PC #4

March 24, 2009

A new proposal to tow the Queen Mary may be brought before the Long Beach City Council in the near future. The following considerations are important:

- The icon of the city being sold to a private interest must be reviewed because the ship is on the National Register of Historic Places and is a public asset.
- Relocating the ship is extremely risky because she is not seaworthy.
- PVC, remaining asbestos and residual bunker C fuel throughout the vessel would create an eco-hazard if the ship foundered, and would block commerce in shipping lanes if she capsized in the harbor.
- In 1997, the Long Beach City Council considered a plan to send the Queen Mary to Tokyo. Councilman Jerry Shultz presented research provided by the QMF to the council in session. This report detailed the fates of the Caronia and SS America, two vessels lost under tow and in better structural condition than the Queen Mary.
- In March of 1997, the Society of Port Engineers of Los Angeles and Long Beach signed a petition opposing the Queen Mary's relocation. Hundreds in Long Beach and around the world, including the Queen Mary's own architect Sir John Brown, former officers, crew and builders also signed this petition.
- It's important to note that the Queen Mary is on the books as a "class A" floating building and probably can't be insured. On December 11, 1967, Long Beach City Manager, John Mansell declared the Queen Mary to be a building when she was taken off the shipping registers. The final authority on the subject was the Coast Guard. Rear Admiral Thomas Sargeant (Commandant of the 11th Coast Guard District) said, "Since there is no intent to navigate the Queen Mary, she really can't be classified as seagoing, and henceforth not a vessel".
- 20,000 tons of propulsion machinery was removed, disabling power and steering capacities. The ship's center of gravity is higher as a result, contributing to the vessel's propensity to roll.
- 15 of the 17 watertight bulkheads were removed or breached during conversion. Flooding would be impossible to control if the hull sustained significant damage under tow.
- Structures added during the conversion in the late '60s are not designed to stand the torsion required of marine architecture. Under tow, the Queen Mary's original decks and bulkheads would tend to separate from structures added later.
- An independent study, conducted by a naval and maritime systems engineer, substantiated findings detailed in the Rados Marine Surveys [of 1990 and 1992]. Evidence of overstress in the form of deck buckling caused from structural fatigue and deterioration exist. This greatly increases the risk of major structural failure.

Diane Rush
past Queen Mary Foundation president
Rossmoor Preservation Committee
Stephen Minister
(562) 431-8751
rush534@yahoo.com