

GAO

Briefing Report to the Chairman,
Committee on National Security, House
of Representatives

March 1996

MILITARY READINESS

Data and Trends for January 1990 to March 1995



G A O
75 *years*
1921 - 1996



United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

National Security and
International Affairs Division

B-271209

March 4, 1996

The Honorable Floyd Spence
Chairman, Committee on National Security
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As you requested, this report is an unclassified version of our earlier classified report on military readiness. We analyzed military readiness data contained in the Department of Defense's (DOD) Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) to determine if the data showed significant changes in readiness since 1990—a year of peak readiness. This report provides readiness information for the four military services. Specifically, it (1) summarizes the reported overall readiness status of all military units from January 1, 1990, to March 31, 1995; (2) assesses readiness trends of selected units from each service for the same period, and, where applicable, discusses reported readiness problems experienced throughout a service and by the selected units; and (3) explains significant changes in reported readiness of the selected units.

On August 31, 1995, we briefed the Subcommittee on Military Readiness, House Committee on National Security, staff on the results of our work. This report summarizes the information we presented in that briefing.

Background

SORTS is DOD's automated reporting system that identifies the current level of selected resources and training status of a unit—that is, its ability to undertake its wartime mission. Units report their overall readiness status as well as the status of four resource areas (personnel, equipment and supplies on hand, equipment condition, and training).¹ Overall readiness status is generally reported at a level consistent with the lowest rated resource level, but commanders are allowed to subjectively upgrade or downgrade the overall rating. SORTS is an internal management tool used by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, services, and combatant commands. It provides the Chairman with the necessary unit information to achieve an adequate and feasible military response to crisis situations and participate in the joint planning and execution process.

¹Readiness status of a unit is reported by assigning "C" levels that are defined as follows: C-1—Unit can undertake the full wartime mission for which it is organized or designed. C-2—Unit can undertake the bulk of its wartime mission. C-3—Unit can undertake major portions of its wartime mission. C-4—Unit requires additional resources and/or training to undertake its wartime mission, but if the situation dictates, it may be required to undertake portions of the mission with resources on hand. C-5—Unit is undergoing a service-directed resource change and is not prepared to undertake its wartime mission.

In viewing SORTS information, it should be noted that there are significant differences in the way each service manages readiness. For example, the Air Force's goal is to maintain all units at the C-2 level or better. In contrast, the Army uses a tiered resourcing system that maintains contingency units at the C-1 or C-2 level but allows later-deploying units to fall to the C-2 or C-3 level. The Navy and the Marine Corps manage readiness so that deployed units are C-1 or C-2. Units deployed or preparing for deployment have higher resource allocation priority than nondeployed units. Therefore, reported readiness fluctuates with deployment and maintenance cycles.

Results in Brief

DOD-wide, the percentage of military units with the ability to undertake all or major portions of assigned missions remained generally stable from January 1, 1990, to March 31, 1995.

Of the 94 units we reviewed, readiness remained at levels consistent with service goals in 75 (80 percent) of the units. However, readiness declined below the goals in 19 (20 percent) of the units. In five of these units, the readiness reductions were for fairly short periods of time due to the units' participation in contingency operations. In the remaining units, readiness reductions were caused primarily by personnel shortages, equipment shortages, and difficulty in obtaining training for personnel in certain military occupations.

In the Navy units we analyzed, ships maintained the desired readiness levels when periods of planned maintenance and training were excluded. However, the readiness of Navy aviation squadrons declined in the training area—a problem we found was Navy-wide. The reduction was caused by personnel shortages related to the Navy's decision to increase the number of aircraft authorized in some squadrons and a shortage of funds to pay for the flying hours needed to keep pilots qualified. As a result, from April 1994 through March 1995, the number of naval aviation units reporting the desired readiness levels declined by 27 percent. Although the funding problem was alleviated at the beginning of fiscal year 1995, the Navy has been unable to raise the readiness to previous levels.

