

**REVIEW OF
COAST GUARD
WARTIME TASKING;
A REPORT**



MAR 24 1981

Dear Admiral

This is to keep you informed about developments in the efforts to restructure our relationship with the Navy. On 19 March 1981, the Navy-Coast Guard Board approved the Joint Wartime Tasking Study, a copy of which is enclosed. The study will now be submitted to Chief of Naval Operations and Commandant for approval. I believe this study will prove an invaluable management tool as we determine future requirements in both our wartime and peacetime missions. The NAVGARD Board agreed to three follow-on actions. First, and most important is the study of command relationships and organization in establishing the Maritime Defense Zone. An ad hoc study group will be established to develop a mission statement to determine organizational relationships and resource requirements. As this will have significant impact on Fleet and Area commanders, their inclusion is imperative to this study. Specific details regarding this follow-on study will be provided separately.

A second ad hoc study group will be established to address the Coast Guard's role in the Naval Control of Shipping mission. Another will be formed to examine our contribution to the Mine Countermeasure mission. These ad hoc study groups will be principally formed within our respective Headquarters. The Chief, Military Readiness Division, will coordinate Coast Guard input in all these efforts.

The ad hoc working group which focused on upgrading the HAMILTON has already completed its work. I am pleased to report that the Navy has agreed to upgrading various combat systems including substituting the 5"/38 gun, the MK56 GFCS with the MK75/76mm gun and MK92 FCS. The SPS 40B air search radar will replace the SPS-29. The WLR-1 will be replaced by the SLQ 32 and NAVMACS. A+ communications will be added. In conjunction with our upgrade

of the flight decks, the Navy will add the LAMPS I electronics equipment. Space and weight will be reserved for TACTAS and CIWs. The Navy investment will be approximately \$20.1M for each HEC. We are seeking matching funds in our AC&I appropriation to accomplish mid-life renovation. We contemplate, subject to budgetary approval, a major maintenance availability of approximately \$6M. We will also relocate CIC and radio improve the flight deck and add rudder roll stabilization. To improve operating capability and weight and moment, we will replace the existing boats and davit system with RHIB's and single point davit. We plan to begin to program in FY83 renovating three ships each year. While the foregoing information is not for publication, it can and should be shared with the Coast Guard.

Discussion of the HAMILTON class lead to discussion of the 270 MEC. The Vice Chief of Naval Operations, ADM WATKINS, is concerned that the space and weight reservation concept upon which we have based future growth of the BEAR class may not work. ADM WATKINS wants to know how much time the combat system additions will take to install and check out. We are, therefore, planning to use one of the first four 270's for this purpose. The Vice Commandant acquainted the Navy with our plans to replace the HH-3F. Our Navy counterparts were most interested in our proposal to include some military capabilities in our mission statement. There are advantages to both parties if we are able to find a mutually acceptable airframe.

I am encouraged by Navy's attention to our proposals. The Navy-Coast Guard Board seems to be an effective forum. The Vice Chief of Naval Operations, in testifying on our behalf before the House Merchant

REVIEW OF COAST GUARD WARTIME TASKING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
I - INTRODUCTION	1
II - BACKGROUND	3
III - ANALYSIS	
Part 1 - COAST GUARD MISSIONS & WARTIME CAPABILITIES.	11
Part 2 - NAVY MISSIONS/CG CAPABILITIES	21
Part 3 - EXPANDED WARTIME TASKING POTENTIAL	31
VI - ORGANIZATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS	37
V - CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS	38

REVIEW OF COAST GUARD WARTIME TASKING

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Coast Guard agreed to conduct a joint comprehensive examination of Coast Guard wartime tasking. Over the past few years legislation affecting the Coast Guard has tended to focus its operations in the U.S. littoral sea and the future appears to offer no change to this trend. Over the same time frame the Navy, at the direction of DOD, has given priority to operations normally associated with forward areas. The Coast Guard operational presence in the littoral sea offered the opportunity for the service to make a contribution in wartime tasks normally associated with the area and in the peacetime preparations and exercising for those tasks.

The analysis compares present Coast Guard programs and capabilities with broad naval missions and identifies areas where the Coast Guard could logically make a contribution. Wartime tasking was then placed in three categories:

- . NEW TASKING
 - Naval Control of Shipping
 - Harbor Defense and Security
 - Mine Countermeasures
- . EXPANDED EXISTING TASKING
 - Inshore Undersea Warfare
 - Anti-submarine Warfare
 - SAR/Salvage
 - Surveillance and Interdiction
 - Convoy Escort
- . NO CHANGE IN TASKING
 - Explosive Ordnance Loading
 - Aids to Navigation
 - Port Safety and Security
 - Security of Locks and Dams
 - Surface Vessel Ferry Command
 - Anchorage Regulation
 - Non-Combat Operations
 - Intelligence
 - Control of Pilot Qualifications
 - Icebreaking

Agreement on these revised mission assignments acknowledges that specific force levels and resource decisions will be the subject of joint working groups acting at the direction of the Navy/Coast Guard Board and be subject to the budget priorities of both services.

The study also concludes that Coast Guard Area Commanders should become the organizational element responsible to the Fleet Commander for the planning and coordination of our coastal defense. This too would be dependent upon the acquisition of the necessary resources and require ongoing close liaison between Fleet Commander, Area Commander and the respective service's headquarters staffs.

REVIEW OF COAST GUARD WARTIME TASKING

I - INTRODUCTION

The Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Coast Guard have jointly agreed to a comprehensive examination of Coast Guard wartime missions. There are several reasons for this. Today, Coast Guard wartime tasking reflects the decisions made at a time when both organizations were substantially different. Roles and missions, operational resources and the technology to execute and support operations are also substantially different. Moreover, since the future promises an accelerating rate of change for both services it appeared appropriate to examine the matter. The study will (1) examine present missions, (2) add missions where recent legislative changes, amendments to operating procedures and/or responsibilities and changes in capabilities have created conditions for the Coast Guard to assume new or expanded roles, (3) suggest appropriate changes in organizational relationships which would serve to support the naval missions of sea control and power projection while contributing to U. S. strategic mobility in support of national policy objectives.

Study Structure

The study analysis has five sections. Section I is the introduction. Section II is background and a qualitative analysis of presently assigned Coast Guard missions and capabilities. The narrative and supporting data indicate present Coast Guard expenditures of effort and resources and illustrates its strengths and shortfalls. Emphasis was placed on those missions and capabilities which support fundamental Navy missions and national defense objectives. Section III overlays those Navy missions which seem most adaptable to Coast Guard operations and capabilities and identifies potential new tasking. It should be specifically noted that the study only identifies shared tasks. It is not to be inferred that the Coast Guard would hold sole responsibility in any mission area. Section III is presented in three parts. Parts 1 and 2 are an analysis of those Navy missions which present and projected Coast Guard operational capabilities suggest could be added to existing Coast Guard wartime responsibilities. Navy capabilities in these areas are compared with existing - or realistically achievable - Coast Guard capabilities to identify those tasks which can be supported or logically performed by the Coast Guard. Such parameters as the ability to quickly transition from peacetime to wartime function, command and control capabilities, present expertise, normal location of operational forces, threat environment/defensive needs and training requirements are used to evaluate relative advantages in determining potential additional mission assignments. The third part of this Section is a synthesis of Parts 1 and 2. The result is a list of possible additional and expanded missions for the Coast Guard.

It should be clearly understood that because this study is qualitative in nature, addressing broad issues in conceptual terms, it will be necessary for subsequent ad hoc working groups established under the aegis of the Navy/Coast Guard Board, to study particular issues and propose specific operational solutions and force levels over an extended period of time. Following agreement on revised mission assignments for the Coast Guard there will be planning, programming and budgetary requirements for both services. It is expected that these requirements will be addressed by each service within its respective priorities and in accordance with existing interservice support agreements. The advantage to this close association is that common problems will be jointly reviewed and the consequences mutually recognized and agreed upon.

