

82



[Redacted]

09/07/2005 04:44 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc  
bcc  
Subject MU-2

[Redacted]

54

Gentlemen,

I have owned and operated an MU-2B-35 Serial No. [Redacted] for the past 3 years. This aircraft performs as good or better than the Aero Commander 690A, Beechcraft 90 and 200 that I owned before this aircraft. The airplane is no more challenging to operate than any other twin engine turbine powered aircraft. Excellence maintainance and training are available for operators of this airplane and support from the factory is outstanding. I conclude that this airplane is as safe as any other when operated properly.

[Redacted]



09/07/2005 07:15 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc  
bcc  
Subject (no subject)

Dear Mr. Rudolph,

Over the past 12 years I have owned and flown a K model MU2 for 5 years followed by a MU2B-40 Solitaire. I have flown accident free during that time (and for the previous 30 years in other aircraft as well). I have engaged in recurrent training both in the aircraft and in a simulator on multiple occasions. In reviewing the NTSB reports of the recent MU2 accidents the only common thread is not a recurrent mechanical problem with the aircraft, but rather it appears from first reading that most of these accidents stem from a lack of pilot proficiency. The MU2 is a high work load machine which requires a pilot with good skills and training to fly the aircraft safely. It appears that this requirement is not being met and multiple accidents have consequently resulted. I feel that an annual demonstration of proficiency either in the aircraft or the simulator should be required. Failure to demonstrate such proficiency would mandate supplemental training before being signed off for continued flight as pilot in command of the aircraft. Ensuring that all MU2 pilots possess a sufficient level of proficiency to fly the machine safely for routine operations and for emergencies would go a long way to reducing the MU2 accident rate and restoring the fine name of a very capable aircraft.

Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

84



[Redacted]

09/07/2005 07:46 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA [Redacted]  
cc  
bcc  
Subject MU-2 accidents

Mr. Doug Rudolph  
Aerospace Engineer  
Small Airplane Directorate  
ACE-112

Dear Mr. Rudolph:

I know that you have to respond to the Congressmen from Colorado in response to the recent MU-2 accidents, the first of which seems to be at first glance an obvious VMC stall after losing an engine after takeoff and the second a CFIT accident both with the same operator and at the same airport. I do wonder why these congressmen did not ask you about the Cessna 421 and Citation accidents at the same airport.

I have been flying my MU-2 for business now for almost 9 years and have over 1000 landings and takeoffs in the plane in all types of weather/wind conditions. I have taken annual recurrent training with Reese Howell in Smyrna Tennessee and SIMCOM in Orlando.

My experiences with the airplane are straightforward. I have not noticed any loss of control incidents, and have flown the airplane and the simulator single engine numerous times. I do find the simulator very helpful for practicing various unusual configurations safely, including many that you would not want to duplicate in the actual airplane, such as a FCU failure.

I respectfully ask you not to accede to the wishes of these uninformed congressmen and several so called aviation experts in the Denver area who have no real experience with the airplane and its fine straightforward flying characteristics to those who are experienced in it.

As you know, this airplane has been studied exhaustively more that any other turboprop by the FAA over and over again. Please do not do harm to those of us who fly the plane safely...

\*

There have been numerous accidents in the MU-2, the majority of which have been found to be due to inexperienced pilots, poor maintenance and test procedures, tip tanks coming off, NTS checks at night above an overcast, CFITs, single engine training (Chicago area) with an instructor who has no real familiarization with the airplane, flying ILS (Martha's Vineyard) with inop pilots HSI etc. etc.

\*

Properly trained pilots in well maintained airplanes have demonstrated over and over again that they are safe and incidentally love the airplane

Thanking you for your consideration in advance. Please call me if I can help you with more information.