In the Marine Corps units we analyzed, the readiness for ground combat units remained at desired levels throughout the period, whereas the readiness of support and aviation units fluctuated or remained stable at a lower level. This happened because these units continuously provided detachments to deploying ships and Marine Expeditionary Units. Although

a constant drain of personnel and equipment depressed the reported readiness of parent units, Marine Corps officials said that this practice reflected normal operations and that they considered the readiness of these units to be adequate, albeit at a level lower than desired. Officials attributed this situation to Marine Corps-wide problems in training personnel for certain occupational specialties. Since the Corps does not have its own training capability for skilled specialties, it must rely on the other military services to provide it. Officials expect it will take about 2 years to resolve this problem.

Readiness for most active Army infantry, armor, and artillery units we analyzed remained high for contingency units and generally stable for later deploying units. There were, however, significant changes or fluctuations in the readiness of five active Army units due to contingency operations. These units were used to support operations such as Somalia, thereby decreasing their availability to the parent units or inhibiting the deployed units' ability to train its personnel. Also, Army National Guard combat units experienced readiness reductions. Officials attributed the reductions to comprehensive readiness reporting criteria that provide a more accurate portrayal of personnel availability and to the difficulty of getting guardsmen trained in occupational skills. National Guard units also overstated their readiness by understating the number of training days required to achieve a C-1 status. Lastly, some commanders subjectively upgraded their units' overall status. Officials told us they could not determine in retrospect whether the upgrades were justified.

Readiness for Air Force units we analyzed generally remained at desired levels. However, there was some reduction or fluctuation in the readiness of airlift and Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) units. Air Force officials said this condition occurred because aircraft have been continuously committed to the operations in Saudi Arabia, Somalia, and Bosnia. Officials said heavy usage of airlift aircraft have strained the supply of spare parts and engines. The constant use of AWACS aircraft for contingency and counterdrug operations affected the Air Force's ability to train crews and maintain required skills. We also noted that commanders sometimes reported overall readiness levels higher than the measured resource areas. Air Force officials said they consider this SORTS feature to be a strength of the system. They believe that a commander is in the best position to accurately assess the readiness of a unit on the basis of a wide range of information available to make this judgment.

Scope and Methodology

DOD has over 10,000 units that report readiness status under SORTS. We analyzed the overall readiness reported for all units since January 1, 1990. In addition, we performed a detailed analysis of all readiness data reported for a cross-section of units² in each service. To ensure that we obtained adequate coverage, we asked service officials to help us select specific units that would represent the various types of units within the service. The units selected are not a statistical sample, and the results of our analyses cannot be projected to the entire service. The units included in our review are shown in appendix II.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff established the requirements for specific data that each service must report. In addition, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force identified a number of service-unique indicators that their units are required to report. We selected indicators from this universe that we believe are most relevant to identifying readiness trends. In general, these indicators comprised the overall C-rating for the unit, the C-rating for each of the four measured resource areas, and data elements that are used to determine the C-rating in each measured area. (See app. II.)

For the selected units, we graphed the data elements and identified trends. Where we noted changes in historical trends or in units that dropped below C-2 for extended periods, we compared the readiness data with operational scheduling and maintenance data and discussed these conditions with readiness officers from the respective services. Briefing sections I-IV of this report contain summary data for each service.

With the exception that we did not assess the reliability of SORTS data provided by the services, our review followed generally accepted government auditing standards and was conducted from November 1994 through July 1995.

In written comments on a draft of our report, DOD agreed with the information presented. (See app. I.) We are sending copies of this report to the Chairmen, Senate and House Committees on Appropriations; the Chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services; and the Secretaries of Defense, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Copies will also be made available to others upon request.

²For our analyses, we selected the following reporting organizations: Navy ships, submarines, and aircraft squadrons; Marine Corps and Army battalions, support groups, and squadrons; and Air Force wings and squadrons.

The major contributors to this report are listed in appendix IV. If you or your staff have questions about this report, please call me on (202) 512-5140.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark E. Gebicke". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "M".

