



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER
NAVAL SURFACE FORCE
UNITED STATES PACIFIC FLEET
2841 RENDOVA ROAD
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92155-5490

IN REPLY REFER TO
5830
Ser N00B34
21 Apr 17

SECOND ENDORSEMENT on CAPT (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN ltr 5830 of 20 Feb 17

From: Commander, Naval Surface Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet
To: File

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

1. I concur with the findings of fact, opinions, and recommendations contained in the investigating officer's report as modified by the First Endorsement. Enclosure (14) is marked Confidential; a copy of this enclosure is on file with COMNAVSURFPAC N00J pending declassification.
2. I do not concur with recommendation number 14 as it has been found to be already included in Naval Ships' Technical Manual (NSTM) Chapter 581 Anchoring (S9086-TV-STM-010); however after further investigation I find there does need to be a review to determine whether procedures that fully capture the requirements to set an anchor currently exist. As such, I recommend that Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command review procedures related to how an anchor is set in NSTM Chapter 581. I also recommend that NAVSEA review and implement changes as required and report results to Commander, Naval Surface Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet. Any changes incorporated into Naval Ship Technical Manuals will be subsequently updated by Naval Education and Training Command schoolhouses in respective training curriculums and by COMNAVSURFPAC N7 for Fleet training assessments.
3. Investigating Officer recommendation number 15 will be fully considered by the Surface Warfare Officer School Board of Visitors (BOV) on 4 May 2017. COMNAVSURFPAC N7 is directed to monitor discussion and potential implementation of this recommendation.
4. My point of contact for this matter is LCDR (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) JAGC, USN. He can be reached at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) or via e-mail at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
T. S. ROWDEN

Copy to:
NAVSEA
COMCARSTRKGRU FIVE
OJAG (CODE 11)



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER BATTLE FORCE SEVENTH FLEET
COMMANDER CARRIER STRIKE GROUP FIVE
UNIT 200218 BOX 1
FPO AP 96602

5830
Ser N00/036
15 Mar 17

FIRST ENDORSEMENT on CAPT (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Itr 5830 of 20 Feb 17

From: Commander, Carrier Strike Group FIVE
To: Office of the Judge Advocate General (Code 11)
Via: Commander, Naval Surface Forces Pacific

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE
GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

1. Forwarded, concurring with all findings of fact and opinions of the investigating officer. Of note, the Commanding Officer (CO) was relieved based on a loss of confidence in his ability to command, consistent with recommendation (2) on 1 March 2017.
2. I concur with recommendation (2), that CAPT Carrigan be detached for cause. As the CO, CAPT Carrigan was ultimately responsible for the grounding. The investigation found that he was frustrated with the inability of the ship to get underway on time, and as a result his demeanor discouraged the crew from making critical communications that could have increased situational awareness on the bridge and potentially prevented the grounding. Communications between CIC and the Bridge were severely degraded by the CO's decision to turn off NET 15 in the pilot house. Finally, CAPT Carrigan chose to remove himself and key watchstanders from the Bridge while the anchoring evolution was ongoing, losing time and focus that may have allowed ANTIETAM to take corrective actions in time to prevent the grounding.
3. I concur with recommendation (3), issuing a (b) (6) to the Executive Officer (XO). The XO was on the bridge and ultimately bears some responsibility for his failure to act swiftly to prevent the grounding. However, the XO's actions after the grounding significantly mitigated damage to ANTIETAM and prevented ANTIETAM from colliding with other vessels in the harbor. Given the XO's sound judgment and levelheadedness as the situation developed, further adverse administrative action against him would be inappropriate.
4. I do not concur with recommendations (4), (5), (6), (8), (9), and (10). The primary cause of the grounding was the CO's judgment and decision making, including his actions that distracted or rushed the bridge team. While this does not absolve other individuals from responsibility, none of their actions alone would have caused the grounding.
5. I concur with all other recommendations. Recommendations (1), (7), (11), (12), and (13) will be implemented by ANTIETAM and CTF 70. Recommendations (14) and (15) are positively endorsed and forwarded to Afloat Training Group and Naval Surface Forces Pacific for their review and action.

