FORCE

Courtesy of U.S. Air Force

The DeHavilland Canada C-7 Caribou is a short takeoff and landing (STOL) transport whose ability to take off from short, unprepared fields (1,500 feet) in all weather conditions led to widespread use in Southeast Asia. No longer in the active Air Force, the remaining aircraft fly in the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard. The aircraft can carry 25 or more passengers, or up to about 9,000 lbs. of cargo.

In addition to the Air Force's common use airlift aircraft, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have aircraft assigned for their respective needs. The latter aircraft are largely intended for specialized purposes, such as Army combat assault helicopters and Navy airlift to ships at sea. These specialized assets are not further discussed in this report.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Our objective was to assess Defense efforts to match intratheater airlift need and capability. We met with Defense representatives and examined their records to identify established movement requirements, current capability to meet movement requirements, and both near- and long-term plans for intratheater airlift. To this end, we also examined Defense testimony to the Congress and related congressional committee reports.

We worked at headquarters, Department of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS), and each military service to identify headquarters level planning and coordination. We also worked at services' command and field offices in Germany, Korea, the Philippines, and the United States to identify need and capability as determined by users and airlift managers. Specific locations visited are identified in appendix I.

In addition to interviewing officials at these locations, we examined records, such as mobilization planning data, aircraft inventories, aircraft maintenance data, and Defense analyses of intratheater airlift issues. We assessed consistency of Defense movement and aircraft requirements not only among components, but also within components. We compared capability with movement requirements; however, we neither assessed the adequacy of mobilization plans, nor did we try to independently determine movement requirements.

This evaluation dealt primarily with common use intratheater airlift managed by MAC. We focused on Defense efforts to match intratheater airlift need and capability because of apparent problems and longstanding congressional interest. However, we also considered the relationship of intratheater airlift issues to the broader issues of all airlift and mobility.

We did not examine overall Defense justifications for the CX air transport, a Defense proposal primarily addressed to stated shortfalls in intertheater (strategic) airlift capability. However, we considered the CX's intratheater capabilities to the extent such tactical capabilities were included in Defense proposals. Our reports in October 1980 1/ and April 1981 2/ addressed issues which needed to be resolved at the proposal stage of the CX program.

1/"The DOD Should Resolve Certain Issues Concerning the CX Aircraft Before Requesting Proposals from Industry" (PSAD-81-8, Oct. 10, 1980).

2/"Major Issues Concerning the C-X Range and Payload Remain Unresolved" (MASAD-81-24, Apr. 6, 1981).

CHAPTER 2

INTRATHEATER AIRLIFT CAN BE STRENGTHENED THROUGH MORE COMPREHENSIVE AND COORDINATED PLANNING

Intratheater, or tactical, airlift is an essential part of mobility within combat theaters. Once little more than a means of transportation for unanticipated emergencies, such airlift is now included in preliminary planning as a normal adjunct of combat operations. Impassable terrain or urgency for speed can make the need for intratheater airlift critical.

Providing adequate intratheater airlift capability requires comprehensive and coordinated planning. Movement requirements must be determined and ranked, and capability must be identified and allocated to best meet the most critical requirements. In the event of unmet needs, planning can then consider not only alternatives to improve capability, but also the impact of alternatives to reduce movement requirements. Such a planning process involves combat theater commands and creates the need for coordination among the numerous military organizations involved.

Military services, unified commands, and Defense have made commendable progress in intratheater airlift planning. However, they need to do more because plans are not yet complete and coordination among participating organizations can be improved. Questions remain about intratheater movement and resulting aircraft requirements and how the requirements will be met.

MAC IS THE DEFENSE MANAGER FOR COMMON USE INTRATHEATER AIRLIFT

Defense and JCS have given MAC the responsibility of providing common use airlift support to all military services. Because of the priority of its airlift role, MAC has been designated a specified command of the U.S. Air Force. As such, the MAC commanding general reports directly to the Secretary of Defense through JCS on airlift matters. The commanding general receives peacetime direction and day-to-day administrative and logistical support from the Air Force. As a specified command, MAC is responsible to plan and execute airlift missions during periods of crisis and war in support of other commands and to coordinate and exercise airlift strategy, doctrine, and plans under JCS direction.