Mark E. Gebicke
Director, Military Operations
and Capabilities Issues

Contents

Letter	1
Briefing Section I Navy Readiness Trends: January 1990-March 1995	8
Briefing Section II Marine Corps Readiness Trends: January 1990-March 1995	10
Briefing Section III Army Readiness Trends: January 1990-March 1995	12
Briefing Section IV Air Force Readiness Trends: January 1990-March 1995	14
Appendixes	
Appendix I: Comments From the Department of Defense	16
Appendix II: Units Included in Our Readiness Assessment	17
Appendix III: Readiness Indicators Included in Our Analysis	21
Appendix IV: Major Contributors to This Report	23

Abbreviations

AWACS	Airborne Warning and Control System
DOD	Department of Defense
SORTS	Status of Resources and Training System

Navy Readiness Trends: January 1990-March 1995

GAO Summary of Navy Readiness Trends

- Percentage of units that reported C-1 to C-3 for overall readiness was stable.
- For the cross-section of units:
 - Ship readiness remained stable.
 - Aviation readiness was reduced.

The percentage of units that reported an overall readiness status of C-1 to C-3 was stable. The readiness reported for 15 of the 16 ships included in our analysis fluctuated cyclically between when they were deployed and not deployed or undergoing maintenance. Five of eight aviation units showed a similar readiness trend. In the remaining units, we identified significant reductions in readiness levels.

Only one Navy ship experienced a reduction in readiness, as compared to several aviation units. In explaining the reduced readiness in aviation units, Navy officials said that during the past year, the training readiness of aviation squadrons Navy-wide declined significantly.

Officials attributed the reduction to two major factors. First, contingency operations caused a shortage of flying hour funding in late 1994, which significantly reduced training readiness. We did not verify the funding shortage. Second, personnel shortages were caused by force structure changes that increased the number of authorized aircraft in some squadrons. In August 1994, the number of squadrons that reported C-1 or C-2 in training declined by 15 percent from only 3 months earlier. The funding shortage was alleviated at the beginning of fiscal year 1995, but training readiness has not yet reached previous levels.

Marine Corps Readiness Trends: January 1990-March 1995

GAO Summary of Marine Corps Readiness Trends

- Percentage of units that reported C-1 to C-3 for overall readiness was stable. However, the percentage that reported C-1 or C-2 declined.
 - For the cross-section of units:
 - Ground combat forces were stable at high levels.
 - Continuous deployment of people and equipment caused cyclical changes in support units.
-

Although the percentage of units that reported C-1 to C-3 for overall readiness was stable, the percentage that reported C-1 or C-2 declined. Readiness in the seven Marine Corps ground combat units we reviewed was stable at desired levels. Likewise, readiness in 7 of the 13 aviation and support units remained stable at desired levels. However, we noted significant fluctuations or changes in the reported readiness of five aviation, maintenance, and support units and one instance in which a squadron's training rating dropped due to insufficient flying hours late in fiscal year 1994.

Marine Corps officials contended that these changes generally reflect normal variations due to the way the Corps organizes and deploys its forces. For example, many Marine Corps aviation and support units are not deployed as a single entity that reports readiness. Instead, the units provide detachments, comprised of mission-ready personnel and equipment, to a deploying Marine Expeditionary Unit. This necessarily degrades the readiness status of the parent unit, which then begins to build toward its next commitment. This continuous cycle of deploying the best-trained personnel and mission-ready equipment may cause changes in the reported status of the unit or cause it to remain at a low level over time.

Officials said that although readiness for many of the units was stable, it was not at the desired level. They said that there are Corps-wide problems in providing sufficient personnel trained in many of the low-density, highly skilled military occupational specialties. Officials attributed this largely to the planned force-structure reduction designed to reduce the Corps to 159,000 personnel. Although this level was subsequently changed to 174,000, the Corps meanwhile had lost many of its skilled personnel and forfeited future training opportunities. Since the Corps does not have its own facilities to train personnel for these skills, it relies on the other services to provide training. Officials expect it will take about 2 years to correct this deficiency.