[Redacted signature block]

85

60  
[Redacted]



[Redacted]

09/07/2005 07:47 PM

Please respond to

[Redacted]

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc  
bcc  
Subject MU 2

Dear Sir,

I am a 2500 hour pilot with about 2400 hour multiengine experience. I owned and flew an aerostar for about 1000 hours before buying a MU 2 early this year. I have about 30 hrs on this aircraft, all under training by an instructor(s) in the right seat. During this time I was exposed to stalls, slow flight. actual engine out situations etc. I was impressed how manageable and benign these conditons were. I was also impressed that the aircraft has limitations and specifics that cannot be violated like any other aircraft. I can see how a casual pilot who is not adequately signed off on this aircraft ( insurance requires it) can get into trouble. I can also see how any pilot can get into trouble in this aircraft as in any other aircraft due to pilot error. Accounts of the recent accidents in Denver suggest pilot error as the cause, not any uniqueness of the aircraft. In this context, it is worth noting that "unique characteristics" can be a matter of semantics. Uniquely different from what? Unless there is an established standard the term is meaningless. MU 2 is a fine aircraft and it would be a disservice to owners and operators if a cloud is raised over it for political reasons or pressure. Other accidents under similar circumstances in other aircraft models should be included in the review before taking precipitous action.

[Redacted]

87



[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
09/07/2005 03:01 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc  
bcc  
Subject ACS on MU-2B's dated 09-02-05

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

Dear Mr.. Rudolph:

My name is [Redacted] and was born and presently live in [Redacted] where I learned to fly some 35 years ago (Longer than what I would like to admit)

I am single and multi engine and IFR rated of course with 6,000 plus hours of which for the last 11 years and over a 1,000 have been on Short Body Mitsus.

My initial training was done at Howell Enterprises by Reese Howell in Smyrna TN. I have gone every year for recurrent training at their facilities.

I have owned and flown Cessnas 411 , Barons, Dukes, Bonanzas and Aerostars among others. If you remember 411's and Aerostars have been bad mouthed thru the years. These and any high performance demand a degree of professionalism to fly the safely. Your training is what makes the difference between a "safe" plane and an "unsafe" one!

Our present aircraft [Redacted] has flown, made the approach and landed with out incidence in three different occasions on one engine. One of them on account of low oil pressure in the middle of the Caribbean Sea. Turned the engine off, feathered the prop and continued on my way! No sweat!

Let me add that I consider myself an average pilot and after the firs 40 to 50 hours I felt very comfortable on the Mitsubishi.

In addition there is no manufacturer that gives the back up that Mitsubishi gives to their fleet.

Mr.. Rudolph, airplanes do not loose control it is the pilots that loose control of their aircraft. This whether they are King Airs, Pipers, Turbo Commanders or you name it. If the pilot stops flying the plane they are going to loose control regardless of what airplane they are flying. Mitsus are no different!

In relation to the training available both principal facilities, SimCom and Howell offer excellent training. I prefer Howell on account that I like to train in my airplane where I have practiced single engine approaches and landing so when the occasion to arose I knew I had done it and felt very comfortable.

Fly the airplane until you are at the ramp and the engines turned off! The training, manuals and handling of this aircraft are better than many airplanes I have flown and it is certainly the most reliable plane out there.

You may contact me at my telephone [Redacted] if you wish.

Sincerely,  
[Redacted]

90



[REDACTED]  
09/07/2005 12:44 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc [REDACTED]  
bcc [REDACTED]  
Subject acs-mu2

In response to this acs I am an owner of an mu-2b (f model). In over six hundred hours of flight in this aircraft I have found it to be an economical, fast, comfortable, high performance aircraft. It is a very stable platform for instrument approaches. It is also the ONLY medium turbo-prop to complete airborne icing tests behind a tanker down to and including a stall/recovery. It was designed to use unimproved strips and as such is built tough.

As the past owner/pilot of several other light piston twins ( C-320 & C-421, B-55) I have found the mu-2 to be superior in handling and performance under all conditions. Maintenance issues have been less for the mu-2 than for the C-421 which I flew for more than 1000 hrs. In both cases maintenance was performed at approved shops.

Please note! I consider proper training to be a mandatory requirement for ANY high performance aircraft.

I prefer to train in my aircraft for initial and annual recurrent training although simulator training by experienced instructors would also be acceptable.

I am an ATP, CFII and MEI with total time in excess of 30,000 hrs

COMMENT

What, if any, pilot license, ratings, or experience do the individuals who requested this grounding hold? Their actions have triggered an unnecessary and adverse reaction that can cost many people financial and personnel loss for no good reason. Will this type of response apply to ALL aircraft that crash? Should this type of response apply to all individuals who use an incident or accident as a media event? The MU-2B has passed ANY and ALL previous inspections. Why do this again?

My email [REDACTED]

Thank you.