In planning for common use airlift, theater commanders are to determine movement requirements, in coordination with Air Force commands and MAC; rank such requirements within their theaters; convert movement requirements to aircraft requirements; and submit

the requirements to JCS. Methods of coordination between the Air Force and other services vary. In Europe, a joint Army, Navy, and Air Force regulation cites specific tasks and responsibilities for preplanned airlift and requires commanders to review airlift needs semiannually. Transportation managers in each component command are to report changes directly to the Headquarters, U.S. Air Forces in Europe (USAFE), for coordination with the MAC theater airlift manager (Commander of Airlift Forces). In the Pacific, however, regulations do not require such periodic requirement determinations. Command planning has been on a project basis, and coordination has been on an ad hoc basis.

JCS ranks and provides overall aircraft requirements data to MAC. MAC then allocates intratheater airlift resources in accordance with JCS and unified command priorities. Under current contingency procedures, MAC would deliver the aircraft and related assets to specified locations and turn operational control over to the unified theater commands. MAC has proposed that all airlift assets be assigned to it, even in contingencies; however, the proposal has not been approved.

The Defense structure for common use intratheater airlift planning is relatively efficient and viable, but the numerous organizations involved and the transfers of operational control planned during war make strong coordination a key to success.

MAC has actively participated in airlift planning overall, but it can improve participation in certain areas, particularly in helping theater commands determine intratheater movement requirements and how intratheater airlift assets will be used in contingencies. In chapter 3, we point out such opportunities for greater coordination between MAC and the theater commands.

DOES TOP DEFENSE MANAGEMENT HAVE ADEQUATE DATA TO DETERMINE OVERALL INTRATHEATER AIRLIFT REQUIREMENTS AND TO SET PRIORITIES?

Defense proposals to improve airlift capability should be based on validated and ranked movement requirements. Determining overall requirements and setting priorities can be difficult, particularly if the needed data are incomplete, and if the input from various participating organizations is not consistent.

Although Defense testimony to the Congress has portrayed a longstanding need to lift personnel and materiel within a theater, problems in planning for intratheater airlift (see ch. 3) have prevented precise determination of what and how much is needed. These problems have limited Defense's ability to validate needs.

Since 1970, Defense has initiated two major proposals to improve intratheater airlift. The first proposal involved developing

an intratheater transport--the advanced medium short takeoff and landing transport--whose development lasted from 1971 to 1979. The second proposal began in 1979, and it involves developing a strategic transport--the CX--with secondary intratheater capability.

Defense decisions on these major airlift proposals have been based on limited data and leave basic questions not only in movement and aircraft requirements, but also in relative priority of tactical versus strategic needs. We further discuss past and current Defense plans to meet such intratheater requirements in chapter 3.

CHAPTER 3

COMMON USE INTRATHEATER AIRLIFT PLANS ARE INCOMPLETE AND SHOULD BE BETTER COORDINATED

Means for determining common use intratheater movement and airlift requirements and improving airlift capabilities vary considerably among organizations and are not well coordinated. Airlift planning among theater commands varies from extensive to nearly nonexistent. Planning by Defense and service headquarters and theater commands is often done independently, without coordinating what scenarios to use and how to quantify movement requirements and capability. Therefore, Defense planners do not have, in our opinion, sufficient information on worldwide intratheater movement requirements or the necessary data to rank those requirements. Without such data, Defense cannot ensure optimal distribution of existing tactical airlift resources among theaters or be assured of the accuracy of decisions affecting procurement of tactical versus strategic airlift resources.