Section IV contains organizational considerations which could be adopted to execute whatever wartime tasking is agreed upon. While other alternatives may exist, the one presented appears to best suit the long term interests of both services.

Section V contains the conclusions and recommendations of the analysis. The proposed changes are significant. Expanded mission responsibility is recommended for the Coast Guard. A fundamental change in the relationship between the services is also recommended — not in any legal sense, rather in a functional one. These mission assignments are understood to be supporting/facilitating roles by the Coast Guard for the Navy as it seeks to meet its responsibility for the maritime defense of the nation. The study concludes that the Coast Guard can be assigned an operational command role under the FLTCINCS designed to facilitate the peacetime management of and planning for wartime missions in the U.S. littoral area.

II - BACKGROUND

NAVY Responsibility

The statutory mission of the U. S. Navy is to be prepared to conduct prompt and sustained combat operations at sea in support of U. S. national interests and the national defense strategy. The essential elements of the national defense strategy are (1) deterrence, (2) forward presence, (3) strategic mobility. The U. S. Navy is particularly well suited to meet the requirements of these national defense elements. Recent events in Southwest Asia have aptly demonstrated the reliance this nation places on the uniquely valuable capabilities of naval forces operating to support our national interest in distant areas of strategic importance. However, as a consequence of multiple and growing requirements, the Navy is stretched thinner today than at any time since WWII. Although today's ships are more capable than those of earlier eras, the U. S. Navy fleet is roughly only half the size it was a decade ago. U. S. traditional supremacy on the high seas is being challenged. As a result, today there is increasing awareness of the need to maintain a Navy capable of maritime superiority not only during hostilities, but during peacetime as well. To achieve this objective in the near term, the U. S. must carefully allocate available resources to the most urgent needs. This requires flexibility in strategic planning as well as dependence on allies and other friendly contributions, thus permitting the Navy to concentrate on those missions which must be performed primarily by uniquely capable and sophisticated U. S. forces, i.e., those used for deterrence and forward presence. A review of the wartime tasking of the U. S. Coast Guard is particularly appropriate at this time because of its potential contribution to those tasks necessary for the satisfactory performance of the strategic mobility mission.

Coast Guard Responsibility

Title 14 USC provides the basic statutory authority for the Coast Guard. Section I states that the Coast Guard will be at all times a military service and branch of the armed forces which will reside, "...in the Department of Transportation, except when operating as a service in the Navy." Section II of the Title lists the primary duties of the Coast Guard. It states that the Coast Guard "...shall maintain a state of readiness to function as a specialized service in the Navy in time of war." The Coast Guard's relationship with the Navy is described in Section III. It calls for the Coast Guard to "...operate as a service in the Navy" upon declaration of war or when the President directs and while so operating the Secretary of the Navy "... may order changes in Coast Guard operations to render them uniform to the extent he deems advisable, with Navy operations." Section 145 states that when in the Department of Transportation the Secretary of Transportation "...shall provide for such peacetime training and planning of reserve strength and facilities as is necessary to insure an organized, manned and equipped Coast Guard when it is required for wartime operation in the Navy." It further provides that both Secretaries may "...from time to time exchange such information, make available to each other such personnel, vessels, facilities and equipment and agree to undertake such assignments and functions for each other as they may agree are necessary and advisable." While operating with the Navy, 32 USC 700.53 also provides for the Coast Guard to "...organize, train and maintain the readiness of the Coast Guard to function as a specialized service in the Navy for the performance of military duties as directed." It is important to note that neither is there a legal bar to the assignment to the Coast Guard of additional wartime tasks nor would new legislation be necessary.

Threat

The United States is an island nation dependent upon the freedom of the seas for its economic life.. Using the wartime bench mark requirement, the U. S. has a need for at least 9,000 merchant vessel transits along raw material import Sea Lanes of Communication (SLOCs) each year to sustain our minimum wartime economic base. At the same time, there is unprecedented economic activity on the U. S. Outer Continental Shelf in search of new petroleum and mineral assets. Currently there are approximately 2,400 fixed platforms, 140 offshore drilling rigs, 75 diving systems, 2,800 logistic support vessels, 108 industrial vessels, 27,600 personnel employed, and over 3,000 open sea lightering operations per year. This activity could easily double by the latter half of this decade. Casting this same scenario into a wartime situation with hostile interests threatening the orderly flow of raw materials shows clearly that we as a nation have a substantial maritime protection problem oriented in our ports and littoral sea.

Threats to the maritime economic activity within this area could originate prior to and/or after hostilities ranging from enemy covert mining operations prior to hostilities, sabotage, terrorism, or flagrant attack. While this threat may be relatively small, the impact of successful operations in this area could be devastating to our nation's economic well being.

The U. S. littoral sea contains a portion of the SLOCs, offshore assets and marine terminals. The categories of naval wartime missions occurring in the littoral sea (Inshore Undersea Warfare, Mine Counter Measures, Harbor Defense, etc.) are quite similar to the general operational profile of Coast Guard peacetime programs (SAR, Port Security, Enforcement of Laws and Treaties, etc.) With few exceptions, such as Coast Guard 378' WHEC and the 270' WMEC cutters, existing Coast Guard forces have limited defensive capability and therefore can only operate in relatively low threat environments such as the littoral sea. If properly equipped, many Coast Guard resources could be an alternative force component available to the National Command Authority. They could also release the more costly, sophisticated and capable U. S. Navy assets to high threat areas.

Recent command post exercises such as Proud Spirit '80 have led CINCLANTFLT, and to a lesser degree, CINCPACFLT, to view the Coast Guard in this kind of support role e.g., protection of local SLOCs.

Present Coast Guard Tasking

As Table 1 shows, the great bulk of present wartime missions are parallel to those of peacetime programs, with the principal difference being the imposition of more rigid controls upon civil maritime traffic in and around our coasts in wartime. The loci of these littoral sea operations would remain a comparatively low threat environment under most wartime scenarios.

TABLE 1

EXISTING COAST GUARD PEACETIME PROGRAMS AND WARTIME TASKING.

<u>PEACETIME PROGRAMS</u>	<u>WARTIME TASKING</u>
SEARCH & RESCUE	Search & Rescue
AIDS TO NAVIGATION	
Short Range Aids	Short Range Aids to Navigation in support of increased operations in ports and the littoral area. Short Range Aids to Navigation for advanced bases and operations.
Radio Navigation	Operation of certain Radionavigation Systems IAW JCS Master Navigation Plan.
Bridge Administration	None.
PORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY	Protection of waterfront facilities. Explosive Ordnance loading supervision. Regulation & Control of dispersal anchorages. Control of maritime pilotage. Control of U.S. Fishing Vessels & Small craft operations IAW OPNAV INSTS. Assistance to U.S. Army in providing waterside security for vital locks and dams.
COMMERCIAL VESSEL SAFETY	Provide shore based ship-to-shore terrestrial communications services for U.S. controlled and allied merchant ships. Control of radio stations aboard merchant ships when in territorial waters. Establish and operate surface vessel ferry command.
RECREATIONAL BOATING SAFETY	None.
MARINE ENVIRONMENT RESPONSE	Coordinate Federal response to mitigate flammable and hazardous chemical discharge that enter port.
ICEBREAKING Polar/Domestic	Icebreaking in support of military operations.
MILITARY PREPAREDNESS Plans Development Capabilities Training	Surface surveillance & interdiction. ASW/ Ocean escort operations. Inshore undersea warfare.
ENFORCEMENT OF LAWS AND TREATIES	None, beyond that necessary to support general security in the littoral area.
MARINE SCIENCE ACTIVITIES	None.

Recent Legislation and Coast Guard Program Growth

Legislative changes to the Coast Guard's roles and missions since WWII have substantially expanded its authority and have tended to increase the pace of its operations in the littoral regions of the United States. Table 2 is a compilation of the more significant of these acts since Coast Guard inclusion in the Department of Transportation in 1967. The Magnuson Act of 1950 (Title 50 USC) and Executive Order 10173 are not listed but are very important since they provide broad emergency authority over anchorages, the movement of vessels in harbors and ports and the protection of waterfront facilities in time of national emergency upon the declaration of the President. In addition the 1961 Oil Pollution Act tasked the Coast Guard with maritime pollution and enforcement responsibilities out to 50 miles from the Coast thereby substantially increasing open ocean operations.