Army Readiness Trends: January 1990-March 1995

GAO Summary of Army Readiness Trends

- Percentage of units that reported C-1 to C-3 for overall readiness was stable.
 - For the cross-section of units:
 - Readiness for most units was stable.
 - Readiness for some units was affected by contingency operations.
 - Readiness of National Guard combat units declined and units consistently overstated readiness.
 - Subjective upgrades were used.
-

The percentage of units that reported C-1 to C-3 for overall readiness was stable. We noted significant changes or fluctuations in reported readiness for active Army units due to contingency operations and equipment maintenance problems, a general reduction in readiness reported by National Guard units and, in some cases, commanders' subjective upgrades of overall readiness ratings.

Five of the units included in our analysis were used to respond to contingency situations, which affected readiness for fairly short periods of time. Officials said that such use of units may affect readiness in two ways. First, if only part of the reporting unit is deployed, certain resources available to the unit are depleted, thereby degrading readiness in such areas as personnel and equipment on hand. Second, if a unit is engaged in one role, such as peacekeeping or security operations, it may be unable to train personnel in the full range of military skills or to maintain its equipment in mission-ready condition.

We noted a reduction in readiness for National Guard combat units, which Army officials attributed to more stringent reporting requirements and the difficulty of getting personnel trained in the needed occupational skills. Moreover, our analyses disclosed that two of the four National Guard combat units we analyzed appear to have understated the number of training days required to achieve C-1 status.

In several instances, Army unit commanders subjectively upgraded their units' overall status. Army officials told us there was no way of determining in retrospect whether the upgrades were justified. They said many commanders view the SORTS reports as "report cards" on their performance and will therefore make every effort to present the unit in the best light. Officials also explained that a commander's subjective assessment to upgrade or downgrade readiness is a standard, deliberate part of the process that provides a more complete assessment of a unit's readiness.

Air Force Readiness Trends: January 1990-March 1995

GAO Summary of Air Force Readiness Trends

- Percentage of units that reported C-1 to C-3 for overall readiness was stable.
 - For the cross-section of units:
 - Readiness for most units was stable, with reserve units noticeably more stable.
 - Continuous commitments affected readiness of airlift and specialty units.
 - Subjective upgrades were used.
-

The percentage of units that reported C-1 to C-3 for overall readiness was stable. Readiness remained generally stable in most of the units we reviewed. Guard and reserve units were the most stable. In three of the units, there was some reduction or fluctuation in reported readiness, primarily among airlift and specialty aircraft units. Air Force officials generally attributed the changes to continuous use of the aircraft for contingency operations and the resulting strain on the supply of spare parts and engines. We also noted that Air Force commanders sometimes

upgraded their units' overall readiness status above the level indicated by the four measured resource areas.

Included in our sample were four Air Force Reserve and four Air National Guard units—two fighter squadrons and two airlift squadrons from each. Reported readiness in these units remained at high levels throughout the period. Air Force officials attributed this condition to the Air Force policy of viewing reserve components as an integral part of the total force. They said that the reserve units had equal access to the supply system in obtaining spare parts, were usually staffed with experienced pilots and maintenance personnel, and were generally not used as heavily as active component units.

Continuously using the aircraft to support Desert Storm, Somalia, and Bosnia operations, along with counterdrug operations, affected the reported readiness of Air Force units during this period. Particularly affected were the airlift units required to transport personnel, equipment, and supplies. For example, in fiscal year 1991, the C-141 fleet flew 58 percent over the planned flying hour program, and the C-5 fleet flew over by 175 percent. Heavy use of the C-141 and C-5 aircraft created a greater demand for spare parts and engines and accelerated the rate at which the aircraft required major repairs. Units with specialty aircraft, such as the E-3B Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS), were also affected. These aircraft are an integral part of air operations and are in constant demand by the commanders in chief.

