

PAGE/LINE #	NAVY COMMENT	NTSB REPLY	NAVY Answer to NTSB reply
<p>Page 9, Line 4-6</p>	<p>This paragraph should be redacted per paragraph 06.E.(5) of Security Clearance Guide 03-017 for Combatant Ships. Note the final sentence of the paragraph did not appear in the January 16, 2020 draft of the report previously reviewed.</p>	<p>This reply is confusing. As to page/line, you site line 4-6; yet in comments, you state the “entire paragraph should be redacted...” For clarity sake, we separate this paragraph into the three sentences of which it is comprised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Kindly state the Navy’s objection to the first sentence to this paragraph which states: “The <i>Fitzgerald</i> was equipped with AIS but was not transmitting data to other vessels.”</li> <li>2) The second sentence reads: “To track the destroyer’s position electronically, other vessels had to rely on visual, radar, and automatic radar plotting aids (ARPA).<sup>6</sup>” And footnote 6 is a description of ARPA. NTSB asks the Navy to state its objection to this sentence</li> </ol> <p>The last sentence to this paragraph states: “The destroyer was built by design [REDACTED].” NTSB drew information from two articles, currently available to the public, which treat [REDACTED] design and which the NTSB believes is fairly common knowledge. A) The first article, from the Naval Institute [REDACTED].”</p> <p>B) The second article was published by the <i>Naval War College Review</i>, [REDACTED].</p> <p>[REDACTED] Kindly state</p>	

		what is the Navy's objection to the NTSB restating what is contained in documents available to the public and, if possible, provide language which the Navy feels will meet warrant holder's concerns.	
Figure 5	Illustration shows an SCC with "screens/displays." At the time of incident, USS FITZGERALD had the analog steering system.	Agree. New illustration was sent by Navy and older Navy provided version was replaced by the new illustration. Thank you.	