

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California



THESIS

A-7 vs. A-10 CLOSE AIR SUPPORT AIRCRAFT STUDY.

KOREAN PENINSULA SCENARIO (U)

by

James Wally Pratt

March 1977

Thesis Advisor:

Donald R. Boucheux

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) A-7 vs A-10 Close Air Support Aircraft Study. Korean Peninsula Scenario (U)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Master's Thesis; March 1977
7. AUTHOR(s) James Wally Pratt		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		12. REPORT DATE March 1977
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 54
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Distribution limited to U.S. Government Agencies only; Test and Evaluation (25 March 1977). Other requests for this document must be referred to Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California 93940		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE Exemption Cat 2 Declassification Indef.
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A-7 A-10 Close Air Support		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) (U) An expected value computer simulation model was used to evaluate the A-7 and A-10 Close Air Support Aircraft attacking three notional North Korean targets with three different weapons. North Korean Combat Air Patrol, radar-guided surface-to-air missile, infrared guided surface-to-air missile, and anti-aircraft artillery defenses were simulated. The computer model simulated and tabulated the number of aircraft and targets		

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

destroyed during a 60-day campaign. The ratio of the number of targets destroyed per aircraft destroyed was used as a measure of effectiveness to evaluate the aircraft. The results of the study showed that the A-7 aircraft performed substantially better than the A-10 aircraft in this scenario.

DD Form 1473
1 Jan 73
S/N 0102-014-6601

2

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

requests for this document must be referred to
Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93940.

A-7 vs. A-10 Close Air Support Aircraft Study.
Korean Peninsula Scenario (U)

by

James Wally Pratt
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.S., United States Naval Academy, 1970

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN OPERATIONS RESEARCH

from the
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
March 1977

Author

James W. Pratt

Approved by:

Donald R. Bouchant
Thesis Advisor

Joseph B. Tyeve
Second Reader

Michael D. Averis
Chairman, Department of Operations Research

A. Schady
Dean of Information and Policy Sciences

ABSTRACT

(U) An expected value computer simulation model was used to evaluate the A-7 and A-10 Close Air Support aircraft attacking three notional North Korean targets with three different weapons. North Korean combat air patrol, radar guided surface-to-air missile, infrared guided surface-to-air missile, and antiaircraft artillery defenses were simulated. The computer model simulated and tabulated the number of aircraft and targets destroyed during a 60-day campaign. The ratio of the number of targets destroyed per aircraft destroyed was used as a measure of effectiveness to evaluate the aircraft. The results of the study showed that the A-7 aircraft performed substantially better than the A-10 aircraft in this scenario.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION -----	8
II.	THE NORTH KOREAN AND SOUTH KOREAN WEAPONS -----	12
	A. NORTH KOREAN DEFENSES -----	12
	B. NORTH KOREAN TARGETS -----	13
	C. REPUBLIC OF KOREA CANDIDATE AIRCRAFT -----	15
	D. REPUBLIC OF KOREA ORDNANCE -----	16
III.	THE MODEL -----	18
	A. INTERCEPTORS -----	19
	B. SAM -----	21
	C. IRSAM -----	22
	D. AAA -----	23
	E. TARGETS -----	24
	F. NAVIGATION AND TARGET ACQUISITION -----	36
	G. COMPUTER SIMULATION MODEL -----	37
IV.	RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS -----	41
APPENDIX A	JMEM/AS Outputs -----	44
APPENDIX B	Sample Computer Output -----	50
	LIST OF REFERENCES -----	52
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST -----	54

LIST OF TABLES

- I. Input Data Sheet for Trajectory Method ----- 29
- II. Input Data Sheet for Unguided Weapon Method ----- 31

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EXPENSE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

(U) I would like to acknowledge the personnel of CINCPAC Review and Analysis Office, and especially Mr. C. E. Thompson, Mr. E. M. Atzinger, and Mr. J. E. Hoagbin, for their assistance in the development of this thesis.