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE
GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

6. My point of contact for this matter is LCDR [REDACTED] JAGC, USN. She can be reached at
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
C. F. WILLIAMS

Copy to:
C7F

5830
20 Feb 17

From: CAPT (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN
To: Commander, Task Force SEVEN ZERO

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

Ref: (a) JAGINST 5800.7F, JAGMAN
(b) U.S. Navy Regulations, 1990, as amended
(c) COMNAVSURFPACINST/COMNAVSUFLANTINST 3502.3, Surface
Force Readiness Manual
(d) COMNAVSURFPAC/COMNAVVAIRPAC/COMNAVSURFLANT/
COMNAVVAIRLANTINST 3530.4E, Navigation Department
Organization and Regulations Manual (NAVDORM)
(e) Naval Ships Technical Manual, Chapter 581
(f) OPNAVINST 3100.7B, Preparing, Maintaining, and Submitting the Ship's Deck Log
(g) MILPERSMAN 1611-020

Encl: (1) CTF 70 ltr 5830 Ser N00/349 of 1 Feb 17
(2) ANTIETAM Navigation Bill (ANTIETAMINST 3520.1C)
(3) ANTIETAM Sea and Anchor Bill (ANTIETAMINST 5406.1)
(4) 14 Nov 2016 Group Staff Navigation Assessment Checklist of ANTIETAM
(5) COMCARSTRKGRU FIVE Navigation Assessment Qualification Report msg
232214Z NOV 16
(6) CAPT Joseph Carrigan, USN Voluntary Statement of 18 Feb 2017
(7) LT (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 17 Feb 2017
(8) LTJG (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 15 Feb 2017
(9) ENS (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 17 Feb 2017
(10) LTJG (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 17 Feb 2017
(11) CDR (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) email of 14 Feb 2017
(12) ANTIETAM Sea & Anchor Watchbill of 25 Jan 2017
(13) Yokosuka and Yokohama Small Craft Advisory (NAVOCEANASWCEN Yokosuka
Japan msg 310032Z Jan 17
(14) Naval Meteorology and Oceanography Command (NMOC) weather summary for 31
Jan 2017
(15) QMC (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 17 Feb 2017
(16) ENS (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 15 Feb 2017
(17) ANTIETAM ECDIS-N Voyage Planning Checksheet for 31 Jan 2017
(18) ANTIETAM Voyage Management System (VMS) data from 31 Jan 2017
(19) ANTIETAM navigation brief of 30 Jan 2016
(20) LT (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 16 Feb 2017
(21) ANTIETAM Pre-Underway Checklist for 31 Jan 2017
(22) MMC (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 15 Feb 2017
(23) MM3 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 16 Feb 2017

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

- (24) CDR (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 18 Feb 2017
- (25) Navigation Brief Attendance Sheet of 30 Jan 2017
- (26) LT (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 16 Feb 2017
- (27) ANTIETAM Grounding Reconstruction
- (28) ANTIETAM Deck Log from 30-31 Jan 2017
- (29) LT (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 16 Feb 2017
- (30) ENS (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 15 Feb 2017
- (31) ANTIETAM Combat Information Center General Log
- (32) ENS (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 16 Feb 2017
- (33) ANTIETAM Bell Log of 31 Jan 2017
- (34) YN1 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 15 Feb 2017
- (35) Publication 941, Fleet Pacific Guide
- (36) BM1 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 15 Feb 2017
- (37) BM2 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 15 Feb 2017
- (38) BMC (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 15 Feb 2017
- (39) BMCS (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) USN Voluntary Statement of 17 Feb 2017
- (40) ANTIETAM Commanding Officer's Standing Orders
- (41) ANTIETAM CIC Navigation Log
- (42) ANTIETAM Engineering Log
- (43) Ship Repair Facility Yokosuka, Japan damage assessment of 18 Feb 2017

Preliminary Statement

1. Purpose and Scope. In accordance with reference (a), this reports the command investigation convened pursuant to enclosure (1) to inquire into the facts and circumstances surrounding the grounding of USS ANTIETAM (CG 54) in Tokyo Bay, Japan (Anchorage A-10). This investigation focused on the cause of the grounding, resulting damage, fault, neglect, or responsibility thereof, and recommendations of appropriate administrative or disciplinary action.

2. Executive Summary.

a. The grounding of ANTIETAM was preventable and ultimately the responsibility of the Commanding Officer (CO) in accordance with reference (b).

b. The primary cause of grounding was human error.

(1) The CO, Executive Officer (XO), Officer of the Deck (OOD), Conning Officer (CONN), and Navigator (NAV) did not account for the full effect of high winds and currents during planning and execution of the navigation and anchoring plan.