Finally, Air Force commanders sometimes upgraded the overall readiness status of their units. In some units we analyzed, commanders subjectively upgraded the overall readiness reported for extended periods of time (5 consecutive months or longer). Air Force officials said that they do not consider upgrades to be a problem. In fact, they consider the capability to do this to be a strength of the Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) rather than a weakness. They believe that a commander is in the best position to accurately assess the readiness of a unit, on the basis of a wide range of information available to make this judgment. Commanders have the prerogative to upgrade or downgrade their unit's overall readiness status.

Comments From the Department of Defense



PERSONNEL AND
READINESS

THE OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-4000



Mr. Mark E. Gebicke
Director, Military Operations and Capabilities Issues
National Security and International Affairs Division
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC 20548

Dear Mr. Gebicke:

This is the Department of Defense (DoD) response to the General Accounting Office (GAO) UNCLASSIFIED draft report entitled, "MILITARY READINESS: Data and Trends Since 1990," dated December 22, 1995, (GAO Code 703083), OSD Case 1006-AX. The DoD concurs with the report and appreciates the time and work the GAO put forth in this effort.

The UNCLASSIFIED draft report summarizes a previous SECRET GAO report on the same issue. Consistent with the SECRET report, the UNCLASSIFIED draft states that, "DoD-wide the percentage of military units that have reported the ability to undertake all or major portions of assigned missions remained generally stable from January 1, 1990, to March 31, 1995." The report also cites readiness problems for a relatively small number of specific units. The Services examined each unit cited in the report and found that readiness problems have been addressed. In most cases recovery is complete, and for the remaining units, plans are in place to return units to their normal readiness levels or prepare them for inactivation. In many cases, corrective actions were ongoing at the time specific problems were reported. Moreover, the Department has in place a process to identify and correct readiness problems when they emerge. This process culminates in meetings of the Senior Readiness Oversight Council, chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Defense that is in turn supported by the Joint Monthly Readiness Review, chaired by the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. At these meetings, readiness concerns are identified, assessed, and where appropriate, action plans are set in motion to resolve these concerns. This process demonstrates the DoD's continuous vigilance and commitment to readiness as its first priority.

The Department appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft report.

Sincerely,

Louis C. Finch
Deputy Under Secretary
Readiness



Units Included in Our Readiness Assessment

Major command	Unit name	Major equipment	Home station
Air Force			
Air Combat Command			
96th Wing	28th Bomb Squadron	B-1B aircraft	Dyess Air Force Base, Tex.
4th Wing	744th Air Refueling Squadron	KC-10A aircraft	Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, N.C.
1st Fighter Wing	71st Air Rescue Squadron	HC-130P aircraft	Patrick Air Force Base, Fla.
	27th Fighter Squadron	F-15C/D aircraft	Langley Air Force Base, Va.
2nd Bomb Wing	20th Bomb Squadron	B-52H aircraft	Barksdale Air Force Base, La.
355th Wing	354th Fighter Squadron	OA-10A aircraft	Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz.
23rd Wing	41st Airlift Squadron	C-130E aircraft	Pope Air Force Base, N.C.
U.S. Air Forces, Europe			
52nd Fighter Wing	23rd Fighter Squadron	F-16C aircraft	Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany
Pacific Air Forces			
18th Wing	961st Airborne Warning and Control Squadron	E-3B aircraft	Kadena Air Force Base, Japan
3rd Wing	90th Fighter Squadron	F-15E aircraft	Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska
Air Mobility Command			
	60th Airlift Wing	C-5B aircraft	Travis Air Force Base, Calif.
	437th Airlift Wing	C-141B aircraft	Charleston Air Force Base, S.C.
	22nd Air Refueling Wing	KC-135A aircraft	McConnell Air Force Base, Kans.
Air Force Special Operations Command			
353rd Special Operations Group	1st Special Operations Squadron	MC-130E aircraft	Kadena Air Base, Japan
Air National Guard			
135th Airlift Group	104th Fighter Squadron	A-10A aircraft	Martin Air National Guard Station, Md.
172nd Airlift Group	183rd Airlift Squadron	C-141B aircraft	Jackson Air National Guard Station, Miss.
136th Airlift Wing	181st Airlift Squadron	C-130H aircraft	Dallas Naval Air Station, Tex.
149th Fighter Group	182nd Fighter Squadron	F-16A/B aircraft	Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.
Air Force Reserve			
914th Airlift Group	328th Airlift Squadron	C-130H aircraft	Niagra Falls, N.Y.
	459th Airlift Wing	C-141B aircraft	Andrews Air Force Base, Md.
442nd Fighter Wing	303rd Fighter Squadron	OA-10A aircraft	Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo.
301st Fighter Wing	457th Fighter Squadron	F-16A aircraft	Ft. Worth Naval Air Station, Tex.

