"Newseyletter" Stephen Decatur Chapter No. 4, USCS

Richard F. Hoffner, USCS # H-4456, Chapter Cachet Director 415 Moyer Road, Souderton, PA 18964-2319

Phone: 215-721-8606

e-mail: pauscg@gmail.com ______

Early 2011 Deposit Balance \$_

Navy may order both versions of the LCS ship, from both bidders



USS Independence LCS-2

In an about face from the guest to decide which class of LCS they would order, the best performing candidate between the USS Freedom and the Independence, the Navy is now sounding out legislators for a plan to purchase 10 ships from each contractor. Both Austal USA and Lockheed Martin were competing for a contract to build up to 55 of the ships, based on the model to be selected by the Navy.



USS Freedom LCS-1

To date, the Navy has delayed an announcement on the winner of the contract, probably because there have been delays in testing and mechanical problems with the two ships already in commission. If their latest idea is accepted by Congress, then the competition "winner" will not have to be chosen.

Study - U S Navy to take over operations of U S Army vessels An interesting article in a recent

Navy Times issue indicates that there is a move to turn over operations of U S Army vessels, to the U S Navy as a method to cut operational costs. The vessels number perhaps up to 121 ships. The ships would include the future Army Joint High Speed Vessels (JHSV), eight Logistic support vessels (LSV), thirty-four Landing Craft utility (LCU), forty-eight

Landing Craft mechanized, three Modular causeway system ships (CF), sixteen small tugs (ST), six large tugs (LT), two Large tug 100 Flight III, and four Barge derricks



U S Army ship JHSV-1 Spearhead

My first thought was, with the USN trying to cut personnel and man ships with smaller crews plus turning many vessels over to the MSC to man or drive them, why? Reports indicate that currently it takes 3,100 Army personnel and 200 civilians to operate the vessels. It is unlikely the Navy will use military personnel aboard the vessels.



The Army operates several reserve bases in the US to home port the vessels, but many ships are dispersed around the globe.



U S Army Barge Derrick BD-6901 The question is, would not civilian mariners be paid more then the personnel operating the ships? Where would the savings come from? Do the Army Reserve bases where some of the ships are home ported also revert to the Navy? To me it looks like a win-win for the Army and a loss for the American taxpayer.

Cracks Plague Ticonderoga-Class

(NAVY TIMES 09 DEC 10) Christopher P. Cavas Barely a year after the Navy spent \$40 million to fix the cruiser USS Port Royal CG-73 after an embarrassing grounding, the ship is again out of action, back in a shipvard at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. But this time it's not a damaged hull that's the problem. Rather, it's an issue that is plaguing all 22 cruisers in service: cracks in the aluminum superstructure.



USS Port Royal CG-73 aground off Honolulu

The Port Royal was operating in the Pacific Northwest in September when sailors discovered new cracks in the superstructure, including an eight-crack on the 06 level, one of the highest decks in the ship. Most of the cracks that appear on the Ticonderoga-class cruisers are being repaired during regular overhauls, but in this case the damage was enough to send the ship home to Pearl Harbor for yet another extended repair period. So far, the Navy has awarded \$14 million to BAE Systems in Pearl to fix the Port Royal. The Port Royal has seen little service since returning from its last deployment in June 2008. On Feb. 5, 2009, just after completing a three-month overhaul, the ship ran up on a reef just off the Honolulu airport, in clear sight of every aircraft taking off and landing at the airport, and visible from the beaches at Waikiki. The cruiser was refloated after threeand-a-half days on the reef and towed back to Pearl Harbor, where the commanding officer was relieved of his duties.