TABLE 2

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>ACT</u>	<u>IMPACT</u>
1967	DOT Act	Coast Guard transferred to new Dept. of Transportation. No change in relationship w/Navy. Bridge Administration program acquired from Corps of Engineers.
1970	National Environmental Policy Act	First national policy commitment to restore environmental quality.
1970	Water Quality Improvement Act	Substantially increased the Coast Guard's involvement with both U.S. and foreign merchantmen. Established clear federal responsibility for pollution response including a national response mechanism with the Coast Guard as the lead agency.
1972	Ports & Waterways Safety Act (as amended)	Provided sweeping authority for the Coast Guard to issue regulations for the movement and control of vessels in the navigable waters of the U.S. and the regulation of waterfront facilities. Provided authority to operate and establish VTSS. Purpose of legislation was prevention of damage to, destruction of, or loss of vessels, bridges or other structures.
1973	International Loadline Act	Further expanded Coast Guard interrelationships with and authority over U.S. and foreign merchant vessels.
1976	Fisheries Conservation Management Act	Fundamentally changed domestic and international policy concerning offshore fishing. Greatly expanded open ocean surveillance role for Coast Guard.

1978 Port & Tanker Safety Act

Sets design and construction standards for domestic and foreign tank vessels. Establishes Coast Guard inspections of both U.S. and foreign vessels within U.S. waters as well as evaluation of foreign crew requirements for vessels operating in U.S. waters. Requires Coast Guard to monitor oil lightering in U.S. offshore waters. Authority provides comprehensive oversight and management of oil and LNG vessels engaged in U.S. trade. Expanded Coast Guard involvement in ports and authority over merchant vessels.

1978 Outer Continental Shelf
 Lands Act

Coast Guard is required to investigate fires, oil spills and personnel accidents on drilling rigs and platforms. Inspecting of facilities, documenting personnel and establishing regulations for construction and operations also authorized. This expands Coast Guard surveillance, inspection management and protection of offshore assets concentrated in the littoral sea.

More recently, interdiction of controlled substances and enforcement of immigration statutes have occupied an increasing portion of Coast Guard time. The enforcement of laws and treaties requires a readiness posture akin to that attained during periods of heightened international tensions. This involves close, timely, and effective coordination between the On Scene Commander (OSC) and the Departments of State, Defense and Justice. The Coast Guard will establish its own Operational Computer network in FY82. The coastal surveillance and interdiction mission assigned to the Coast Guard during the Viet Nam War has been revitalized and indeed expanded during peacetime especially with enforcement of the Fisheries Conservation Management Act (FCMA) and other laws and treaties. Ocean Operations, principally surveillance and boardings have increased over 92% and 44% respectively since passage of the 1976 FCMA. Table 3 graphically shows the pace of this increase of operations in the 200 mile economic zone.

TABLE 3
FY-1976 THROUGH 1980
COAST GUARD OCEAN OPERATIONS PROGRAM GROWTH

<u>MISSION/ACTIVITY</u>	<u>1976¹</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>% INCREASE FY80 OVER 76</u>
Cutter Patrol Days	5,631	6,218	10,075	10,424	10,835	92.4
Aircraft Patrol Hours	12,934	12,584	14,588	17,555	19,600	51.6
Personnel Man Years	3,988	5,469	6,668	7,292	6,758	68.4
Fishing Vesse's Boarded	N/A	1,248	2,378	1,719	1,799	44.1

¹ Includes Transition Quarter (TQ), i.e., data represents 5 quarters.

Inshore, successive post war congressional edicts have made the Coast Guard Marine Safety Office and Captain of the Port virtual traffic police with respect to vessel movement in and out of port and in littoral areas. Vessel Traffic Services (VTS) have been established in 6 of our busiest harbors as the newest means of insuring safe, efficient port throughput. Table 4 shows some of the more important activities in which the Coast Guard engages to assure the safe movement of cargoes through our ports.

TABLE 4

FY-1976 THROUGH 1980

PORT SAFETY/SECURITY AND COMMERCIAL VESSEL SAFETY PROGRAM OUTPUTS

<u>MISSION/ACTIVITY</u>	<u>1976¹</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>% CHANGE FY80 OVER 76</u>
Inspection of U.S. Vessels under Construction (monthly totals)	577	615	675	725	725	30.1
Harbor Patrol Operating Hours	84,594	93,000	118,000	125,000	125,000	47.7
Cargo Vessel/ Barges Boarded	33,987	52,500	62,725	64,500	64,000	89.7
Foreign Flag Vessels Inspected	2900	3470	4540	1450	1500	(48.3) ²
Waterfront Facilities Inspected	85,401	91,800	61,275	59,000	59,000	(30.9) ³

¹ Includes Transition Quarter (TQ) i.e., Data represent 5 quarters.

² Decline in inspections due to 1978 Presidential Initiative on Tankers which drove smaller, older vessels from U. S. trade. More Safety of Life at Sea Convention (SOLAS) inspections now performed in foreign ports.

³ Decline due to internal Coast Guard decisions on program priorities.

The Coast Guard's SAR responsibilities are well known. The network of Operations Centers (formerly Rescue Coordination Centers) in each Area Command/District office represents a completely integrated communications, command and control system that daily coordinates a variety of air, sea, and joint evolutions. Major Coast Guard mobile and shore units are equipped with appropriate cryptologic devices to operate in the Naval Telecommunications System. The Coast Guard Telecommunications System has a primary mission and is so configured to function as an adjunct to and integral part of the Naval Telecommunications System. The Coast Guard Telecommunications System has primary responsibility to interface (in terrestrial modes) all non-military national assets with the U.S. Government. It routinely provides support for U.S. Naval vessels when requested to by the Chief of Naval Operations, Military Sealift Command (MSC) vessels (both chartered and commercial) National Ocean Survey vessels and all other Federal Agencies with a maritime operating element. It has assumed almost total world-wide terrestrial functions performed by the U.S. Navy for other than U.S. Naval vessels.

Navy Littoral Sea Operations

Over the past 15 years the Navy has experienced a steady decline in numbers of ships. The principal changes in composition have been a halving of the numbers of aircraft carriers and battle group capable surface combatants, a halving of amphibious lift capability, and an associated reduction in the numbers of auxiliary and support ships. The U. S. Navy has by DOD direction, concentrated on a forward defense strategy prompted in part by a decline in force structure and the need to deploy assets world-wide to meet national interests. This strategy provides for a defense well forward of homewaters and maximizes the Navy's utility, as an instrument of National Power. It does, however, tend to relegate the threats of subversive damage to ports and harbors and covert/overt mining in the littoral approaches to a relatively lower priority. While the threat to those areas is minimal in peacetime, there is heightened potential for irreparable damage and disruption of the deployment to and resupply of theaters of operation during wartime.

Section II Summary

The Coast Guard's normal operations are heavily concentrated in the ports, waterways and 200 mile fisheries conservation zone. The portent of the future is expanding program growth for the Coast Guard in this area. Programs and operating forces (land, sea, and air resources), with a communications, command and control system to manage these complex operations are in place. Relatively speaking, the Navy recognizing the greater threat posed in deep ocean operations has retrenched its coastal capabilities. Coast Guard operations overlap areas to varying degrees where traditional naval wartime tasks must be performed such as Control of Navy Shipping, Harbor Defense and Security, Mine Counter Measures, Inshore Undersea Warfare, etc. Essential elements of these wartime tasks, because they are dependent upon Coast Guard statutory responsibilities cannot be effectively performed without direct Coast Guard participation in the mission.

III- ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

Part 1 of this section is a qualitative analysis of the Coast Guard's operational capability viewed in terms of its application to wartime tasks. The entering arguments are the program areas listed in Table 1. Where possible, capabilities are quantified in commonly acceptable categories; e.g. number of units, personnel and funds.¹

¹ Caution should be exercised when using this data because the multi-missioned nature of Coast Guard operating forces does not easily lend itself to a balance sheet/audit type analysis. "Double Counting" of assets is easily accomplished if audit procedures are used.

SECTION III - ANALYSIS - PART 1

COAST GUARD MISSION/CAPABILITY ANALYSIS

MISSION	PEACETIME CAPABILITY	APPLICATION TO NAVAL WARTIME NEEDS	FY-1981 RESOURCES
1. PORT SAFETY/SECURITY. A. Provide a comprehensive safety and security envelope for critical port facilities in military essential ports. B. Maintain vessel movement, status and cargo data. C. Provide detection and enforcement capability for safety and security regulations.	1. 54 Captains of the Port plus Marine Safety Offices. Five Vessel Traffic Services (Seattle, San Francisco, Valdez, Houston and New Orleans. New York scheduled for future completion). Potential capability for temporary VTS to be established on as-needed basis. 2. A Marine Safety Information System (MSIS) which provides real time data on commercial vessels identity, movements, cargo and violation information. 3. Security patrols both land and waterside and vessel boardings, especially for category vessels. 4. A substantial, well trained port safety and security Reserve force with capability for mobilization.	1. Explosive ordnance shipping management. 2. Naval Control of Shipping in littoral area including assisting in convoy formation. 3. Anchorage control. 4. Pier and waterfront safety/security (general). 5. Establishment of special port navigation regulations to meet special military traffic requirements. 6. Support of harbor defense and security. 7. Surface Vessel Ferry Command. 8. Assist Army in security of locks and dams from waterside. 9. Mine hunting and channel conditioning in ports from harbor entrances to deep water. (Harbor and channel conditioning equipment for WPBs and helos would be required.) 10. Management of craft of opportunity 11. Inshore undersea warfare. 12. Intelligence training and gathering (HUMINT) regarding threat of subversion, espionage, mining or other disruption. 13. Control of Soviet Bloc and special interest vessels. 14. Control of port access through certification or seamen/stevedores.	POSITIONS (FTP) Military 1928 Civilian 296 Total 2224 BUDGET AUTHORITY (\$000) \$53,416 RESERVE 9400 Billets

COAST GUARD MISSION/CAPABILITY ANALYSIS - PART 1

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>PEACETIME CAPABILITY</u>	<u>APPLICATION TO NAVAL WARTIME NEEDS</u>	<u>FY-1981 RESOURCES</u>
<p>2. MILITARY READINESS.</p> <p>A. Combat-ready training through FTG's, Navy schools, combined exercises and OJT.</p> <p>B. Plans preparedness through joint service planning and exercises.</p> <p>C. Establish military readiness requirements for COGARD surface and air platforms.</p> <p>D. Liaison with USN for budgetary and equipment requirements.</p> <p>E. Liaison with other DOD services.</p>	<p>1. 12 high endurance cutters. Combat equipment includes guns, sonar, EW, torpedos, etc.</p> <p>2. 111 medium endurance cutters and patrol craft. Combat equipment includes guns, small arms and boarding parties.</p> <p>3. Aircraft assets include 25 C-130, 41 HU-25A*, 37 HH-3F and 90 HU-65A*. Provides patrol capability. Assets are multi-missioned.</p> <p>4. Contract for 13 270' WMECs has been awarded to replace 13 obsolete WWII vintage cutters.</p> <p>5. WWMCCS.</p> <p>6. Ship/Shore command and control communications network with quick response during joint USN/USCG operations.</p>	<p>1. ASW. (12 cutters have primary mission of ASW.)</p> <p>MEC's and WPB's have primary mission of surveillance and interdiction.</p> <p>3. Convoy escort.</p> <p>4. Intelligence acquisition.</p> <p>5. Command and control.</p> <p>6. Non-combat operations.</p> <p>7. Aircraft assets offer surveillance for both littoral and harbor defense and surface interdiction platforms.</p> <p>8. Potential for mine counter-measures exists with helo assets.</p> <p>9. New 270' WMECs will provide a substantially improved military capability. They will be flight-deck equipped for LAMPS III, have a Link 11, MK 75, 76 mm rapid-fire gun with the MK 92 FCS and an automated command and control display system. Weight and space reservations have been made for LAMPS, and TACTAS, HARPOON and vulcan PHALANX.</p> <p>10. WHEC-210 and WPB-95 class cutters are capable of carrying a lightweight HARPOON quad mount. WHEC-210 already contain space reservation for a hull-mounted active sonar.</p> <p>11. WAGB's have a capability as LAMPS platforms, as well as being suited for a limited logistic role.</p> <p>12. Virtually all cutters, WLB and larger, have a capability for Cover and Deception and Unconventional Warfare missions as well as Surveillance and Interdiction.</p>	<p><u>POSITIONS (FTP)</u></p> <p>Military 1656</p> <p>Civilian 203</p> <p>Total 1859</p> <p><u>BUDGET AUTHORITY</u></p> <p>(\$000)</p> <p>\$50,059</p>

*Replacement programs for HU-16, C-131 and HH-52A underway

COAST GUARD MISSION/CAPABILITY ANALYSIS - PART 1

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>PEACETIME CAPABILITY</u>	<u>APPLICATION TO NAVAL WARTIME NEEDS</u>	<u>FY-1981 RESOURCES</u>
3. ENFORCEMENT OF LAWS AND TREATIES (REGULATIONS). A. Provide surveillance detection and apprehension of violations of fisheries, controlled substances, customs, immigration and other laws and regulations. B. Undertake a comprehensive boarding and inspection program.	1. High and medium endurance cutter, patrol craft, small boat and aircraft patrols. 2. Command, control and communications network with quick response in combined air and surface operations. 3. Aircraft assets include 25 C-130, 41 HU-25*, 37 HH3F and 90 HU-65A*. Provides patrol capability. (Assets are multi-missioned). 4. 4 WMEC's are capable of light ice breaking.	1. ASW. (12 378' WHEC's 8 on west coast, 4 on east coast). Addition of 270' WMEC will more than double CG fleet of ASW capable vessels. 2. Surveillance and interdiction. 3. Inshore undersea warfare. 4. Control of fishing vessels. small craft and personnel. 5. Provide shore-based ship/shore communications services for U. S. controlled and allied merchant ships.	POSITIONS (FTP) Military 7563 Civilian 805 Total 8368 BUDGET AUTHORITY (\$000) \$200,101

*Replacement programs for HU-16, C-131 and HH-52A underway.

COAST GUARD MISSION/CAPABILITY ANALYSIS - PART 1

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>PEACETIME CAPABILITY</u>	<u>APPLICATION TO NAVAL WARTIME NEEDS</u>	<u>FY-1981 RESOURCES</u>
<p>4. SEARCH AND RESCUE/ SALVAGE.</p> <p>A. Render appropriate assistance to distressed vessels/aircraft on, over and under the marine environment.</p>	<p>1. A comprehensive network of boats, cutters, aircraft, and operations centers on continuous alert to dispatch appropriate assistance to SAR incidents on and over the maritime environment.</p> <p>2. A command, control and communications network with capabilities over the maritime frequency spectrums.</p> <p>3. CG does not presently have salvage platforms. (USCGC ESCAPE formerly USS ESCAPE, ARS, will be added to WMEC inventory.)</p> <p>4. AMVER (Automated Mutual Vessel Assistance Program) system can locate merchant vessels near the scene of a distress to render assistance. This is especially important in the mid-ocean regions.</p>	<p>1. Military SAR.</p> <p>2. Combat salvage.</p> <p>3. Merchant vessel communications support.</p> <p>4. Coastal intelligence/surveillance.</p> <p>5. Assistance in Naval Control of Shipping.</p>	<p><u>POSITIONS (FTP)</u></p> <p>Military 10294</p> <p>Civilian 1392</p> <p>Total 11686</p> <p><u>BUDGET AUTHORITY</u></p> <p>(\$000)</p> <p>\$328,294</p>