(2) There was insufficient determination of ship movement by the CO, OOD, CONN, and NAV while attempting to anchor.

(3) The CO's risk assessment while determining courses of action during the attempt to reposition was flawed.

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

(4) The CO, OOD, and CONN failed to apply sufficient controllable forces to prevent running aground.

(5) Bridge and CIC watch standers failed to provide forceful backup to the CO. There were no explicit declarations that "the ship was standing into danger" nor were adequate maneuvering recommendations provided to CO, OOD, and CONN following general awareness that ANTIETAM continued to approach shoal water after anchoring.

c. The CO exercised absolute authority of ANTIETAM and the ship's safe navigation, and was not relieved from such responsibility by any competent authority prior to the grounding.

d. Specific opinions and recommendations regarding accountability determinations for CO, XO, NAV, OOD, and CONN are set forth in the Recommendations section.

3. Investigating Team.

a. Assistant Investigating Officer: CDR [REDACTED] Commander, Task Force SEVEN ZERO Deputy Assistant for Current Operations (N3A)

b. Technical Assistants: QMCS [REDACTED] (Afloat Training Group West Pacific), QMCS [REDACTED] (Afloat Training Group West Pacific), GSCS [REDACTED] (Ship Repair Facility Japan), QM1(SW) [REDACTED] Commander, Task Force SEVEN ZERO

c. Legal Advisor: LT [REDACTED] JAGC, Commander, Task Force SEVEN ZERO

4. Administrative and Logistics Support.

a. The Investigating Team received tremendous administrative and logistics support from Task Force SEVEN ZERO (CTF 70); Destroyer Squadron FIFTEEN (CDS 15); ATG WESTPAC Yokosuka, Japan; and U.S. Naval Ship Repair facility, Yokosuka, Japan (SRF Yokosuka).

b. The Commanding Officer and crew of ANTIETAM provided exemplary support, in addition to being forthright and transparent in providing information to the investigating team.

Findings of Fact

1. The Navigation Bill was not signed by current Commanding Officer as required by reference (c). [Encl (2)]

2. Sea and Anchor Bill was signed in 2013. [Encl (3)]

3. Sea and Anchor Bill was last reviewed in November 2014. [Encl (3)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

4. Pursuant to reference (d), an Immediate Superior In Command (ISIC) Navigation Assessment was conducted by Afloat Training Group West Pacific 15-16 Nov 2016 on behalf of Commander, Carrier Strike Group FIVE. [Encl (4)]
5. ANTIETAM was certified for unrestricted operations during the ISIC Navigation Assessment. [Encls (4), (5)]
6. Reference (d) does not include a requirement for anchoring evolutions during the ISIC Navigation Assessment. [Encl (4)]
7. Getting underway on time was an objective of the CO [Encls (6)-(9)]
8. The Navigator was not qualified as Officer of the Deck as required by reference (d). [Encl (10)]
9. ANTIETAM did not have a qualified navigator onboard as required by reference (d). [Encl (10)]
10. Engineering department leadership made an unauthorized change to the watch bill by replacing EN3 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) with MM3 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) as Anchor Windlass Operator. [Encls (11), (12)]
11. Winds were forecasted to be 20-25 knots with gusts to 30 knots at the time of grounding. [Encls (10), (13)-(16)]
12. Winds were observed from approximate true bearings 345-000 degrees at velocities between 20-27 knots in vicinity of anchorage (A-10). [Encls (10), (13)-(16)]
13. Observed weather at the time of grounding was consistent with the forecast. [Encls (10), (13)-(15)]
14. Navigation plan was approved in Voyage Management System (VMS) by the CO 26 Jan 2017. [Encl (17)]
15. The navigation voyage planning check sheet prescribed in reference (d) was incomplete; only two of five required pages were completed. [Encl (17)]
16. The navigation plan called for use of anchorage A-10. [Encls (10), (17), (18), (19), (20)]
17. The anchoring plan called for the use six (6) shots of chain to anchor the ship. [Encl (19)]
18. Auxiliaries division (EA) conducted valve alignment and startup of Anchor Windlass. [Encls (21)-(23)]
19. MM3 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) completed the Anchor Windlass test. [Encls (22)-(23)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