91



[Redacted]  
09/07/2005 12:02 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc  
bcc  
Subject Mitsubishi MU2-B 20

[Redacted]

Dear Sir:

I have owned and operated an F Model Mitsubishi since 1999. During this period I have accumulated over 700 flight hours in this aircraft. I have Commercial Rating with Multi-Engine and Instrument privileges. I am Type Rated in Lear Jets and have a Letter of Authorization to operate the L-39 Aircraft. I have flown the MU2 in all weather conditions. Of all the aircraft I have ever owned or flown I find the MU2 to be the most honest airplane I've ever flown.

I attend annual re-current training with Howell Enterprises and highly recommend this as the only means to improve flight safety. The practical as well as well as theoretical knowledge gained during this training is invaluable.

During all my flight hours in the Mitsubishi I have never experienced any unusual flight characteristics. There are definite differences in the manner in which one fly's an aircraft controlled by spoilers versus one controlled with ailerons. However, these differences are fully explored during flight training making them a non-event. I remember during my initial training the first time an engine was caged and I attempted to fly the airplane as one would a King Air for example. I was not able to maintain altitude. Once I was instructed to fly the airplane the way you fly a jet all was well. The airplane immediately increased it's vertical speed to a positive number and continued to climb comfortably. It's all in training.

The MU2 is probably the strongest best built aircraft I've ever flown. My experience is that it's a solid airplane that has not required excessive maintenance. The shops I have frequented are intimately knowledgeable of the type and do a very good job.

I think it would a travesty to ground the fleet. There's nothing wrong with this airplane. Maybe we need to look at the pilots and their operations.

I am happy to answer any questions you might have. I can be reached by email or during the day at [Redacted]

Sincerely,

[Redacted]

92



[Redacted]  
09/07/2005 09:57 AM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc  
bcc  
Subject MU-2B

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

History: This message has been forwarded.

09-07-2005

Doug:

I began to fly MU-2's in 1976. I have approximately 2000 hours in the airplane. It was the first high performance turbo prop I flew during my aviation career. I was a Sales Demonstration Pilot for Mitsubishi Aircraft for 2 years. I loved the airplane since the first time I put my hands on it. I continued to fly the MU-2 after leaving the employment of Mitsubishi in part 135 and corporate operations. I never had a problem mechanically in the MU-2 however, I always respected it's limitations. Limitations that I learned from operating and training in the airplane. I always felt I had to be especially careful in high density altitudes and icing due to the nature of the high wing loading. This all comes through experience and pilots with little experience should not be flying this airplane. This is a high performance airplane and it requires a great deal of attention and situational awareness. On the other had this is a very well built and engineered aircraft. The quality of construction can be compared to Mercedes in an automobile. The F-104 was an airplane that had a reputation, but does this mean that it's a poor design, dangerous airplane? Pilots have to be professionally trained to be proficient.

I hope this helps you in your assessment of the MU-2.

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

93



[Redacted]  
09/07/2005 09:36 AM

To: Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc:  
bcc:  
Subject: MU2

[Redacted]

History: This message has been forwarded.

Doug,

I just received an e-mail concerning your evaluation of the MU2 aircraft.

I own a MU-2B-60 Mitsubishi Marquise. I have owned this AC for almost a year. I went to initial training at Sim Com and then had 75 hrs with an expert MU2 instructor in the aircraft. I have found this to be a wonderful aircraft. I logged close to 200 hours and have found the aircraft to have no bad habits when flown as intended. In training I found the aircraft easy to handle even at speeds below the normal flight envelope. I have flown in all flight conditions finding no problems.

I had heard many bad things about how the MU2 flies but have found it was always from someone who had no experience in one or who had not been trained properly and scared themselves in an MU2.

I have flown many types of AC and have owned 8 planes personally. The MU2 is the best built and best flying plane I have ever owned or flown.

I have also found the support from MU2 pilots, Mitsubishi Heavy Industries and Turbine air service to be second to none. I also own a Beechcraft Baron and although the Beech support and pilot association is top notch they don't compare to the Mitz group.

I have been flying 25 years + with a commercial, multi and instrument ratings. Even with my limited time in the MU2 it is usually obvious to me after reading the NTSB's reports that the pilots tried to fly the plane in a way it wasn't designed to fly prior to ground contact.

Once again I am not an expert on Mitsubishis but feel I am well trained and competent in the MU2. If I did not feel it was safe I would not fly it myself let alone with my family and grandchildren.

