

DOCUMENT RESUME

07077 - [B2687759]

[Planning for Coast Guard Mobilization under Navy Command in Wartime]. ICD-78-423; E-146896. July 13, 1978. 4 pp.

Report to Secretary, Department of Defense; by Richard W. Gutmann, Director, Logistics and Communications Div.

Issue Area: Military Preparedness Plans (800); Rapid Mobilization Scenarios for Military Forces. (808).

Contact: Logistics and Communications Div.

Budget Function: National Defense; Department of Defense - Military (except procurement & contracts) (051).

Organization Concerned: Department of the Navy; Coast Guard.

Congressional Relevance: House Committee on Armed Services; Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Authority: OPNAV Instruction 4000.79.

A survey of planning for Coast Guard mobilization under Navy command in wartime was concerned with the: adequacy of Navy plans for use of Coast Guard assets in other than normal peacetime roles, readiness of Coast Guard equipment with potential Navy wartime missions, and readiness of Coast Guard personnel to perform wartime missions. On the basis of information available, it appeared that the Navy was planning to use only certain specific Coast Guard vessels in wartime roles and had not adequately considered the potential wartime use of other Coast Guard assets. Among the actions the Navy has initiated to more fully evaluate the potential wartime role of the Coast Guard and to improve interservice coordination was a study to identify wartime and contingency tasks that may be assigned to the Coast Guard and to determine how much and what kinds of equipment should be provided by the Navy. The cost effectiveness of each Coast Guard improvement program will be looked at in two ways: to determine if it is more effective for the Navy to provide equipment to the Coast Guard or to spend the same money on Navy-manned and operated systems; and to address the cost effectiveness of each weapon system to the Coast Guard in carrying out peacetime missions. The study will also address the adequacy of the Navy logistics system to support weapons systems proposed for the Coast Guard, but the study will not address the extent to which the Navy should be involved, in peacetime, in planning and monitoring programs affecting wartime readiness. (RRS)



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

7759

LOGISTICS AND COMMUNICATIONS
DIVISION

B-146896

July 13, 1978

The Honorable
The Secretary of Defense

Dear Mr. Secretary:

We have recently completed a survey of planning for Coast Guard mobilization under Navy command in wartime under assignment code 947280. We were particularly concerned with the (1) adequacy of Navy plans for use of Coast Guard assets in other than their normal peacetime roles, (2) readiness of Coast Guard equipment with potential Navy wartime missions, and (3) readiness of Coast Guard personnel, both active duty and reserves, to perform their wartime missions.

We were unable to fully evaluate the adequacy of Navy planning for use of Coast Guard resources in wartime because we were denied access to pertinent portions of Navy and Coast Guard planning documents. However, on the basis of the information made available to us, it appeared that the Navy was planning to use only certain specific Coast Guard vessels in wartime roles under Navy fleet command and had not adequately considered the potential wartime use of other Coast Guard assets.

While our survey was in progress, the Navy and the Coast Guard initiated a number of actions to more fully evaluate the potential wartime role of the Coast Guard and to improve their interservice coordination.

LCD-78-423
(947280)

Foremost among these actions was the initiation of a Chief of Naval Operations study of U.S. Coast Guard wartime capabilities by the Center for Naval Analyses. This study, scheduled for completion in December 1978, has the following two main objectives:

- To identify wartime and contingency tasks which may be assigned to the Coast Guard.
- To determine how much and what kinds of equipment should be provided by the Navy.

Under the study, the cost effectiveness of each Coast Guard improvement program will be looked at in two ways.

- First, the study will determine if it is more effective for the Navy to provide equipment to the Coast Guard or to spend the same money on Navy-manned and operated systems.
- Second, the study will address the cost effectiveness of each weapon system to the Coast Guard in carrying out its peacetime missions.

The study will also address the adequacy of the Navy logistics support system to support each weapon system proposed for the Coast Guard.

One area the study apparently will not address is the extent that the Navy should be involved, in peacetime, in planning and monitoring of Coast Guard programs affecting wartime readiness, such as reserve force training. For example, Port Security is a mission that the Coast Guard will perform extensively in wartime. In peacetime, only a small number of active duty personnel are assigned to Port Security. In wartime, most of the personnel who will be involved in this mission will come from the Coast Guard Reserve. Of the over 11,000 selected reserve spaces, about 68 percent are to augment Port Security units in wartime.

The Coast Guard's reserve training policy emphasizes that reservists will spend 65 percent of their training time in augmentation training at active units. We were told at one Coast Guard district, however, that reservists were not being adequately trained to perform their wartime mobilization missions because they spend too much time augmenting active units that do not have such missions as Port Security. If this situation prevails in other Coast Guard districts, many reservists may not be receiving adequate training in the duties they would perform in wartime. We believe the study should include consideration of the extent that the Navy should participate in such matters as the development and monitoring of training programs for Coast Guard reservists.

In addition to the wartime capabilities study, the following actions have also been taken by the Navy and the Coast Guard.

- Issuance of OPNAV Instruction 4000.79, dated May 13, 1977, setting forth the policy for Navy support to the Coast Guard.
- Updating the Navy/Coast Guard interservice support agreement.
- Issuance of wartime mission statements by the Navy for certain Coast Guard assets.
- Designation of contact points in each service responsible for interservice coordination of key functions and programs.
- Initiation of a request for an assessment by the Office of Naval Intelligence of potential threats to U.S. harbors.

In view of the initiatives described above, we do not contemplate any further reporting on this subject and are not making any recommendations at this time. However, we plan to evaluate the results of the U.S. Coast Guard Wartime Capabilities Study and the implementation of its recommendations at a later date.

A similar letter is being sent to the Secretary of Transportation. Copies are being sent to the Secretary of the Navy and the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "R. W. Gutmann".

R. W. Gutmann
Director