(continued)

**Appendix II
Units Included in Our Readiness Assessment**

Major command	Unit name	Major equipment	Home station
Army			
3rd Infantry Division (mechanized)	2nd Battalion, 1st Aviation Regiment	AH64A; OH58C helicopters	Katerbach, Germany
	1st Battalion, 6th Infantry Regiment	Bradley fighting vehicles	Vilseck, Germany
	3rd Battalion, 1st Field Artillery Regiment	155mm self-propelled howitzers	Bamberg, Germany
	2nd Battalion, 64th Armor Regiment	M1A2 main battle tanks	Schweinfurt, Germany
	82nd Combat Engineering Battalion	Combat engineer vehicles; personnel carriers	Bamberg, Germany
	703rd Combat Support Battalion	Recovery vehicles; medical equipment	Kitzingen, Germany
4th Infantry Division (mechanized)	1st Battalion, 4th Aviation Regiment	AH64 attack helicopters	Fort Carson, Colo.
	1st Battalion, 148th Field Artillery Regiment	155mm self-propelled howitzers	Pocatello, Idaho
	2nd Battalion, 77th Armor Regiment	M1A1 main battle tanks	Fort Carson, Colo.
	1st Battalion, 8th Infantry Regiment	Armored personnel carriers	Fort Carson, Colo.
	4th Combat Support Battalion	Personnel carriers	Fort Carson, Colo.
	299th Engineering Battalion	Personnel carriers	Fort Carson, Colo.
24th Infantry Division (mechanized)	1st Battalion, 24th Aviation Regiment	AH64 attack helicopters	Hunter Army Airfield, Ga.
	4th Battalion, 41st Field Artillery Regiment	155mm self-propelled howitzers	Fort Benning, Ga.
	1st Battalion, 64th Armor Regiment	M1A1 main battle tanks	Fort Stewart, Ga.
	2nd Battalion, 18th Infantry Regiment	Bradley fighting vehicles; Dragon anti-tank missiles	Fort Benning, Ga.
	24th Combat Support Battalion	Recovery vehicles; personnel carriers	Fort Stewart, Ga.
	317th Engineering Battalion	Combat engineer vehicles; personnel carriers	Fort Benning, Ga.
	1st Battalion, 263rd Armor Regiment	M1A1 main battle tanks	Mullins, S.C.
	1st Battalion, 108th Armor Regiment	M1A1 main battle tanks	Calhoun, Ga.
	148th Combat Support Battalion	5,000-gallon trailers; 10,000-gallon collapsible tanks	Forsyth, Ga.
	648th Engineering Battalion	Tank launch recovery vehicles; combat engineer vehicles	Statesboro, Ga.
10th Infantry Division (light)	3rd Battalion, 14th Infantry Regiment	Infantry equipment	Fort Drum, N.Y.