III. THE MODEL

(U) An expected value computer model was used to evaluate the effectiveness of each of the candidate aircraft. A measure of effectiveness of the number of targets killed per aircraft killed was used for the evaluation. The model assumed that the aircraft were in flights of four and that they penetrated a series of defensive barriers. The first barrier encountered was interceptor aircraft, followed by a radar guided SAM barrier, an infrared SAM barrier, and an AAA barrier. The number of aircraft that had survived these defenses then delivered their ordnance and egressed, penetrating the SAM barrier for the second time enroute to their home base. Factors for navigation to the target area and visual acquisition of the target were also included, as were compensation for sortie rate and repair of battle damaged aircraft. Various techniques and studies were used to derive the probabilities of surviving the penetration of the defensive barriers and for the probability of target kill for each of the aircraft and ordnance combinations. It was assumed that the aircraft were either undamaged or killed by each of the defenses except AAA, which could inflict non-fatal battle damage. A fixed ratio of damaged aircraft per killed aircraft was used. The model also assumed that an unlimited number of undamaged targets existed and that the enemy's defensive resources were inexhaustible. That is, each CAS weapons delivery was against a "new" target and

the AAA batteries never lacked for ammunition. Data used in the model was based on a 12-hr flying day and a 24-hr maintenance day.

(U) The decision to select one weapons system over another should be made by the analyst. The results presented here were scenario dependent and meant to be used only as an aid

to help the decision maker in the selection process. Analysis considering the costs of the two systems was not considered. There are many types of cost, total system costs, training costs, research and development costs, operational costs to name a few, and the A-10 is a very new aircraft system with many of these costs still unknown or variable. For this reason an analysis of cost and effectiveness was not conducted. Other factors must be considered in a system buy such as maintainability, reliability and mission. Only the decision maker can decide the needs and capabilities of the man-machine system necessary to fulfill the mission assigned. The function of the analyst is to aid, as much as possible, the decision maker in the selection process.

(U) Many areas for further research have presented themselves during the course of this thesis. The scenario was very much built around the data available; the targets used were selected from those few found in the JMEM/AS Manual; the defenses encountered were from those that were studied in the HAVE LIME study; and the interceptor aircraft were evaluated under the criteria of the COMBAT HASSLE study. Further research could be profitably dedicated to obtaining improved information on the weather of the Korean Peninsula, the effects of aircraft characteristics on air-to-air engagements, and the use of additional aircraft in this scenario, as well as the effects of the expansion of the data obtained from the JMEM, HAVE LIME, and COMBAT HASSLE.

APPENDIX A - JMEM/AS OUTPUTS

Traj.	Tank	Art.	Pers.
1	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
2	.0000	.0000	.0000
3	.0000	.0000	.0000
4	60.5862	60.5862	60.5862
5	177.8510	177.8510	177.8510
6	144.0083	144.0083	144.0083
7	6792.5278	6792.5278	6792.5278
8	.0000	.0000	.0000
9	5500.0000	40.0000	40.0000
10	805.2524	1.0000	1.0000
11	9.7838	6931.0788	14528.4960
12	.0000	.0000	.0000
13	.0000	.0000	.0000
14	350.0000	.0000	.0000
15	5500.0000	.0000	.0000
16	45.0000	.0000	.0000
17	1900.0000	1.0000	1.0000
18	.0000	.0100	83.0000
19	.0000	.0100	83.0000
20	1.0000	5.0000	5.0000
21	.0700	.0000	.0000
22	.0000	.0000	.0000
23	.0000	.9200	.9200
24	.0370	26.0000	26.0000
25	.0000	1.0000	1.0000
26	.0000	.0188	.0693
		.0188	.0693

REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

Troj.	Tank	Art.	Pers.
5500.0000	1	1.0000	1.0000
.0000	2	.0000	.0000
.0000	3	.0000	.0000
60.3213	4	60.3213	60.3213
178.3413	5	178.3413	178.3413
144.2067	6	144.2067	144.2067
6801.8838	7	6801.8838	6801.8838
.0000	8	.0000	.0000
5500.0000	9	38.0000	38.0000
823.4376	10	1.0000	1.0000
9.6868	11	14463.4660	1.0000
.0000	12	.0000	.0000
.0000	13	.0000	.0000
350.0000	14	.0000	.0000
5500.0000	15	.0000	.0000
45.0000	16	.0000	.0000
2850.0000	17	1.0000	.0000
.0000	18	.0100	1.0000
.0000	19	.0100	83.0000
1.0000	20	5.0000	83.0000
.0700	21	.0000	5.0000
.0000	22	.0000	.0000
.0000	23	.9200	.0000
.0370	24	6.0000	.9200
.0000	25	1.0000	6.0000
	26	.0146	1.0000
		.0146	.1171
			.1171