QUANTIFICATION OF COMMON USE REQUIREMENTS VARIES FROM EXTENSIVE TO NEARLY NONEXISTENT

The bulk of military transportation planning for airlift is aimed at getting men and materials from the United States to a combat theater; less emphasis has been placed on planning for such movements within a theater. Defense officials advised us that some intratheater planning had been done at the Washington headquarters level, but that detailed planning for common use intratheater airlift would involve MAC and the theater commanders.

MAC, which is Defense's central manager for all common use airlift, has little data on intratheater movement requirements. MAC officials advised us that in a contingency the command would simply send aircraft to locations specified by JCS. The officials said that, if done at all, movement requirements are determined within theater commands, such as the Pacific and Europe commands.

JCS provides unified theater commanders with basic assumptions and general information, including the available resources. Using this information, theater commanders are to determine strategy and prepare a detailed plan of action for numerous aspects of contingencies, including transportation.

The level of planning at theater commands varies greatly. USAFE has studied intratheater movement and aircraft requirements in detail and is continuing to do so. Although the unified

Pacific Command has not quantified intratheater requirements beyond stating the number of aircraft desired, the subordinate theater command in Korea began efforts to further quantify common use movement requirements during our review. The U.S. Readiness Command was only in the early stages of planning for overall movement requirements of the Rapid Deployment Force.

Detailed analyses of European needs

USAFE has analyzed intratheater airlift needs in support of a central European conflict in detail. A September 1978 report entitled "Intratheater Airlift Movement Analysis - Fiscal Year 1978" discusses movement requirements and shortfalls in capability. The USAFE analysis is described in detail, including our observations, in the classified supplement to this report. During our review, USAFE staff were updating the study to reflect current movement requirements.

The USAFE analysis appeared to be well reasoned and documented, although its results and conclusions are sensitive to assumptions, such as the amount of time available to prepare for expected contingencies. In accordance with MAC/USAFE agreements, USAFE coordinated data with MAC representatives. USAFE totaled the known and estimated requirements, computed the flying hours necessary to meet movement requirements, and compared the needed flying hours with flying hours available from existing assets.

USAFE analysts divided the services' movement requirements into the following four categories:

--Requirements which are programed to occur on a specific date, regardless of the tactical situation, can be forecast and be preplanned for movement.

--Requirements which are programed to occur after a specific triggering event are generally known except for the specific time at which they will occur. Preplanned scheduling may not be feasible, but support requirements may be identified in advance.

--Requirements which depend entirely on the tactical situation may have a high probability of occurrence but cannot be reasonably predicted as to location, quantity, or frequency of movement.

--Requirements which may not meet the first two criteria above, but which normally would recur among known locations, can be incorporated into a preplanned route structure.

While the analysts considered only three of the categories to be reasonably predictable, the analysts emphasized the importance of considering even the least predictable category. In our opinion, the categories could be useful in planning for intratheater airlift in other theaters as well.

Lack of detailed analyses of Pacific area needs

At the beginning of our review, officials of the Pacific Command said that their intratheater airlift needs had not been quantified and that such quantification would be extremely difficult, if not impossible. The command believed that tactical airlift movement requirements "directly relate to the employment of forces and actual battle scenario," and that these matters do not lend themselves "to ready numerical analysis due to the overwhelming volume of variable factors involved."

According to Pacific Command officials, they planned to simply have a specified number of aircraft available to meet whatever requests may be received from day-to-day transportation needs. The highest priority needs would be met first, and requests in excess of capability would not be met. Beyond such general rules, they said they did not know what types of movement requirements could or could not be met.

During our review, U.S. Forces, Korea, the theater command for that country, began to analyze theater movements with a view toward better quantifying its intratheater transportation needs--including airlift. The classified supplement further describes Pacific area planning efforts.

Rapid deployment planning at an early stage

The U.S. Readiness Command and the Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force have only begun overall planning for the rapid deployment concept. Thus far, they have partially determined intratheater airlift movement requirements. The command extrapolated the requirements based on an April 1980 exercise, Positive Leap. We were advised by task force officials that a congressionally mandated mobility study addresses intratheater needs for rapid deployment, but the study was not completed during our review.