(continued)

**Appendix II
Units Included in Our Readiness Assessment**

Major command	Unit name	Major equipment	Home station
	3rd Battalion, 108th Infantry Regiment	TOW anti-tank missiles	Utica, N.Y.
	2nd Battalion, 25th Aviation Regiment	OH58A helicopters	Fort Drum, N.Y.
	2nd Battalion, 7th Field Artillery Regiment	105mm towed howitzers	Fort Drum, N.Y.
	10th Combat Support Battalion	Medical equipment	Fort Drum, N.Y.
	41st Engineering Battalion	Track and wheeled engineering vehicles	Fort Drum, N.Y.
Marine Corps			
1st Marine Air Wing	Marine Wing Support Squadron 172	Mobile airfield equipment	Okinawa, Japan
2nd Marine Air Wing	Attack Squadron 231	AV8B aircraft	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station, N.C.
	Electronic Countermeasures Squadron 1	EA6B aircraft	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station, N.C.
	Light Attack Helicopter Squadron 269	UH1N; AH1W helicopters	New River Marine Corps Air Station, N.C.
	Fighter/Attack (all weather) Squadron 533	F/A18D aircraft	Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station, S.C.
3rd Marine Air Wing	Marine Air Control Group 38	Radios; vans	El Toro Marine Corps Air Station, Calif.
	Fighter/Attack (all weather) Squadron 121	F/A18D aircraft	Miramar Naval Air Station, Calif.
	Attack Squadron 214	AV8B aircraft	Yuma Marine Corps Air Station, Ariz.
1st Division	1st Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment	Infantry equipment	Twenty Nine Palms, Calif.
	1st Light Armor Reconnaissance Battalion	Light armor vehicles	Camp Pendleton, Calif.
2nd Division	3rd Battalion, 2nd Marine Regiment	Infantry equipment	Camp Lejeune, N.C.
	1st Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment	Infantry equipment	Camp Lejeune, N.C.
	2nd Light Armor Reconnaissance Battalion	Light armor vehicles	Camp Lejeune, N.C.
2nd Surveillance, Reconnaissance, and Intelligence Group	2nd Radio Battalion	Radios	Camp Lejeune, N.C.
3rd Division	2nd Battalion, 3rd Marine Regiment	Infantry equipment	Kaneohe Bay Marine Corps Air Station, Hawaii
U.S. Marine Corps Reserves	1st Battalion, 24th Marine Regiment	Infantry equipment	Detroit, Mich.
	4th Combat Engineering Battalion	Engineer equipment	Baltimore, Md.

(continued)

Appendix II
Units Included in Our Readiness Assessment

Major command	Unit name	Major equipment	Home station
1st Force Service Support Group	1st Maintenance Battalion	Repair equipment	Camp Pendleton, Calif.
2nd Force Service Support Group	8th Engineering Support Battalion	Engineer equipment	Camp Lejeune, N.C.
3rd Force Service Support Group	3rd Support Battalion	Logistics support equipment	Okinawa, Japan
Navy			
Atlantic Fleet	USS <u>Puget Sound</u>	Destroyer tender	Norfolk, Va.
	USS <u>Simon Lake</u>	Submarine tender	La Maddalena, Italy
	USS <u>Monterey</u>	Guided-missile cruiser	Mayport, Fla.
	USS <u>Eisenhower</u>	Nuclear aircraft carrier	Norfolk, Va.
	USS <u>Connolly</u>	Destroyer	Norfolk, Va.
	USS <u>Nassau</u>	Amphibious assault ship	Norfolk, Va.
	USS <u>Gladiator</u>	Mine counter-measures ship	Ingleside, Tex.
	USS <u>Nebraska</u>	Ballistic missile submarine	Kings Bay, Ga.
	USS <u>Saturn</u>	Combat stores ship	Norfolk, Va.
	Helicopter Support Squadron 4	CH53E helicopters	Norfolk Naval Air Station, Va.
Pacific Fleet	Electronic Warfare Squadron 120	EA6B aircraft	Oceana Naval Air Station, Va.
	Fighter Squadron 102	F14 aircraft	Oceana Naval Air Station, Va.
	Anti-Submarine Squadron 32	S3 aircraft	Cecil Field Naval Air Station, Fla.
	USS <u>America</u>	Conventional aircraft carrier	Norfolk, Va.
	USS <u>Willamette</u>	Fleet oiler	Pearl Harbor, Hawaii
	USS <u>Sacramento</u>	Combat support ship	Bremerton, Wash.
	USS <u>Callaghan</u>	Guided-missile destroyer	San Diego, Calif.
	USS <u>Ingraham</u>	Guided-missile frigate	Everett, Wash.
	Anti-Submarine Helicopter Squadron 14	SH60F; HH60H helicopters	North Island Naval Air Station, Calif.
	USS <u>New Orleans</u>	Amphibious assault ship	San Diego, Calif.
USS <u>Honolulu</u>	Fast-attack submarine	Pearl Harbor, Hawaii	
Attack Squadron 196	A6 aircraft	Whidbey Island Naval Air Station, Wash.	
Fighter/Attack Squadron 94	F/A18 aircraft	Lemoore Naval Air Station, Calif.	
Tactical Support Squadron 50	C130; T39; C2 aircraft	Guam, U.S. territory	