Thanks for your patience and your work on this concern,

[Redacted signature]

94



[Redacted]

m>  
09/08/2005 08:26 AM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc  
bcc  
Subject MU-2B FAA Airworthiness Concern Sheet .. UN-Concern-ed

Mr. Rudolph ....

I have just received the FAA Airworthiness Concern Sheet dated 09.02.05 pertaining to the MU2 ... and I am appalled ....

I am a practicing Texas trial attorney with 31+ years of experience .... specializing in Intellectual Property matters [ i.e. patent, trademark, copyright, trade secret matters .... and I have been selected by Texas Monthly magazine's poll of Texas's 65000+ lawyers as in the top 5% of all Texas lawyers -- a Texas Super Lawyer in Intellectual Property Litigation for the years of 2003, 2004 and 2005 ] , with an undergraduate degree in Mechanical Engineering from the University of Texas, with honors ..

I have been flying since 1978 ..... and have owned MU2 aircraft off and on since 1984 .... and use my aircraft in support of my legal practice [ which over the years has involved a number of different aircraft issues ( patented aircraft environmental systems, patented aircraft instruments, copyrighted aircraft writings, trademarks/service marks for aircraft goods and services, helicopter main rotor blade design and fabrication ... to name a few ) ] .... I am a commercial, multi-engine, instrument rated pilot with 2300+ total time ... having approximately 1850+ multi-engine time and 1100 hours of turbine time ... about 100 hours in jets [ mostly SIC in a Lear 24 ] and the remaining 1000+ hours PIC in 4 different MU2's [ 3 short body and 1 long body aircraft ] that I have owned [ fully or in partnership with others ] during the past 21+ years ... my piston twin time has mostly been in twin Cessnas and twin Beechcraft aircraft ...

I currently fly a 1973 MU-2B-25 ... K-Model .... Serial Number 273 .... [Redacted] ... with a -10 engine conversion .... which is owned and operated by related entities ....

I have been flying [Redacted] since December 2001 .... averaging about 125-150 hours per year ....

I have NEVER had any issue relating to loss of control on the ground or in flight of any MU2 ... and even to suggest such borders on the absurd ... The MU2 is a high performance aircraft ... and needs to be approached accordingly ....

I participate in annual recurrent training ... currently at SimCom .... previously at FlightSafety... as is dictated not only by my own common sense but also as required by the aircraft insurance company ... However ... in my opinion ... there is nothing about this aircraft that inherently poses a safety hazard that is any different than any other airplane .... and that the most dangerous part about flying is the drive to and from the airport ....

Having owned a number of other airplanes .... I continue to be impressed with the level of Mitsubishi factory support .... from parts availability for this aircraft which has not been in production for 20 years .... to the factory sponsored multi-day PROP safety seminars [ that are provided by the factory for all MU2 owners and operators at no charge every other year ] .... My experience teaches me that the MU2 is no different than any other high performance ... high wing loaded .... aircraft ..... the pilot must know the aircraft, its systems and its flight characteristics .... in all configurations, attitudes and power settings.... and never forgetting the cardinal rule of .... FLY THE AIRPLANE ....

Sadly .... and apparently .... the recent Colorado MU2 accidents suggest in both cases that this cardinal rule was not observed ... Controlled flight into terrain is not an issue for MU2's alone .... it is an

issue for the pilots all airplanes from a Cessna 150 to a Boeing 747 .... no one is immune from the consequences that flow from altitude inattention and flying significantly BELOW the glide slope as in the case of the N454MA accident ....

My experience and training is that the MU2 can be safely operated single engine ... should an emergency arise ... and is no different than any other twin in this situation .... one must fly the airplane taking into account all necessary fundamental variables, such as airspeed, altitude, bank angle and of course, the asymmetric thrust common to single engine operation ...

Again sadly .... this apparently was not the case for N538EA .... It seems to me that if inquiry needs to be made ... perhaps looking into pilot fatigue issues and the longevity of daily duty cycles for pilots as it specifically pertains to Part 135 nightly check haulers operating any aircraft ... has significantly more merit than to continue to vilify the MU2 ... as does an inquiry into this politically motivated witch hunt directed towards the MU2 by individuals who have sought to pad their own wallets under the transparent lip service of disingenuously characterized MU2 safety related concerns .... all at the risk of MU2 owners and operators ....