LACK OF COORDINATION AMONG THEATER AND HEADQUARTERS COMMANDS

Variations in planning, and the fact that the commands involved were not always aware of what others were doing, demonstrate the need need for greater coordination among theater and headquarters commands. For example, more than a year after USAFE had completed its 1978 intratheater airlift movement analysis, Pacific Command officials advised us that quantification of intratheater needs would be difficult, if not impossible. Airlift planners

in the Pacific told us that they were not acquainted with the study, even though MAC officials had access to the analysis.

Another example of the lack of coordination is the work of a task force to determine movement and aircraft requirements for the CX transport now being proposed to the Congress. Intratheater requirements were developed, but the requirements were apparently not coordinated with theater commanders, who are responsible for determining such requirements. Advance coordination would have been difficult because the task force worked under extreme time constraints during its about 4-month existence. However, subsequent coordination could have helped to test the validity of the task force's work. Also, Army and Marine Corps representatives participated in the task force, but the Navy did not participate.

MAC, as the Defense central manager for airlift, is in a good position to coordinate intratheater movement requirements with theater commands, but MAC headquarters officials advised us they are not closely involved in such efforts. As previously noted, they told us that MAC headquarters receives the theater commanders' aircraft requirements from JCS.

MAC initiatives

The comments in this chapter about MAC's lack of involvement in common use intratheater airlift planning are not intended to imply a general lack of MAC concern for intratheater airlift. They are only intended to point out apparent gaps in the overall effort because MAC's initiatives have been commendable, particularly in assessing the capability of current assets and tactics and in testing new and better ways to use existing assets.

MAC studies have assessed tactical airlift capabilities and potential threats. In February 1980 MAC reported its results on phase I of Project Close Look II, a comprehensive effort to investigate means to improve operational capabilities in tactical airlift. On the basis of project results, MAC reported that tactics needed to be changed and aircraft equipment needed to be modernized and MAC made numerous recommendations. MAC is continuing additional phases of the project, and MAC officials expect the project to provide the framework and impetus to enhance MAC capabilities for the 1980s. Also, in a February 1981 report, MAC assessed threats to airlift from attack helicopters.

The Air Force Airlift Center at Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, has initiated numerous projects to determine whether and how selected items can be loaded on MAC aircraft and to see if new equipment works, but covering a wider range of objectives as well. Recent intratheater projects include tests of a new lighting system, methods to reduce fuel consumption, and feasibility of

nonstandard operations to develop data on what is possible in wartime emergencies.

EFFORTS TO IMPROVE INTRATHEATER AIRLIFT CAPABILITIES HAVE BEEN UNSUCCESSFUL

For over a decade, Defense and the Congress have been concerned about inadequate intratheater airlift capabilities. However, little progress has been made.

Defense testimony before the Congress throughout the 1970s has included discussions of problems with intratheater airlift, including insufficient numbers of aircraft, inadequate range and payload for light transport aircraft, and limited takeoff and landing performance in C-130 aircraft. During this period, the Air Force proposed, and the Congress supported, a three-pronged effort to improve intratheater airlift. This effort included

--replacing existing light transport aircraft with more modern aircraft,

--developing and procuring a more capable medium transport aircraft to replace the C-130, and

--continuing long-range development for a vertical/short takeoff and landing aircraft.

However, Defense and the Air Force have made little progress over the last 10 years in improving intratheater airlift capabilities. For example, Defense did not approve Air Force plans to acquire more modern light transport aircraft. Also, the Air Force developed and tested a replacement for the C-130 but, after a period of abeyance, the Secretary of Defense canceled the program in 1979. Finally, Defense determined that development of a new generation vertical/short takeoff transport was not cost effective.

