

## **TUCUMCARI vs. CYCLONE**

*[22 Dec 01] I have been researching today's US Navy Patrol Craft. Specifically the PC-1 CYCLONE Class. I feel that it is time to resurrect the old PGH-2 TUCUMCARI designs. When comparing the CYCLONE spec to the TUCUMCARI spec, I find that as a Special Warfare vessel, TUCUMCARI far exceeds CYCLONE in most respects. It appears that if the TUCUMCARI drawings and engineering data were available, the timing is right for some US shipyard to make an Unsolicited Proposal to the USN to build a prototype using all the modern bells and whistles. The basic TUCUMCARI was 100% successful. The vessel either met or exceeded the mission requirements of the Navy. I have always asked the question, "Why did the USCG and the USN have to go to Vosper Thornycroft, a British company for a high speed vessel design"? Do we not have capable engineers in the United States? -- Ken Plyler ([Kfppfk@aol.com](mailto:Kfppfk@aol.com))*

*[17 Dec 01] Just a tidbit that might be useful to you: The PHM actually had dual height sensors, radar and sonic. Both signals were interpolated by ACS simultaneously. I have experienced foilborne ops with sonic sensor only, and the ride was noticeably rougher, but effective. -- Rob DeSendi, USS AQUILA PHM-4 ([RDesendi@nsmayport.spear.navy.mil](mailto:RDesendi@nsmayport.spear.navy.mil))*

*[26 Dec 01] I believe the radar and sonic height sensors were independent of each other. There was a switch on the bridge to select "radar" or "sonic" not both. The ride on the radar sensors was better in most sea states, but the sonic sensors were much more reliable--Chuck Shannon, ET1 MLSG ([ChuckE68@aol.com](mailto:ChuckE68@aol.com))*