

Re: [OT] Navy releases photos of U.S.S. San Francisco

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.history/2005-01/2646.html>

From: Pat Flannery (*flanner_at_daktel.com*)

Date: 01/28/05

Date: Fri, 28 Jan 2005 04:41:40 -0600

OM wrote:

>...*That they are, and the fact that the sub didn't sink can only be
>attributable to three factors:*

>

>1) *The construction of that boat was far more sturdy than has been
>given credit for.*

>

>2) *The crew's swift implementation of DC procedures.*

>

>3) *King Nep was looking out for our brother swabbos that day.*

>

>

And the fact that the front 50 feet of a Los Angeles class sub is a freeflooded area with the sonar gear in it, which acted like a crushable bumper in this case. San Francisco was one of the earlier Los Angeles class boats, she she didn't have the Tomahawk vertical launch cruise missile tubes in that area, which could have had added a whole new element to the collision.

>...*On a side note, the Navy Department has officially confirmed that
>the mountain the sub hit was *not* on any nav charts whatsoever, and
>that the sub's navigation team did have the latest updated charts.*

>*While the Skipper has been temporarily reassigned during the
>investigation to shore duty, it looks more positive for his career
>aspects than previous talk would have given.*

>

>

I'm still trying to figure out how you cave in the side of the sub's bow when hitting a submerged mountain; the thing must have been shaped like Devil's Tower with near vertical sides.

sci.space.history: Re: [OT] Navy releases photos of U.S.S. San Francisco

Pat