Since 1979 the Secretary of Defense has directed that emphasis be given to developing the CX transport aircraft. Defense and military service representatives said that procuring both intertheater and intratheater aircraft was considered a political and practical impossibility. They said Defense officials had determined that the money to buy an advanced medium short takeoff and landing transport could be better used to augment intertheater needs, particularly since this would be the only major airlift procurement program before the year 2000. As of April 1981, Defense proposed to continue developing the CX aircraft through fiscal year 1982 at a cost of about $246 million, while continuing to examine the trade-off between new designs and existing aircraft.

Our examination of the secondary tactical mission of the proposed CX transport showed some tactical capability, but not

enough to meet previously stated tactical needs. Whereas the Air Force in 1970 described a desired short field capability of 1,000 to 2,000 feet, the CX's austere field is about 3,000 feet long. Also, Defense and service officials said the primary strategic role of the CX could limit aircraft availability to meet simultaneous tactical needs, and the cost of the relatively large CX could limit use near a combat zone.

CONCLUSIONS

Progress in developing intratheater airlift--from an emergency expedient to a preplanned adjunct of combat operations--has been commendable, but much more can be done. We believe the USAFE analysis is the type of grass roots planning which is needed for an effective movement capability. But, the Pacific Command has had more limited results.

Overall management of common use airlift has been centralized under MAC, but coordination among the numerous organizations involved has had several gaps. The varying degrees of planning and lack of coordination demonstrate the need for greater involvement of Defense headquarters levels, particularly JCS and MAC. They could help assure a uniform means of determining airlift requirements among military services and theater commands. Also, MAC is in a good position to consider related aspects of intratheater airlift, such as evaluating the impact of combat zone helicopter capability on fixed wing intratheater needs.

Without adequate procedures to develop worldwide intratheater airlift requirements data, Defense cannot determine what and how much airlift capability is needed. This, in turn, adversely affects decisions on procurements of tactical airlift aircraft, distribution of existing tactical airlift assets, and alternatives for meeting shortfalls in tactical airlift capabilities.

Better planning of intratheater airlift movement requirements is needed by the unified commands, along with greater coordination among the commands, Defense, JCS, and MAC, to assure sound requirement determinations worldwide and to adequately plan for the necessary aircraft to satisfy movement requirements. We believe such data is necessary to properly determine intratheater aircraft requirements, to logically distribute existing intratheater lift assets, and to better balance strategic versus intratheather aircraft needs.

We did not request formal comments on this report from either Defense or the Air Force, but we discussed the report's contents with Defense officials associated with intratheater airlift. Their views have been incorporated in the report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To better determine intratheater movement and aircraft requirements, we recommend that the Chairman, JCS, and the Commander in Chief, MAC, improve oversight and coordination of common use intratheater airlift planning, including greater participation by MAC in component and theater command efforts. They should

- --improve methods to determine movement and aircraft requirements at the theater command levels and relate such requirements to capability;
- --ensure consistent use of the most appropriate intratheater airlift planning methods within MAC, theater commands, and other services;
- --ensure that mobilization plans more adequately reflect intratheater movement requirements and capability.

FIELD COMMANDS VISITED DURING GAO'S REVIEW

UNITED STATES

U.S. Readiness Command, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida

U.S. Pacific Command, Camp H.M. Smith, Hawaii

U.S. Navy Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii

Naval Air Force, Pacific, San Diego, California

Fleet Marine Forces Pacific, Camp H.M. Smith, Hawaii

MAC, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois

Pacific Air Forces, Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii

U.S. Air Force Airlift Center, Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina

834th Airlift Division, Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii

GERMANY

U.S. European Command, Stuttgart

U.S. Army Europe, Heidelberg

V Corps, Frankfurt

4th Transportation Brigade, Oberursel

USAFE, Ramstein Air Base

435th Tactical Airlift Wing, Rhein-Main Air Base

KOREA

U.S. Forces, Korea, Seoul

314th Air Divison, Seoul

PHILIPPINES

Fleet Tactical Support Squadron (VRC-50), Naval Air Station, Cubi Point

374th Tactical Airlift Wing, Clark Air Base

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE,$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

THIRD CLASS