COAST GUARD MISSION/CAPABILITY ANALYSIS - PART 1

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>PEACETIME CAPABILITY</u>	<u>APPLICATION TO NAVAL WARTIME NEEDS</u>	<u>FY-1981 RESOURCES</u>
5. COMMERCIAL VESSEL SAFETY. A. Enforce vessel design, construction, equipment and maintenance standards through plan review, inspections and examinations. B. Establish and develop safety standards for vessels and offshore platforms. C. Investigate marine accidents. D. Enforce vessel documentation and personnel qualification regulations.	1. 54 COTP's and additional marine safety and marine inspections offices in major ports. 2. Personnel qualified in hull and machinery design and inspection. 3. Personnel qualified in personnel certification. 4. Marine Safety Information System (MSIS) provides real time data on commercial vessel identity, movement, cargo and violation information. 5. A command, control and communications network with capabilities over the maritime frequency spectrum.	1. Control of pilots. 2. Supervision of commercial/contract vessel repair. 3. Establish surface vessel ferry command for new vessels. 4. Reactivation of reserve fleet. 5. Control of merchant vessels. Provide ship/shore terrestrial communication services.	POSITIONS (FTP) Military 2031 Civilian 659 Total 2690 BUDGET AUTHORITY (\$000) \$67,347

COAST GUARD MISSION/CAPABILITY ANALYSIS - PART 1

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>PEACETIME CAPABILITY</u>	<u>APPLICATION TO NAVAL WARTIME NEEDS</u>	<u>FY-1981 RESOURCES</u>
<p>6. AIDS TO NAVIGATION.</p> <p>A. Operate and maintain fixed and floating aids to navigation in harbors, rivers and coastal waters. Operate radio-beacons.</p> <p>B. Operate and maintain worldwide LORAN-C and OMEGA radio-navigation systems.</p> <p>C. Review new bridge permits and investigate those which unreasonably obstruct navigation.</p>	<p>1. Shore units, buoy boats and buoy tenders on coasts, the Great Lakes and U. S. navigable waters. Provide comprehensive navigation services to mariners and airmen through 48000 short-range and 197 radio-navigation aids. OMEGA provides worldwide radio-navigation services.</p> <p>2. Provides transportable LORAN-C (TRANSLOC) to meet DOD contingency needs. Provide limited overseas coverage on a continuous basis.</p> <p>3. 27 buoy tenders provide limited surveillance and light ice breaking capability.</p>	<p>1. Aids to navigation for advanced bases.</p> <p>2. Aids to Navigation in support of increased operations in ports and littoral seas.</p> <p>3. Operation of radio-aids in accordance with JCS Master Navigation Plan.</p> <p>4. Surveillance.</p> <p>5. Cover and Deception, Unconventional Warfare support, limited logistic support.</p>	<p><u>POSITIONS (FTP)</u></p> <p>Military 8084</p> <p>Civilian 991</p> <p>Total 9075</p> <p><u>BUDGET AUTHORITY</u></p> <p>(\$000)</p> <p>\$275,513</p>

COAST GUARD MISSION/CAPABILITY ANALYSIS - PART 1

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>PEACETIME CAPABILITY</u>	<u>APPLICATION TO NAVAL WARTIME NEEDS</u>	<u>FY-1981 RESOURCES</u>
7. MARINE SCIENCE AND POLAR/ICE OPERATIONS. A. Provide extended support for arctic and ant-arctic operations. B. Conduct International Ice Patrol. C. Conduct ice breaking activities in northern U. S. ports to facilitate traffic. D. Conduct oceanographic research, make weather and scientific observations.	1. Five helicopter-equipped polar icebreakers. 2. Ice breaking tugs (14) for light ice breaking in northern ports and Great Lakes. 3. Special marine science vessel (on east coast) and personnel qualified in marine science specialties.	1. Ice breaking and reconnaissance in support of military and re-supply operations. 2. Non-combat icebreaking for harbor operations in northern ports. 3. Supply, weather and hydrographic services. 4. Command Deception, Unconventional Warfare Support, limited logistics support, Surveillance and Interdiction LAMPS platforms.	POSITIONS (FTP) Military 1917 Civilian 200 Total 2117 BUDGET AUTHORITY (\$000) \$58,619

COAST GUARD MISSION/CAPABILITY ANALYSIS - PART 1

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>PEACETIME CAPABILITY</u>	<u>APPLICATION TO NAVAL WARTIME NEEDS</u>	<u>FY-1981 RESOURCES</u>
<p>8. MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.</p> <p>A. Detect spills.</p> <p>B. Initiate and monitor spill response.</p> <p>C. Effect clean up where spiller is unable or unknown. Coordinate federal, state and local resources responding to oil and hazardous material discharges.</p> <p>D. Patrol high risk areas in ports and offshore with convergence of SLOCs into ports.</p>	<p>1. Multi-missioned shore units (500)*, boats (2000)*, cutters (100)*, buoy tenders (30)* and aircraft (160)*. Six aye eye sensors procured to provide all weather, day/night wide area surveillance to detect/map oil pollution and document sources. 54 COTP units with expertise in response coordination of multi-agency spill response through a regional and national network of multi-agency response teams.</p> <p>2. Three specialized units (Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf Strike Teams) with expertise and specialized equipment for large scale pollution control, lightening, damage assessment and limited diving salvage capability.</p> <p>3. Coast Guard command, control and communications network.</p> <p>4. All-weather surveillance of rivers, harbors and littoral waters.</p>	<p>1. Salvage</p> <p>2. Littoral zone surveillance.</p> <p>3. Port protection against threat of fire, explosion and discharge of flammable and hazardous chemicals. Clearing channels of disabled/sunken vessels.</p>	<p><u>POSITIONS (FTP)</u></p> <p>Military 2697</p> <p>Civilian 484</p> <p>Total 3181</p> <p><u>BUDGET AUTHORITY</u></p> <p>(\$000)</p> <p>\$83,824</p>

*Approximate number of multi-missioned resources.

COAST GUARD MISSION/CAPABILITY ANALYSIS - PART 1

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>PEACETIME CAPABILITY</u>	<u>APPLICATION TO NAVAL WARTIME NEEDS</u>	<u>FY-1981 RESOURCES</u>
<p>9. RECREATIONAL BOATING SAFETY.</p> <p>A. Board and inspect recreational boats to ensure compliance with applicable federal laws.</p> <p>B. Investigate accidents to isolate hazards and promulgate minimum requirements for equipment, construction and operators' qualifications.</p> <p>C. Educate the public to enhance safety.</p> <p>D. Conduct safety and regatta patrols for special events.</p> <p>E. Maintain liaison with the states and train state enforcement personnel.</p>	<p>1. 31 Boating Safety Detachments, provide boating safety training and limited boardings.</p> <p>2. Auxiliary flotillas nationwide and over 40,000 civilian members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary.</p>	<p>1. Auxiliary personnel can be used in a variety of CG tasks which could free military personnel for direct military operations. With additional training they could function as HUMINT collectors or mine watchers.</p>	<p><u>POSITIONS (FTP)</u></p> <p>Military 1297</p> <p>Civilian 261</p> <p>Total 1558</p> <p><u>BUDGET AUTHORITY</u> (\$000)</p> <p>\$39,357</p>

III - ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

Part two of this section has the major wartime tasking associated with coastal operations as the entering argument. For the purposes of the study this region was defined as that segment of the maritime responsibility assigned to the former Navy Sea Frontier Command. Existing Navy capabilities are compared with the Coast Guard's and conclusions drawn with respect to the proper role for each service.