Fundamentally .... responsibility for the operation of any aircraft is with the pilot ... pilot errors [ i.e. altitude inattention ] or poor judgment [ i.e. flying when too tired or fatigued ] or lack of skill [ i.e. lack of single engine proficiency ] ... are NOT airplane issues ... they are and always will be ... pilot issues ....

While to some of the uninitiated [ without MU2 training and knowledge ] ... the MU2 is a common [ misunderstood ] whipping boy of the industry [ ostensibly because of its use of spoilers rather ailerons for roll control ] .... and this is the undeniable tragedy .... as it is truly the uninitiated's loss because they will never know that the MU2 is a safe, strong, capable, predictable, stable, fast and reliable mode of transport that is without any economic and performance equal ....

From the viewpoint of a long time pilot of MU2's ... there is absolutely no need nor reason for FAA Concern ....

Indeed, as for the MU2 -- the FAA should be UN-CONCERN-ED ....

The CONCERN that the FAA should have -- should be directed to how the FAA is being manipulated by third parties to attack the specific "safety" reputation of the MU2 ...

If safety is truly the motivation for this inquiry .... then why haven't similar charges have been leveled against other aircraft manufacturers having like accidents even at the same Colorado Centennial airport under similar conditions ( i.e. recent Cessna 421 and Cessna Conquest 1 accidents ) ] ... the silence is deafening ...

Safety is apparently the last thing on their hidden agendas ....

Answers to the "Who is really forcing this issue ? " and "What is their motivation ?" questions should be instructive .... and call out for investigation ....

If you should have a need for any sworn testimony .... I am happy to accommodate any reasonable request ....

Otherwise ... please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or need any additional information ....

Your consideration is appreciated ...

Regards ....

[REDACTED]

95



[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
09/11/2005 05:22 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc  
bcc  
Subject Mitsubishi MU2

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

***Brit International Aviation Inc***

***10298 C Pickering Drive, Hangar #10***

***Conroe, Texas 77303***

***Tele 936-788-1878 Fax 936-788-1879***

September 11<sup>th</sup> 2005

Mr Doug Rudolph

I have been in the MU2 maintenance business since 1986 in Conroe, Texas (CXO). I was the Director of Maintenance for a 135 operation, operating 15 MU2s, running checks, packages and military courier operations. The company at that time owned some 23 MU2s of different models.

I controlled a maintenance base in Denver and maintenance personnel in the North East. During the time between 1986 and 1992 we had several incidents but certainly no accidents with our aircraft.

Incidents were mainly engine failures in flight due to high speed pinion bearing failures and the occasional stator failure. All these failures ended up with safe single engine landings, most of these were at night.

From these first days in the mid 1980s I would sit in the co pilots seat doing maintenance test

flights even though I am not a qualified pilot. I hated to get information second hand, if I can actually experience a problem it is quicker to get to the source it right.

During these years of test flights, (and I am still doing it today as all I maintain are MU2s), I have been involved in, I would say, around 40 NTS shut downs, have not had one ever fail to shut down or re-start in flight. I have never experienced any loss of control during single engine flight, or during shut down or restart.

What I have experienced a couple of times is pilots nervousness, I think this is due because there is not a flight instructor in the right seat to take over if something should go wrong.

I always carry a check list and brief the pilot prior to start up, if he wants to do the shut down I cover the good engine, if he doesn't, I do it. Check list is used from start to finish.

I know any twin engine pilot reading this is saying to himself, I am doing these shut downs in an ideal controlled environment, yes I am. It must be VFR and daylight and feathered on the ground prior to an inflight shut down.

Here is my point, in 1990 in Guatamala City, S. America, I installed the left engine in a MU2 Solitaire after a gearbox repair, did all the appropriate ground checks and told the U.S. pilot, I was ready for an in flight NTS shut down. He did not want to do it and argued with me. I asked him to go through the procedure with me and he could not do it. I opened the Flight Manual, handed it to him and told him to read it because we not going back to the States until this was done. We went and did it. I got a beautiful picture with a feathered prop with the tip tank looking down into the center of a volcano with a ring of clouds round it. It was late in the afternoon by the time we were fuelled and ready to go to Houston Hobby to clear customs. Some 4.5 hours later we arrived at Hobby, the weather was terrible, pouring with rain and low ceiling. We took off around 10:30 pm for Conroe, conditions there were 800 ft, and about 1.5 miles. We were at 5000 ft night IMC when 10 minutes into the flight we experienced a very severe vibration from one of the engines. Immediately, power was pulled back on both engines until we identified the problem engine by an erratic torque gauge, then the engine was shut down, which happened to be the one that was just repaired. Once the aircraft was trimmed we asked for a diversion to Houston IAH because of longer runways. The aircraft performed flawlessly on one engine and we landed without incident. I must admit, it looked like an entirely different situation at night IMC with poor visibility and heavey rain but the pilot followed the procedure we had done several hours