20. Completion of the anchor windlass test was not entered in the Deck Log as required by the CO's Standing Orders. [Encls (21)-(23)]
21. The navigation brief was held on Monday, 30 Jan 2017 at 1600I onboard ANTIETAM. [Encls (6), (10), (24)]
22. All required personnel attended the navigation brief in accordance with reference (d). [Encl (25)]
23. The navigation brief addressed required aspects of navigation. [Encls (6), (19), (25), (26)]
24. The navigation plan included the use of a drop bearing (i.e. Oyama Dashi Point). [Encls (10), (20)]
25. The navigation brief addressed use of the drop bearing. [Encls (19), (20)]
26. The navigation plan to get to anchorage did not include a head bearing as a Conning Officer reference. [Encl (19)]
27. An anchoring brief was not conducted. [Encls (20), (26)]
28. ANTIETAM planned to anchor at anchorage (A-10) which was 588 yds from shoal water. [Encls (18), (19), (27)]
29. Setting of Sea and Anchor detail was not included in the Deck Log. [Encl (28)]
30. Sea and Anchor detail was set at an approximate time of 0810I. [Encls (6), (24)]
31. The CO arrived on the bridge at 0813I. [Encls (6), (28)]
32. The watch was not shifted from the midships quarterdeck to the pilot house before the arrival of the CO on the bridge because not all bridge watch stations were manned. [Encls (16), (20), (29)]
33. The Officer of the Deck shifted the watch from the midships quarterdeck to the pilothouse at 0815I in conjunction with Sea and Anchor detail readiness for sea preparations. [Encls (20), (28)]
34. LT [REDACTED] the Operations Officer, assumed the Deck at 0816I. [Encls (20), (28)]
35. LT [REDACTED] directed the watch team to make reports to LT [REDACTED] s Officer of the Deck Under Instruction (OOD U/I). [Encl (28)]
36. ENS [REDACTED] assumed the CONN at 0820I. [Encls (28), (30)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

37. VMS NAV4 station (i.e. CO station) had technical problems causing ANTIETAM to announce a combat systems casualty at 0819I. [Encls (7), (31)]
38. VMS NAV4 station was restored at 0827I. [Encl (31)]
39. ANTIETAM secured from NAV4 combat systems casualty at 0827I. [Encls (7), (31)]
40. The inability to transfer Integrated Throttle Control (ITC) functionality from Central Control Station (CCS) to the Ship Control Console (SCC) on the bridge caused a combat systems casualty to be announced at 0859I. [Encl (28)]
41. The CO appeared frustrated that a problem transferring throttle control to the pilothouse caused the ship to get underway late. [Encls (7), (10), (24), (29)]
42. The CO directed the speaker for the Net 15 internal communications circuit to be turned down in the pilot house because it was too loud. [Encls (7), (29)]
43. ITC was restored in the pilothouse at 0904I. [Encl (31)]
44. ANTIETAM secured from ITC combat systems casualty at 0904I. [Encl (31)]
45. ANTIETAM got underway at 0909I. [Encls (28), (31)]
46. While outbound from Yokosuka harbor, ANTIETAM detected JS ONAMI (DD 111) inbound to Yokosuka. [Encls (6), (7), (10), (15), (24), (29), (30), (32)]
47. ONAMI was assessed to be in vicinity of ANTIETAM's next planned navigation leg. [Encls (6), (10), (15), (20), (24)]
48. The bridge watch team established a starboard to starboard passing arrangement with ONAMI. [Encls (6), (10), (15), (20), (24)]
49. ANTIETAM delayed turning to next leg of the planned track in conjunction with the ONAMI passing arrangement. [Encls (6), (10), (15), (20), (24)]
50. Navigation made routine course recommendations to anchorage from 0927I to 0939I. [Encl (10), (15), (28)]
51. Navigation course recommendations were derived from Global Positioning System (GPS) information in VMS. [Encl (10)]
52. Navigation did not use head or drop bearings while formulating course recommendations to anchorage. [Encl (10)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