III - ANALYSIS - PART 2

CONTINENTAL MARITIME DEFENSE ZONE MISSION

EXISTING NAVY CAPABILITIES

NAVY OR COAST GUARD COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

CONCLUSIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS

Port Safety and
Security

(Naval Control of
Shipping)

(Harbor Defense)

(IUW)

The Navy allocates limited assets in accordance with the current threat to the protection of specific port areas, i.e. naval bases, explosive loading zones at naval ordnance facilities and areas designated for handling and storage of special weapons (nuclear warheads and missiles). The protection of essential non-military ports is a responsibility of the Coast Guard's COTP function.

Naval personnel attend the Coast Guard Explosive Loading Supervisor School at Concord, CA to learn explosive loading inspection techniques. The Navy and Marine Corps are responsible for the Sea Services Explosive Ordnance Disposal Teams.

COTP's and Vessel Traffic Systems provide a comprehensive safety envelope for ports. A Marine Safety Information System (MSIS) provides comprehensive vessel movement, cargo and passenger data necessary for the management of port activity. Security patrols and boardings provide detection and enforcement capability. A substantial, well trained reserve force provided for the increased pace of wartime port operations. The Coast Guard conducts the only Explosive Loading School (ELS) for the Sea Services.

Coast Guard's multi-missioned SAR assets will assist in harbor defense and surveillance with (175) 41' UTB's, (60) 32' PWB's and other small craft augmented by the Coast Guard Auxiliary. Coast Guard multimissioned air assets can maintain surveillance of activities within the ports and waterways of the continental U.S. Shoreside security would be maintained by the Coast Guardsmen via foot and vehicle.

The Coast Guard has the organization and personnel in place (active and reserve) to effectively administer and conduct the safety and protection of ports and waterways including the following mission elements:

- * Explosive ordnance management.
- * Shore and water side patrols of facilities and protection of offshore assets.
- * Harbor Loading/Unloading Coordination.
- * Dispersal of Merchant Shipping/Designation of Dispersal areas.
- * Regulations and Control of Dispersal anchorages.
- * Assistance to the Army in the Security of Vital Locks and Dams.
- * Providing protective custody to Foreign Merchant Shipping.

Other mission areas which are associated with and compatible with PSS are:

- * Harbor defense.
- * Naval control of shipping
- * Craft of opportunity management.

III - ANALYSIS - PART 2

CONTINENTAL MARITIME DEFENSE ZONE MISSION

NAVY OR COAST GUARD EXISTING NAVY CAPABILITIES

CONCLUSIONS/ COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

RECOMMENDATIONS

Wartime Search and
Rescue *

Navy surface ships, & land based and sea based helicopters have inherent SAR & Salvage capability; however, most units will be unavailable for SAR in the littoral sea due to other mission commitments.

The Coast Guard has (inplace and operating) a network of boats, aircraft, cutters and operations centers which are on 24-hour alert to dispatch appropriate assistance to incidents on, under and over the marine environment. A comprehensive command, control & communications network exists to manage single or joint operations.

The Coast Guard is reasonably equipped, trained & staffed to prosecute this mission.

Salvage

The Navy has substantial underwater rescue and salvage capability. Their assets include (6 Submarine rescue ships, 2 Deep Submergence rescue vehicles, 7 ARS, 7 TATF and a Flyaboard salvage ships capability.)

Although Coast Guard WHEC's & WMEC's can handle some salvage operations (towing), only Navy has underwater rescue and vessels specifically equipped for heavy salvage operations. Present scenarios task such Navy assets with supporting Navy Fleet Operations.

The Coast Guard could be tasked with the overall management of the Combat SAR Mission in the littoral region within its present operating areas of responsibility.

Navy assets would assist as needed and as available in combat SAR and salvage operations. Units may chop to the Coast Guard operational commander if such SAR authority has been delegated by the unified commander.

The Coast Guard has expertise and special equipment for lightering liquid bulk carriers and coordinating salvage operations.

Recent development have seen the Coast Guard reactivate 3 Navy ATF's as WMEC's. While these ships are operated this enhances Coast Guard salvage capabilities on the East Coast.

* (SAR) operations in support of tactical operations in a battle area are the responsibility of the tactical commander.)

III - ANALYSIS - PART 2

CONTINENTAL MARITIME DEFENSE ZONE MISSION

NAVY OR COAST GUARD EXISTING NAVY CAPABILITIES

CONCLUSIONS/ COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

RECOMMENDATIONS

Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW)

While the Navy has the finest deepwater ASW capability to meet the challenges of the threat, littoral region ASW operations are affected by many obstacles associated with the shallow water ASW environment.

Current Navy passive sensor configurations are not appropriate for employment in the continental shelf.

The existing passive Navy assets will be dedicated primarily to battle group/military convoy escort ASW.

Navy capabilities of ocean escort commence at the convoy marshalling areas.

The medium frequency, medium power hull mounted sonars installed on the 12 WHEC 378's offer a distinct advantage in the shallow water littoral regions.

The 270' and the 210' WMEC cutters could be used to conduct ASW in the littoral region if provided with suitable sensors and appropriate weapons systems.

The 270' WMEC is being built to handle the AN/SQR 19 Tactical Towed Array Sonar and LAMPS MK III. Space and weight are being reserved for Phalanx and Harpoon. High resolution radars such as the "aireye" system are planned for the new HU 25 Falcon Jet for surface surveillance.

Navy continue to concentrate on deepwater ASW. Coast Guard can begin to assume shallow water ASW missions.

In addition to the deep-water mission of open ocean ASW for the WHEC and convoy escort mission for the WMEC the shallow water ASW environment of the littoral region is conducive to the employment of surface platforms with the type of ASW weapons and sensors installed on the 378' WHEC. These cutters lack an "ASW standoff prosecution capability" and a means of long range detection.

The 270' WMEC as configured will be an effective ASW barrier patrol platform for the edge of littoral region.

III - ANALYSIS - PART 2

CONTINENTAL MARITIME DEFENSE ZONE MISSION

Inshore Undersea
Warfare (IUW)

NAVY OR COAST GUARD EXISTING NAVY CAPABILITIES

Only the Navy has special hardware and training for IUW mission subtasks.

Special boat units and Reserve IUW groups consisting of reserve personnel, self supporting vans. (Complete with electronic equipment, personnel, support equipment.)

The MIUW reserve groups consist of 18 units, each with approximately 75 personnel.

These IUW groups are strategically located for rapid dispersal.

CONCLUSIONS/ COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

The Coast Guard presently has 78 patrol craft, (twenty-five 95' WPB's and fifty-three 82' WPB's) and a small air wing that can be used to investigate any offshore intruders detected by the reserve IUW groups.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The IUW mission as defined in NWP 40D, should not be assigned to the Coast Guard. The defensive mission elements (shallow water ASW, Anti Swimmer operations harbor defense, mine countermeasures and harbor conditioning) associated with Coastal Sea environment are addressed within other appropriate mission tasks i.e. Port Safety and Security, Surveillance and Interdiction. These IUW capabilities could be put to use in the future protection of offshore assets. There is potential for the CG to be used as an attack element in this mission.

III - ANALYSIS - PART 2

CONTINENTAL MARITIME DEFENSE ZONE MISSION

NAVY OR COAST GUARD EXISTING NAVY CAPABILITIES

CONCLUSIONS/ COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

RECOMMENDATIONS

Surface Surveillance Interdiction

The Navy has 44 patrol craft which consist of 1 PHM with 5 under construction, 2 PG's 2 PB MKIIs, 17 PB MKIIIs, 2 PCFs and 15 PBRs which are capable of conducting surface surveillance and interdiction. However these assets will be deployed to missions elsewhere than the littoral region in most wartime scenarios.

The Navy Reserve has approximately 15 River Patrol Craft in inventory.

The Coast Guard has approximately 270 multimissioned platforms which could be employed within the littoral region. These platforms include (175) 41' UTB's, (25) 95' WPB's, (53) 82' WPB's, (16) 210' WMEC's and (7) general WMEC's with capabilities ranging from small arms to medium cal. weapons. Platforms have surface surveillance radars. The Coast Guard also has multimissioned fixed wing aircraft and helicopters which are distributed around the U.S. coast to assist in surveillance.