Readiness Indicators Included in Our Analysis

Air Force

Air Force SORTS Data

- Overall C-rating
- Personnel C-rating
- Equipment and supplies on-hand C-rating
- Major equipment condition C-rating
- Training C-rating

Air Force-Unique Indicators

- Percentage of authorized personnel available
- Percentage of critical authorized personnel available
- Percentage of authorized crews formed, mission-ready, and available
- Percentage of authorized combat-essential equipment and supplies on hand
- Percentage of authorized support equipment and supplies on hand
- Percentage of possessed combat-essential equipment that was mission-ready and available within unit's response time
- Percentage of possessed support equipment mission-ready and available within unit's response time

GAO Calculations Using Air Force SORTS Data

- Percentage of total authorized personnel assigned
- Percentage of total authorized critical personnel assigned
- Percentage of total authorized crews formed, mission-ready, and available
- Percentage of total authorized crews formed from assigned individual personnel
- Percentage of authorized combat-essential equipment assigned
- Percentage of authorized combat-essential equipment on hand
- Percentage of authorized combat-essential equipment mission-ready and available
- Percentage of assigned combat-essential equipment mission-ready and available
- Percentage of possessed combat-essential equipment mission-ready and available

Army

Army SORTS Data

- Overall C-rating
- Personnel C-rating
- Equipment and supplies on-hand C-rating
- Major equipment condition C-rating
- Training C-rating
- Assigned personnel ratings
- Percentage of total authorized personnel assigned
- Available personnel rating
- Percentage of total authorized personnel available
- Percentage of total senior grade authorized personnel available
- Military occupational specialty-qualified personnel ratings
- Percentage of total authorized personnel qualified in military occupational specialty
- Senior grade personnel ratings
- Percentage of personnel turnover
- Pacing items fill rating
- Condition rating for all on-hand equipment items
- Percentage of all on-hand equipment that is mission-capable
- Condition rating for all on-hand pacing items
- Percentage of on-hand pacing equipment items that are mission-capable
- Training days required to achieve C-1

GAO Calculations Using Army SORTS Data

- Percentage of equipment and supplies on hand

Marine Corps and Navy

- Overall C-rating
- Personnel C-rating
- Equipment and supplies on hand C-rating
- Major equipment condition C-rating
- Training C-rating
- GAO-calculated percentage of total authorized crews mission ready (Marine Corps only)

Major Contributors to This Report

**National Security and
International Affairs
Division, Washington,
D.C.**

Sharon A. Cekala
Charles Bonanno
Waverly Sykes
Jai Eun Lee
James Ungvarsky

**Norfolk Regional
Office**

Ray S. Carroll, Jr.
James Lewis
James Mahaffey
Lester L. Ward

Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. VISA and MasterCard credit cards are accepted, also. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

Orders by mail:

U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015

or visit:

Room 1100
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC

Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000 or by using fax number (301) 258-4066, or TDD (301) 413-0006.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (202) 512-6000 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.

For information on how to access GAO reports on the INTERNET, send an e-mail message with "info" in the body to:

info@www.gao.gov

**United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001**

**Bulk Rate
Postage & Fees Paid
GAO
Permit No. G100**

**Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

Address Correction Requested