53. ANTIETAM miscalculated the approach and passed by anchorage A-10 by 60 yards. [Encls (6)-(7), (10), (15), (17), (24)]
54. The maximum recorded set was 230 degrees true with drift of 2.3 knots at 0943I. [Encl (28)]
55. "All Engines Back 1/3" was ordered at 0938I. [Encl (33)]
56. "All Engines Stop" was ordered at 0939I. [Encl (33)]
57. "All Engines Back 1/3" was ordered at 0939I. [Encl (33)]
58. "All Engines Stop" was ordered at 0940I. [Encl (33)]
59. OOD transited between port and starboard bridge wings to verify sternway. [Encl (20)]
60. Sternway was declared at 0941I. [Encls (20), (28), (30)]
61. The Phone Talker issued the order "let go the anchor" at 0942I after hearing CO comments instead of waiting for direction from the OOD. [Encls (28), (34)]
62. CO believed the ship was 50-75 yards from anchorage when "let go the anchor" was ordered. [Encl (6)]
63. ANTIETAM was 114 yards southwest of planned anchorage (A-10) when the order to "let go the anchor" was given. [Encls (17), (19), (35)]
64. There was a delay between the time the order was issued and the anchor fell. [Encls (6), (20), (24), (32)]
65. The delay occurred because the pelican hook bail retaining pin was inserted backwards making it difficult for deck personnel to remove it. [Encls (32), (36)-(39)]
66. A Deck Log entry stated "Anchored" in position $35^{\circ}18.77\text{N}$ Longitude $139^{\circ}40.863\text{E}$ Latitude at 0944I. [Encl (28)]
67. VMS indicated the ship was "Anchored" in position Latitude $35^{\circ}18.39\text{N}$ Longitude $139^{\circ}40.851\text{E}$ at 0944I. [Encl (17)]
68. The VMS position of the ship was 247 yards from A-10 planned anchorage. [Encls (17), (19)]
69. Reference (d) and Encl (2) state 3 minute fix intervals are required when in restricted waters, but CIC shifted to 5 minute fix intervals once anchored. [Encl (2)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

70. The forecastle crew set the anchor brake with the second shot of anchor chain on deck. [Encls 32, 36-38]
71. There was no visual indication the anchor chain was dragging. [Encls (26), (32), (34), (36)-(39)]
72. Forecastle personnel assessed the anchor was holding. [Encls (36)-(39)]
73. CO directed XO, OOD, and OOD U/I to the starboard bridge wing to address concerns with watch team performance after anchoring. [Encls (6), (10), (15), (20), (24), (29)]
74. The TAO assessed a lack of communication between Bridge and CIC on 31 January. [Encl (7)]
75. The CO, XO, OOD, NAV, and Senior Quartermaster determined the swing circle was in close proximity to shoal water from the position the ship anchored. [Encls (6), (10), (15), (20), (24)]
76. There is no indication ANTIETAM used a nomograph to determine an appropriate anchor chain length for weather conditions as mentioned in reference (e). [Encls (6), (20), (24), (32), (37), (39)]
77. The Senior Quartermaster made a recommendation to the CO to either veer additional chain or reposition the ship. [Encl (15)]
78. The CO, XO, OOD, and Navigation team discussed options to reposition the ship away from shoal water. [Encls (6), (10), (15), (20), (24)]
79. At 0950I, ANTIETAM logged the nearest hazard to shoal as 180 yards off the starboard beam. [Encl (28)]
80. At 0951I, ANTIETAM logged the nearest hazard to shoal as 130 yards off the starboard beam. [Encl (28)]
81. Set and drift were logged at 0951I as 150 at 1 knot. [Encl (28)]
82. A second set and drift entry is logged at 0951I indicating 150 at 1.5 knots. [Encl (28)]
83. The CO directed the OOD to weigh anchor and reposition the ship. [Encls (6), (10), (20), (24), (28)]
84. The bridge directed the forecastle to "weigh anchor". [Encls (20), (32), (38)-(39)]
85. The OOD corrected the order for the forecastle by issuing "heave around and heave on in." [Encls (20), (32)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