earlier. I know he learnt a very serious lesson, do not be complacent.

One thing I learnt from my early maintenance test flights was the different vibration levels in these aircraft.

In 1964 I did my aircraft maintenance apprenticeship in the Royal Navy then drafted to a Carrier Borne Bomber Squadron. After 6 years I transferred to helicopters where a big emphasis was keeping vibration to a minimum, this is where I learnt how to inflight track and balance rotors. When I started working the MU2 in 1986 it was the first prop driven aircraft I had ever worked and the difference in vibration levels concerned me.

I convinced the company to buy a Chadwick to balance props as I believed vibration was the cause of engine failures. 3 bladed MU2 were balanced every 400 hrs and 4 bladed aircraft were balanced every 300 hrs. This made a drastic change. I don't think we had a failure after that, we would get bad SOAPs occasionally. I still keep props balanced as it drastically reduces the wear on these internal engine bearings. It also reduces pilot fatigue.

Today, I maintain MU2 from 1969 to 1982, some with hours up and over 10,000. The aircraft is extremely well built, in fact, apart from airliners, the only aircraft built like this that I have worked is the BAe-Hawker series and the Mitsubishi Diamond (Beechjet).

I work these aircraft every day and there have been problems that not only my maintenance personnel have found but other companies throughout the US, that have shown up through aircraft age. ie Corroded pneumatic lines, De- ice system modification,

Emergency gear pins, MLG door pins, Wing barrell nuts all of which were reported to Mitsubishi and an investigation was started. With the great communications network owners, operators and maintenance personnel were informed and aircraft were checked even before a SB was issued, because this takes time.

With the recent complete update of the Inspection Requirements Manuals with advice from experienced maintenance personnel, the age aspect and maintenance problems found over the years of these aircraft has been covered. It has also covered the aircraft that flew very little, by

making the inspections not only on an hourly basis but on a calendar basis as well.

To this day we have never found any problems with the operation of the aircraft's flying controls other than normal wear and tear which you get on any aircraft, even this wear would not cause any loss of control.

I personally believe that these accidents have nothing to do with the aircraft, especially so with the last one in Colorado which has started all this.

From what I remember in the early 90's when an MU2 G Model in Australia was on a night approach the day before the accident, he was observed to be high on the glide slope, by an aircraft following him to land, the next night he was low and hit a hill. I think there was thick fog at the time.

Then 9 days later a Cessna 425 crashes on the same approach, to many similarities.



97



[Redacted]

09/12/2005 09:02 AM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc  
bcc  
Subject MU-2B

[Redacted]

September 12, 2005

Doug Rudolph  
FAA Small Planes Directorate  
Via Email

Dear Sir,

My name is [Redacted] I currently own, manage, and operate an MU-2B/60 Marquee aircraft. I have owned this aircraft for six years now. I average 200 hours per year in this aircraft as well as 2-300 hours per year in many other aircraft types. I would consider myself quite well versed in aviation. At the age of 41 I have well over 12,000 hours of flying time. I have in the 27 years of flying, (since the age of 14) spent three years on the US Aerobatic team, as well as been a test pilot for the Extra Aircraft Company. I average two to three flights per day in aerobatic training and take flying very seriously.

I have quite a large family with 5 young children that I treasure more so than anything else. I also have been in touch with fatal aircraft accidents since my father was on TWA Flight 800. With this said, my choice of transportation for my family has been well thought out over the many years of flying, and the choice is the Mitsubishi MU-2B/60!