The Coast Guard is building (13) 270' WMEC class cutters, with state-of-the-art equipment, (including the MK 92 FCS, LLLTV, AN/SLQ 32 (V2) Electronic Support Measure Suite and the MK 75 gun, TACTAS and a helicopter deck with support facilities).

With the current Coast Guard peacetime SAR, MEP, & ELT tempo of operations and the associated C³ capability and assets, the Coast Guard could adequately assume a substantial portion of the surveillance and interdiction mission. Included would be the control of U.S. fishing vessels and small craft operations in the littoral region.

To maximize the effectiveness of Coast Guard assets in the S/I role, certain mission dependent equipment should be acquired. i.e. mobile land based DF/EO (Electro Optical) sensor units/limited ASW capable suites for larger cutters/with improved weapons systems. ASW capability is best utilized in shallow water.

III - ANALYSIS - PART 2

<u>CONTINENTAL MARITIME DEFENSE ZONE MISSION</u>	<u>EXISTING NAVY CAPABILITIES</u>	<u>NAVY OR COAST GUARD COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES</u>	<u>CONCLUSIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
Combat Polar Ice Operations	None.	<p>The Coast Guard currently has 5 Polar Icebreakers which are helicopter capable and tasked with icebreaking in support of military operations. Along with these major Ocean Icebreakers, the Coast Guard has 14 Icebreaking Tugs, 27 WLBs and 4 WMECs which are capable of doing light icebreaking operations.</p> <p>Coast Guard Aircraft (C-130's, helicopters & HU 25 Falcon Jet's) are a valuable asset that can be used for Ice patrols.</p>	No change in wartime tasking.

III - ANALYSIS - PART 2

CONTINENTAL MARITIME DEFENSE ZONE MISSION

EXISTING NAVY CAPABILITIES

NAVY OR COAST GUARD COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

CONCLUSIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS

Aids to Navigation

The Navy operates satellite navigation systems which meet many fleet needs. No short range Aids to Navigation (buoys, fixed aids) capability exists.

The Coast Guard, with its operation and maintenance of over 40,000 fixed and floating aids with a network of stations, boats and buoy tenders. (27 seagoing tenders (WLB), 15 coastal tenders (WLM), 6 inland tenders, & 11 river tenders (WLR)). The Coast Guard operates, coordinates and maintains 1 short range radionavigation system and 2 long range systems; Loran-C (both domestic and overseas) and the world wide Omega system. Long range systems are meeting JCS Master Navigation Plan tasking.

The Coast Guard has adequate assets to formally assume the wartime Aids to Navigation mission in the littoral region

The Coast Guard is meeting its tasking for Aids to Navigation for advanced bases and the JCS Master NAV Plan.

III - ANALYSIS - PART 2

CONTINENTAL MARITIME DEFENSE ZONE MISSION

EXISTING NAVY CAPABILITIES

NAVY OR COAST GUARD COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

CONCLUSIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS

Commercial Vessel
Safety

None.

The Coast Guard is presently capable of supporting the following missions.

- * Control of Radio Stations aboard Commercial Vessels in U.S. waters.
- * Establish a U.S. Ferry Command for the purpose of delivering new construction ships.
- * Supervise and control maritime pilotage to ensure that pilots are qualified in all respects for their particular assignments.
- * Provide shore based ship/shore communications services for U.S. controlled and allied merchant ships within the littoral region.

Existing tasking should continue. There will be a need for additional regulations for merchant ships and crews for lifeboat equipment, embarkation ladders, life rafts, security screening personnel, etc.

III - ANALYSIS - PART 2

CONTINENTAL MARITIME DEFENSE ZONE MISSION

Mine Countermeasures

EXISTING NAVY CAPABILITIES

The Navy has 3 active ocean mine sweeping vessels and 22 in the Naval Reserve Fleet (NRF), plus 21 RH-53D helicopters.

Current U.S. MCM platforms are capable against most mine threats but are insufficient in number.

The mission of conditioning the channels which make up "Q" routes does not have sufficient platforms or equipment to meet requirements.

NAVY OR COAST GUARD COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES

The Navy has an active MCM program in place with personnel assigned to that mission on a full time basis. The Coast Guard has none.

Nine MCM ships are in the Five Year Defense Plan (FYDP).

Channel conditioning equipment is light and can be handled by small boats and some Coast Guard helicopters with precise navigation equipment. The possibility exists that properly equipped Coast Guard patrol craft could be utilized in the harbor and channel conditioning aspect of Mine Countermeasures. Also MRR aircraft (HH3F) could provide additional limited sweep capability.

CONCLUSIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS

As the Navy continues to modernize and increase its MCM capabilities, the Coast Guard should explore possibilities of assisting in harbor/channel conditioning.

Channel conditioning (mapping a channel, periodically resurveying it to ascertain the presence of foreign objects) could most readily be adapted to existing Coast Guard assets. However considerable additional equipment and training will be required.

The Coast Guard could be made responsible for management of craft of opportunity.

REVIEW OF COAST GUARD WARTIME TASKING

III-Part 3

EXPANDED WARTIME TASKING POTENTIAL

The synthesis of Parts 1 and 2 provides a list of wartime tasks which could reasonably be assigned to the Coast Guard. The results of the specific tasking analysis have been divided into 3 categories: (1) Totally new assignments for the Coast Guard, (2) expanded scope of existing assignments and (3) no changes or only slight change in the scope of existing assignments. Tables 5, 6 and 7 depict these categories. The principle elements of the rationale affecting the inclusion of each task in a specific category are provided in Part 2. However, there are some general principles developed during the study which influenced the value judgement for all task assignments. These are:

- * The Coast Guard's normal operations are concentrated in the ports and littoral area.
- * The thrust of legislation of the recent past is focusing more Coast Guard operational resources and expertise there.
- * The Coast Guard has a functioning command, control and communications network capable of supporting operations in the coastal area and it is compatible with Navy systems.
- * Over the same period of time the Navy has seen a substantial drawdown in the operating resources in the littoral area.
- * The littoral area is normally a relatively low threat environment which generally matches the defensive capabilities of most Coast Guard platforms.

TABLE 5

NEW COAST GUARD WARTIME TASKING

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>REMARKS</u>
NAVAL CONTROL OF SHIPPING	The Coast Guard's day-to-day operations in managing most aspects of commercial vessel activity make it a logical agency to assist the Naval Control of Shipping Organization in Convoy Formation. Security would be provided from the harbor to the convoy formation point (additional capability would need to be developed to provide this depending upon location). Vessel Traffic Services (VTS) will add to Harbor Safety. The Coast Guard retains a communications capability with merchant vessels. AMVER forms a basis for wider application of control duties.
HARBOR DEFENSE & SECURITY	Surveillance of the maritime environment would be the new aspect of this task. Surveillance would be over and on the water, both in the ports and approaches thereto. Underwater surveillance capability would have to be developed or acquired.
MINE COUNTERMEASURES	Coast Guard could augment USN forces in channel conditioning and sweeping by multi-missioned helos and patrol craft with suitable additional equipment and training. Coast Guard could contribute to management of craft of opportunity portion of the mission.

TABLE 6

SIGNIFICANTLY EXPANDED COAST GUARD TASKING

<u>TASK</u>	<u>REMARKS</u>
ASW	The projected increased ASW capabilities of the 270' WMEC over the vessels which it will replace and the pending upgrading of the 378' WHEC will substantially increase total Coast Guard ASW Forces. Use of multi-missioned patrol aircraft and helicopters for surveillance.
COASTAL SURVEILLANCE & INTERDICTION	General surveillance of multi-missioned patrol aircraft. Helos would expand operations substantially in the harbor /harbor entrance environment. WHEC's, WMEC 270' and 210's are helo equipped for offshore surveillance.
CONVOY ESCORT	Use of WMEC's from harbor entrance to convoy marshalling point. Augmentation of WHEC 378' operations with WMEC 270' fleet can provide escort capabilities. Protection of inbound strategic materials & economic shipping through the littoral area & Caribbean choke points.
WARTIME SAR/SALVAGE	Management & control of all SAR/SALVAGE in the littoral area except in support of specific combat operations. Ready resources and command & control network presently exist. Full combat SAR potential would require appropriate armor & weapons suites and training.
INSHORE UNDERSEA WARFARE	Coast Guard has WMEC and patrol craft which could be used as attack platforms from harbor entrance seaward. Would require a sensor system, either integral or shoreside and reorientation of some reserve activities for expanded mission capability to protect offshore assets.