86. As a result of the order to heave in on the anchor, the forecastle ordered the anchor windlass engaged. [Encls (20), (32), (38)-(39)]
87. An estimated 3 to 4 minutes elapsed between the order and when the windlass was engaged. [Encls (20), (23), (32), (34), (38)-(39)]
88. Anchor Windlass is rated to retrieve anchor chain at 6 fathoms per minute. [Encl (20), (24)]
89. The CO directed the forecastle to expedite heaving in on the anchor when the ship was 160 yards from shoal. [Encls (6), (32), (38)-(39)]
90. The forecastle team commenced heaving in once the windlass was engaged. [Encls (6), (32), (38)-(39)]
91. The XO and OOD each provided maneuvering recommendations to the CO to avoid shoal. [Encls (6), (24)]
92. XO recommended applying an imbalanced port twist (i.e. STBD engine ahead 2/3, PORT engine back 1/3) to prevent the ship from entering shoal. [Encls (6), (24)]
93. CO assessed the greatest risk was damaging the SONAR dome by increasing speed while the anchor was underfoot. [Encl (6)]
94. Engines were applied just before the anchor was in sight. [Encls (6), (20), (28), (34)]
95. Left Full Rudder was logged at 0951I. [Encls (15), (28)]
96. Bridge watch standers recognized that the ship continued to close shoal water. [Encls (6), (10), (15), (24), (28)-(29)]
97. At 0951I, ANTIETAM logged the nearest hazard to shoal was 100 yards off the starboard beam. [Encl (28)]
98. A third entry at 0951I stated the nearest hazard to shoal was 80 yards off the starboard beam. [Encl (28)]
99. Maximum recorded Set and drift was 230^0 at 2.3 knots. [Encl (28)]
100. CONN ordered "All Engines Ahead 1/3 for 3 knots" at 0952I. [Encl (34)]
101. CO gave a direct order to the helm "All Engines Ahead 2/3 for 8 knots" at 0952I. [Encls (9), (34)]
102. The direct order of the CO was not acknowledged as taking the CONN by the bridge team as required by enclosure (40). [Encls (9), (40)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

103. There was no entry made in the Deck Log that the CO took the CONN as required by the CO's Standing Orders. [Encls (28), (40)]
104. Forecastle reported "free to maneuver" at an unrecorded time. [Encls (38),(39)]
105. Navigation observed the distance to shoal continued to decrease. [Encls (6), (10), (15), (28)]
106. There were no reports made that the ship was standing into danger. [Encls (10), (15), (28)]
107. ANTIETAM ran aground at 0953I. [Encls (24), (34)]
108. Starboard shaft speed decreased to 27 revolutions per minute (RPM) without being ordered at 0953I. [Encl (34)]
109. Port shaft RPM fluctuated between 0953-1003I. [Encl (34)]
110. At 0954I, ANTIETAM logged the nearest hazard to shoal was 40 yards off the starboard beam. [Encl (28)]
111. "Anchor's Aweigh" was logged at 0954I. [Encl (28)]
112. CIC recorded a single recommendation at 0954I to maneuver to 355⁰ true. [Encl (41)]
113. Gas Turbine Engines (GTM) 1A and 1B conducted an automatic emergency stop at 0956I as a result of grounding. [Encls (28), (41)]
114. Navigation recommendations resumed at 0958I. [Encl (28)]
115. Three Gas Turbine Generator (3GTG) was shutdown at 1001I because of fuel and lubrication oil leaks inside the module. [Encls (28), (41), (42)]
116. The CO received a series casualty reports. [Encls (6), (16), (24)]
117. ANTIETAM declared loss of pitch control on port and starboard shafts at 1005I. [Encl (41), (42)]
118. GTMs 2A and 2B on the port shaft remained available with pitch locked at 91 percent. [Encls (6), (20), (24), (28), (34), (41), (42)]
119. ANTIETAM maneuvered northwest towards the sea wall and Oyama Dashi Point. [Encls (6), (10), (15), (17), (20), (24), (28)]
120. The CO ordered the TAO, who is the Ship's Maintenance Officer (SMO), to proceed to Central Control Station (CCS) to aid with casualty response. [Encls (6), (7)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

121. XO, Bridge, and Navigation team observed fishing vessels in vicinity of the ship's track. [Encls (6), (10), (15), (20), (24)]
122. The Junior Officer of the Deck (JOOD) initiated sounding a succession of 5 short blasts. [Encl (16)]
123. The XO, Bridge, and Navigation team recognized they continued towards the sea wall in vicinity of Oyama Dashi Point. [Encls (10), (15), (20), (24)]
124. The Senior Quartermaster recommended the ship turn to avoid the fishing vessels and sea wall. [Encls (15), (28)]
125. The XO directed a starboard turn to avoid the fishing boats and sea wall. [Encls (10), (15), (20), (24)]
126. The closest point of approach of ANTIETAM to Oyama Dashi Point was 220 yards. [Encls (17), (27)]
127. Navigation recommended letting go the anchor to stop the ship. [Encls (15), (28)]
128. CO ordered the port and starboard shafts to be stopped and locked. [Encls (6), (9), (20), (24), (42)]
129. ANTIETAM declared she was "Not Under Command" at 1018I. [Encls (15), (28)]
130. Crew members on the fantail reported an oil sheen in vicinity of the ship. [Encl (42)]
131. The XO used bridge-to-bridge radio with Commander, Fleet Activity Yokosuka (CFAY) Port Operations to request immediate tug assistance. [Encls (6), (10), (16), (24), (29)]
132. Tugs arrived to support ANTIETAM at about 1041I. [Encl (28)]
133. The closest point of approach to the "Spider Buoy" (i.e. channel marker) was 23 yards. [Encls (17), (27)]
134. The CFAY pilot arrived on ANTIETAM at 1041I. [Encl (28)]
135. The CFAY pilot used tugs to tow ANTIETAM into port. [Encl (28)]
136. ANTIETAM established readiness to enter port at 1135I. [Encl (28)]
137. ANTIETAM moored at CFAY at 1154I. [Encl (28)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