I have explored the envelope of flight characteristics probably more so than most. I regularly practice emergency procedures including simulated and actual engine shut downs in flight. I have flown the aircraft very far into the stall region of the flight envelope on many occasions. This aircraft is more controllable throughout the range than nearly any other twin that I have flown. Since the aircraft is regularly operated in the Northeast under part 91, I have also been in weather situations that may be far more extreme than others have experienced with this type of aircraft on a very consistent basis.

It is extremely upsetting that some political powers are attempting to shake up the certification and re-certification that the FAA has so carefully worked on over time and time again.

There is nothing wrong with the MU-2B's. They must be maintained properly, and flown by competent pilots. If one were to take the average 10,000 hour corporate jet pilot with a list of qualifications 2 pages long, and place him or her in a single seat, single engine Pitts S1S and launch that person. You can be certain that there would be a fatal accident within minutes. Is the Pitts a dangerous aircraft? It is probably the strongest aircraft ever certified, and that person would have been well legal to fly it!

Don't ruin the best turbo prop in aviation's history!

Sincerely Yours,

[Redacted]

98



[Redacted]

09/11/2005 06:19 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc  
bcc  
Subject Mu2

Dear Mr. Rudolph I am a MU2 owner and have used this aircraft for the past 5 years and over 2000 safe hours to create a medical implant business which has created many jobs and helped many patients in getting the needed medical devices in a safe and timely manner. The grounding of this aircraft would seriously impact my business and affect a number of individuals. Please keep mu2s flying. Weather and pilot error are not aircraft issues [Redacted]

69



[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
09/10/2005 08:17 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
cc [Redacted]  
bcc [Redacted]  
Subject MU-2 safety review

Doug Rudolph,

Please reconsider this very serious action of grounding the MU-2!

What I believe is happening here is some overzealous Senators and others, about to consider grounding an aircraft type based on recent accidents that are typical of all aircraft...not just the MU-2. Doug you know this to be true!

I'm a 20 year Air Force Pilot, flying the MU-2. Like any aircraft I've flown in the past 26 years from the Cessna 150 to the F-15 and MD-80 for American Airlines (furloughed), flying any aircraft is a serious business requiring the individual to maintain aircraft control during any emergency situation. Although sad, these and other accidents of the MU-2 are typical of any twin-engine aircraft.

Remember the MU-2 has an Airworthiness Certificate...Flown properly, there is nothing wrong with the aerodynamics of the MU-2.

Please see through this political grandstanding by not grounding the MU-2.

[Redacted]  
(and MU-2 Pilot)

FREE Emoticons for your email! [Click Here!](#)





[REDACTED]  
09/10/2005 04:21 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA  
" [REDACTED]  
cc [REDACTED]  
bcc [REDACTED]  
Subject Mitsubishi MU-2

70

I have been flying the MU-2 for a little over a year and have almost 650 hours in the aircraft. My background is in military aviation. We at Air First Aviation Companies, Inc. fly our aircraft in support of the Air Force's 325th Training Squadron for live air intercept training. Additionally we provide airborne drone control relay systems for Tyndall AFB's Gulf Range Drone Control Upgrade System and provide low slow targets for F-15 Visual Identification training missions. We fly the aircraft through it's entire performance envelope. The MU-2 is a very straight-forward aircraft. It is a high performance aircraft, but it's flight characteristics are very predictable.

Any aviation endeavor requires good maintenance, good training, competent aircrews, and good operators. As I look at the 24 accidents reports since 1 January 2000, five appear to be known mechanically related and those that were handled according to the Flight Manual were relatively uneventful. Those that ended in fatalities show improper procedures were followed. Of the remainder, there was one was unknown crash (flathatting?) and one bank employee walking into a prop. The last 17 were primarily pilot error/loss of control accidents that would have been catastrophic in any aircraft.

Centennial airport has had recent fatal accidents with a Cessna 421 and a Cessna Conquest 1. Is the FAA to issue a Safety Evaluation of the C421 and its higher accident statistics? The Conquest 1 crashed on the same ILS approach under similar conditions such as rain and location. If the MU-2 is to be subject to this elevated level of scrutiny, should we not also investigate the airport to determine its degree of safety? I would imagine that the Colorado congressmen who have requested this action would adamantly resist that course of action.

Flown and maintained in accordance with written procedures, the MU-2 is as safe or safer than any of the 22 different types of airplanes that I have flown. These range from single engine piston aircraft to high performance jets.

I would urge FAA to quickly dispense with this politically driven witch hunt.

[REDACTED]