TABLE 7

TASKING WITH NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGE

<u>TASK</u>	<u>REMARKS</u>
ICE BREAKING	NONE.
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE MANAGEMENT	NONE.
ANCHORAGE REGULATION	NONE.
PORT SAFETY/SECURITY	NONE.
AIDS TO NAVIGATION	NONE.
SURFACE VESSEL FERRY COMMAND	NONE.
SECURITY OF LOCKS & DAMS	NONE.
INTELLIGENCE	Some improvement in operations due to more capable aircraft.
VESSEL REPAIR	NONE.
CONTROL OF PILOTS	NONE.
AIDS TO NAVIGATION	NONE.

MISSION ASSIGNMENT SUMMARY

TABLE 8

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>ASSIGNMENT CATEGORY</u>		
	<u>NEW</u>	<u>EXPANDED</u>	<u>NO CHANGE</u>
Naval Control of Shipping	X		
Harbor Defense & Security	X		
Mine Countermeasures	X		
Inshore Undersea Warfare		X	
Anti-submarine warfare		X	
SAR/Salvage		X	
Surveillance & Interdiction		X	
Convoy Escort		X	
Icebreaking			X
Explosives Ordnance			X
Aids to Navigation			X
Port Security			X
Security of Locks & Dams			X
Surface Vessel Ferry Command			X
Anchorage Regulation			X
Non-Combat Operations			X
Intelligence			X
Control of Pilot Qualification			X

SUMMARY

The foregoing demonstrates that the Coast Guard's increasing operational presence in the littoral area (including ports) provides it with a capability to perform some wartime missions for which it is not now tasked, as well as an increase in its role in other missions areas. It should be noted that this operational presence/capability and the continuing interest of the Coast Guard in the littoral area are relatively permanent conditions and as such should be a part of the strategic planning process as defense policy is formed.

The study specifically does not mean to imply that any tasking should limit Coast Guard operations to the littoral sea of the United States. On the contrary, recognition of Coast Guard peacetime capabilities to expanded wartime tasks centered in the littoral area is viewed as an opportunity to capitalize on and maximize an existing national resource. Coast Guard operational capabilities should remain transferrable/deployable to advanced bases of operation as they were during the Korean and Viet Nam Wars.

IV - ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Given that expansion of Coast Guard Wartime missions is feasible, peacetime organizational relationships for coordination planning and training will need to be established. These relationships must be devised in consonance with the mutual concerns of each of the Services and must be amenable to smooth conversion to wartime command and control relations. It becomes necessary to establish a command mechanism to allow Fleet Commanders to exercise these fundamental responsibilities for the littoral seas, through appropriate Coast Guard Commanders while currently permitting the cross assignment of necessary Naval Forces to Coast Guard Commanders and "Vice Versa".

Some program and operational facts developed by the study bear on the organizational problem. The Coast Guard is the principle military presence in all but a few strategic ports in the United States. Moreover, they are in daily personal contact with the very shipping companies and unions which will have to be organized into action in the case of mobilization. The continuing trend of recent legislation has prescribed intense Coast Guard involvement in all aspects of port operation and safety. Coast Guard officers are presently working with the MSC and MTMC organization as regulatory changes impact upon the movement of strategic material. Convoy marshalling will be assisted by the use of Vessel Traffic Service (VTS). The VTS will be instrumental in providing for the safe transit of increased shipping in strategic ports. Coast Guard patrol activity has been concentrated out to the 200 mile Fisheries Conservation Zone and throughout the Caribbean.

Multi-missioned Coast Guard ships and aircraft can provide increased coastal surveillance platforms during periods of heightened tension. The present vessel boarding & inspection programs conducted under the auspices of three distinct programs (commercial vessel safety, offshore law enforcement and recreational boating safety) has developed an expanded capability. The Coast Guard is also designed and equipped to respond to the natural disaster and recovery response requirements. This capability is also applicable to port disasters during wartime.

It should be noted that the Coast Guard planning capability is perhaps its most significant weakness. The designation by CNO as "planning agent" for naval functions in support of CONUS land defense would present a particularly difficult challenge. The Area Commanders are inadequately staffed to develop - or to coordinate the development of a wide variety of plans. However, by increasing staff support in Area Commands it is feasible to insure this essential function would be adequately performed. The Coast Guard has adopted the standard JOPS format for its plans. This would permit easy integration of Navy and Coast Guard inputs. If the concept for expanded wartime tasking for the Coast Guard is approved, command and control arrangements and organizational relationships should be the subject of a follow-on analysis with full participation by the affected Fleet and Area Commander.

This planning limitations notwithstanding the nature of the Coast Guards operations argue for it to be assigned the additional function of Commander U.S. Maritime Defense Zone (or Coastal Defense Zone) for the Fleet Commander. This proposal would not only make use of the existing Coast Guard Area Commander - and other subordinate District Commander operational assets but also their command and control networks as well. Such would provide interface with Navy and the other Armed Forces through WWMCCS and a completely compatible communications system.

V - CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Based upon existing and potential operational capabilities of both services the Coast Guard should be tasked with new wartime missions listed below. It is understood that these will normally be prosecuted in the littoral sea of the United States. Final utilization of the Coast Guard for wartime tasks will be in consonance with existing law. The Coast Guard's role and level of participation will be subject to further joint ad hoc study, recommendation by the Navy/Coast Guard Board and the orderly acquisition of necessary assets through the normal budget processes of both services.

VCNO/G-CV

VCNO/G-CV

NAVAL CONTROL OF SHIPPING:
HARBOR DEFENSE & SECURITY:
MINE COUNTER MEASURES:

Approve: /

Do not approve: /

Approve: /

Do not approve: /

Approve: /

Do not approve: /

2. Based upon existing and potential operational capabilities of both services the Coast Guard should have a more substantial role in some missions for which it is already tasked. It is understood that these will normally be prosecuted in the littoral sea of the United States. Final utilization of the Coast Guard for wartime tasks will be in consonance with existing law. The Coast Guard's role and level of participation will be subject to further joint ad hoc study and recommendation by the Navy/Coast Guard Board, the orderly acquisition of necessary assets through the normal budget processes of both services.

ANTI SUBMARINE WARFARE:
SURVEILLANCE & INTERDICTION:
CONVOY ESCORT:
SAR/SALVAGE:
INSHORE UNDERSEA
WARFARE:

Approve: /

Do not approve: /

Approve: /

Do not approve: /

Approve: /

Do not approve: /

Approve: /

Do not approve: /

Approve: /

Do not approve: /

Approve: /

Do not approve: /

3. To maximize the contribution of the Coast Guard to the defense of the country and in consonance with an expanded wartime tasking, it appears that a change in the organizational interface between the services is required. The Coast Guard's coastal operations as well as presence in all major ports offer an organization with command, control and communications facilities which are necessary to manage defense operations in the littoral area.

Recommendation: That Coast Guard Area Commanders be assigned the role of a U. S. Maritime Defense Commander under the FLTCINCS. It is understood that the headquarters staffs of each service in coordination with the FLTCINCS and Area Commanders will develop the specific organizational relationship for implementation of this concept. Full execution of this assignment would necessarily be dependent upon the normal budgetary processes of both services.

Approve: /

Do not approve: /

-END-

BACKCOVER

Original dated 24 March 1981

USCG HISTORIAN'S OFFICE
SPECIAL COLLECTIONS ARCHIVE

Original copy in:

Subj'd Files, Box 343

"Military Readiness"