REPERE... UNCLASSIFIED

Traj.	Tank	Art.	Pers
3613.1506	1	1.0000	1.0000
104.5329	2	104.5329	104.5329
.0000	3	.0000	.0000
78.7322	4	78.7322	78.7322
190.8165	5	190.8165	190.8165
175.6985	6	175.6985	175.6985
6444.8588	7	6444.8588	6444.8588
.0000	8	.0000	.0000
5500.0000	9	40.0000	40.0000
257.9064	10	2.0000	2.0000
15.8206	11	23.2464	23.2464
658.3461	12	.0000	.0000
52.7729	13	.0000	.0000
350.0000	14	.0000	.0000
5500.0000	15	.0000	.0000
45.0000	16	.0000	.0000
-1200.0000	17	1.0000	1.0000
250.0000	18	.0100	.0100
4.0000	19	.0100	.0100
1.0000	20	8.0000	8.0000
.0700	21	.9200	.9200
.0000	22	247.0000	247.0000
8.0000	23	.9500	.9500
.0330	24	20.0000	20.0000
.0000	25	1.0000	1.0000
	26	.1094	.1094
		.1432	.1432
		.1432	.1432

Trajectory	Tank	Artillery	Personnel
1	7000.0000	1.0000	1.0000
2	.0000	.0000	.0000
3	.0000	.0000	.0000
4	58.5783	58.5783	58.5783
5	69.8023	69.8023	69.8023
6	55.4954	55.4954	55.4954
7	8804.6155	8804.6155	8804.6155
8	7000.0000	.0000	.0000
9	956.1569	40.0000	40.0000
10	10.2716	1.0000	1.0000
11	.0000	6621.2916	13346.4700
12	.0000	.0000	.0000
13	450.0000	.0000	.0000
14	7000.0000	.0000	.0000
15	45.0000	.0000	.0000
16	1900.0000	.0000	.0000
17	.0000	1.0000	1.0000
18	.0000	.0100	83.0000
19	1.0000	.0100	83.0000
20	.0650	5.0000	5.0000
21	.0000	.0000	.0000
22	.0000	.0000	.0000
23	.0110	.9200	.9200
24	.0000	24.0000	24.0000
25	.1291	1.0000	1.0000
26	.1291	.4149	.5159
		.4149	.5159

REF ID: A66581 GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

Traj.	Tank	Artillery	Personnel
1	7000.0000	1.0000	1.0000
2	.0000	.0000	.0000
3	.0000	.0000	.0000
4	58.2581	58.2581	58.2581
5	70.0346	70.0346	70.0346
6	55.5877	55.5877	55.5877
7	8819.2536	8819.2536	8819.2536
8	.0000	.0000	.0000
9	7000.0000	22.0000	22.0000
10	986.2900	1.0000	1.0000
11	10.1353	13886.4580	22777.4300
12	.0000	.0000	.0000
13	450.0000	.0000	.0000
14	7000.0000	.0000	.0000
15	45.0000	.0000	.0000
16	2850.0000	.0000	.0000
17	.0000	1.0000	1.0000
18	.0000	.0100	.0100
19	1.0000	.0100	.0100
20	.0650	5.0000	5.0000
21	.0000	.0000	.0000
22	.0000	.0000	.0000
23	.0110	.9200	.9200
24	.0000	6.0000	6.0000
25		1.0000	1.0000
26		.4626	.4626
		.0918	.0918
		.0918	.0918