138. The status of damage and repair assessments resulting from the grounding are summarized in Yokosuka Ship Repair Facility's report and estimate. [Encl (43)]

139. At the time this report was generated, \$4.2 million in material costs have been identified for the repairs. [Encl (43)]

Opinions

1. The grounding was preventable and the CO is ultimately responsible. [FF (5), (93)-(96), (103)-(104)]

2. Deck Log entries do not accurately reflect the sequence of events from the declaration of "anchored" up to the grounding. Based the VMS data, the Engineering Bell Log, witness statements, and other logs, the following is the assessed sequence of events from 0941:30-0953I (times rounded to nearest 30sec):

- a. 0941:30- "All Engines Stop" was ordered.
- b. 0942 – Let go the anchor was ordered.
- c. 0944 – Brake is set with two (2) shots of chain on deck; anchor was not set.
- CO, XO, OOD, and OOD U/I had bridge wing discussion.
- d. 0944:30 – CO ordered OOD to reposition the ship.
- e. 0945 – Order to heave around was issued and the forecastle began to engage the windlass.
- f. 0949 – Windlass was engaged, forecastle began heaving around.
- g. 0951 – Anchor was aweigh.
- h. 0952 - Anchor was in sight; forecastle declared the ship was free to maneuver.
- "All Engines Ahead 1/3" was issued and achieved 10 seconds later.
- i. 0952:30 - "All Engines Ahead 2/3" was issued and achieved 10 seconds later.
- j. 0953:30 – ANTIETAM ran aground.
[FF: (58), (61)-(68), (70), (75)-(78), (83)-(90), (94)-(95), (100)-(102), (104), (110)]

3. The direct cause of the grounding was the failure to counter ANTIETAM's movement toward shoal water. The engines were at all stop from 0941:30I until 0952I. The CO assessed there was risk of damaging the SONAR dome if he maneuvered towards the anchor during its recovery and waited until the anchor was nearly in sight before applying engines. That decision was made without an appreciation of the time required to engage the wildcat (3-4 minutes) and recover the anchor (5 minutes). [FF: (88)-(90), (93)-(96), (103)-(104)]

4. Navigation planning and execution failed to account for high winds and seas on 31 January 2017. ANTIETAM missed the intended anchorage by 60 yards on approach, anchored 247 yards from the intended position, and veered an insufficient amount of anchor chain to stop the ship. This deficiency contributed to the grounding, but was not its direct cause. [FF: (54), (63)-(64), (69)]

5. The anchor was not properly set and was dragging, but did not provide a visual cue (ex. chain hopping) to the forecastle team. The forecastle team reported "the anchor appears to be holding". This likely added confusion regarding ship movement, however, VMS data and watch team

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

statements indicate the CO, XO, OOD, and NAV were aware the anchor was not holding the ship in position. This issue contributed to the grounding, but was not its direct cause. [FF: (72)-(73), (82)-(83), (97)]

6. A primary contributing factor was insufficient forceful backup of the CO by Bridge or CIC watch standers. There was a general awareness that ANTIETAM was approaching shoal, but neither the navigation team nor the CIC team stated the "ship was standing into danger" or provided a recommendation to maneuver away from danger. This deficiency contributed to the grounding, but was not its direct cause. [FF (95)-(97), (107)]

7. The decision to reposition ANTIETAM closer to the planned anchorage did not cause the grounding. Based on the position where the ship anchored, the swing circle overlapped shoal water by 9 yards. Repositioning the ship was a prudent decision. [FF (17), (75), (77)-(78), (83), (85)]

8. The Navigator's lack of Officer of the Deck qualification in ANTIETAM and incomplete Voyage Planning as required by reference (d) indicate a lack of procedural compliance and are contributing factors to the grounding, but were not its direct cause. [FF (8)-(9), (15)]

9. CIC was not leveraged to its capacity in support of safe navigation. Senior supervisors in CIC were not focused on navigation and left the effort to the Piloting Officer. The volume of the Net 15 speaker on the bridge was turned down introducing communications barriers between CIC and the Bridge. CIC asked the Bridge for their intentions when there was ambiguity, rather than passing information or recommendations to the bridge. These deficiencies contributed to the grounding, but were not its direct cause. [FF (70), (74), (108)]

10. There was a lack of formality associated with issuing standard commands, giving orders from the bridge to the forecastle, making navigation reports, and making recommendations to the CO ahead of the grounding which increased decision time. These deficiencies contributed to the grounding, but were not its direct cause. [FF (62), (77), (84), (91), (108)-(109)]

11. Lapses in procedural compliance were noted based on the content of multiple logs, omitted maintenance documentation, and violations of various directives with the NAVDORM, CO'S Standing Orders, and reference (f) being most notable. These deficiencies were not direct contributors to the grounding. [FF (1)-(3), (8), (10), (15), (21), (28), (66), (70), (105)-(106)]

12. An anchoring evolution is not included in the ISIC navigation assessment, which occurred for ANTIETAM in November in conjunction with the conclusion of a maintenance period. Including an anchoring event in the navigation assessment would improve the level of knowledge of anchoring procedures. This was not a direct contributor to the grounding. [FF (4)-(6)]

13. Positive actions by the XO subsequent to the grounding prevented much greater damage to the ship. He directed the watch team to maneuver away from fishing vessels and a sea wall when the port shaft was stuck at 91 percent ahead. He also coordinated emergent tug support once the ship was "not under command" and drifting towards a channel marker. [FF (125), (131)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

14. All identified damages are a direct result of the grounding. [FF (138)-(139)]

Recommendations

1. Disciplinary action under UCMJ Article 15 (NJP), or court-martial in this matter is not recommended. While substandard performance from multiple crew members culminated in the grounding, no individual's conduct on its own met the threshold for culpable negligence listed in UCMJ Articles 92 (dereliction of duty) or 110 (negligently hazarding a vessel). [Opinions (1)-(2), (7)]

2. I recommend the CO be detached for cause based on substandard performance of duty in accordance with reference (g). The CO's decision not to use engines was the grounding's direct cause. [Opinions (1)-(3)]

3. I recommend a [REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) be issued to the XO for (b)(5) (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) (b)(5) (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) based on insufficient oversight of navigation and for insufficient forceful backup of the CO prior to the grounding. It should be noted that his positive actions subsequent to the grounding prevented even more damage. [Opinions (1)-(2), (4), (6), (10), (14)]

4. I recommend a [REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Opinions (2), (4)-(5), (7), (10)]

5. I recommend a [REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Opinions (2), (4)-(5), (7), (9)]

6. I recommend a [REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Opinions (2), (4)-(5), (7)]

7. Disciplinary action or adverse administrative action should not be taken against the Conning Officer. [Opinions (2)-(3)]

8. Based on substandard performance that contributed to the grounding, I recommend [REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Opinions (2), (5), (7), (10)]

9. Based on substandard performance that contributed to the grounding, I recommend [REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Opinions (2), (5), (7), (10)]

10. Based on substandard performance that contributed to the grounding, I recommend the [REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[REDACTED] (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Opinions (2), (5), (7), (10)]

Subj: COMMAND INVESTIGATION INTO THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING
THE GROUNDING OF USS ANTIETAM (CG 54)

11. I recommend ANTIETAM update its Navigation Bill as required by reference (d) and include specific duties and responsibilities for the Senior Quartermaster, TAO, CICWO, and CICWS in order to formalize expectations for their performance. [Opinion (12)]

12. I recommend ANTIETAM update its Anchoring Bill to specifically include a procedure for use of the anchoring nomograph based on the ship's technical drawings. [Opinion (12)]

13. I recommend CTF 70 tailor their ISIC navigation assessment to include anchoring as an observed event. [Opinion (12)]

14. I recommend the Type Commander (TYCOM) [REDACTED] [Opinion (6)]

15. I recommend the TYCOM consider adding an anchorage event to the ISIC navigation assessment. [Opinion (12)]

[REDACTED]