REF ID: A66811 GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

Traj.	Tank	Art.	Pers.
4657.7149			
141.4515	1	1.0000	1.0000
.0000	2	141.4515	141.4515
81.6071	3	.0000	.0000
163.5191	4	81.6071	81.6071
160.4484	5	163.5191	163.5191
8200.3840	6	160.4484	160.4484
.0000	7	8200.3840	8200.3840
7000.0000	8	.0000	.0000
255.1497	9	40.0000	40.0000
18.9868	10	2.0000	2.0000
810.4731	11	23.8214	23.8214
51.2796	12	.0000	.0000
450.0000	13	.0000	.0000
7000.0000	14	.0000	.0000
45.0000	15	.0000	.0000
-1200.0000	16	1.0000	1.0000
250.0000	17	.0100	.0100
4.0000	18	.0100	.0100
1.0000	19	8.0000	8.0000
.0650	20	.9200	.9200
.0000	21	247.0000	247.0000
8.0000	22	.9500	.9500
.0110	23	20.0000	20.0000
.0000	24	1.0000	1.0000
	25	.2526	.2526
	26	.2526	.2526

REF: FEB 19 1961 GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE COMPUTER OUTPUT

```

0001 DIMENSION DBA(91)
0002 REAL K, KBI, KBS, KBIRS, KBA
0003 PI = .9778
C C C PI = PROB. OF NOT ENCOUNTERING CAP
C C C PI = 1 - (PCM * PK) (EQ. 2)

0004 PSI = .8089
C C C PSI = PRCB. OF SURVIVING CAP ENCOURT.

0005 PN = .96
C C C PN = PROB. OF NAVIGATING TO TARGET AREA

0006 PSS = .9504
C C C PSS = PRCB. OF SURVIVING SAM BARRIER
C C C PSS = (1 - PK) ** S/N (EQ. 3)

0007 PSIRS = .956
C C C PSIRS = PRCB. OF SURVIVING IR SAM BAR.
C C C PSIRS = EXP(-F*PK) (EQ. 4)

0008 PS = .978
C C C PS = PRCB. OF SURVIVING AAA BARRIER

0009 PTK = .2098
C C C PTK = PROB. OF TGT KILL BY CAS A/C

0010 PA = .94
C C C PA = PROB. OF VISUALLY ACQUIRING TGT

0011 K = 4.33
0012 SR = 3.1
0013 J = 1
0014 E = 192.
0015 TACK = 0.0
0016 TTK = 0.0
0017 DBA(1) = 0.0
0018 DO 99 I = 2,61
0019 E1 = E * SR
0020 A = E1 * (1.0 - PI) * PSI
0021 A1 = E1 * PI
0022 KBI = E1 - A - A1
0023 B = A1 * PN
0024 C = A1 - B
0025 D = B * PSS
0026 KES = B - D
0027 F = D * PSIRS
0028 KBIRS = D - F
0029 G = F * PS
0030 KBA = F - G
0031 DBA(I) = KBA * K
0032 TK = G * PTK * PA
0033 TTK = TTK + TK
0034 H = G * PSS
0035 KES = KES + G - H
0036 ACK = KBI + KBS + KBIRS + KBA
0037 TACK = TACK + ACK
0038 R = TTK / TACK
0039 E = E - ACK - DBA(I) + DBA(I-J)
0040 M = I - 1
0041 WRITE (6,98) M, TK, TTK, R, ACK, TACK, E
0042 98 FORMAT (1X,I2,1X,6(F8.4,1X))
0043 IF (E.LE.0.0) GO TO 100
0044 99 CONTINUE
0045 100 CONTINUE
0046 WRITE (6,97)
0047 97 FORMAT (1 DAY, 2X, 'TGTS', 3X, 'TOT TGTS',
1 5X, 'R', 7X, 'A/C', 3X, 'TOT A/C', 1X,
2 'A/C AVAIL', 5X, 'KILLED', 3X, 'KILLED', 13X,
3 'KILLED', 2X, 'KILLED', 1X, 'NEXT DAY')

```


INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No. Copies
1. Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	2
2. Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	2
3. Commander in Chief Pacific J021, Box 13 FPO San Francisco, California 96610	1
4. Superintendent (Attn: Code 55Bh) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
5. Department Chairman, Code 55 Department of Operations Research Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1