



[Redacted]
09/12/2005 02:18 PM

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

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

8

Doug Rudolph
Small Aircraft Directorate
901 Locust Street
Room 301
Kansas City, Mo. 64106

Dear Sir:

This letter is in response to the MU-2B ACS dated 9-2-05 issued under your name. I am a Commercial, Instrument, Twin, Land aircraft (with MU300 type rating) pilot that stays current in the MU2 at Simcom. I have been involved with the MU since 1978 first as an employee of Mitsubishi Aircraft International until 1986, and since as a self employed aircraft broker with a specialty in the MU2. I have heard over about 40 years all the good and bad stories about this aircraft, and have had the opportunity to consider this information and most accidents with the best experts and have concluded this aircraft is safe. I have sold all types of aircraft in this time period, and because I have a specialty in the MU2 I have sold hundreds of MU2's and some of them multiple times. I have over the years of selling MU2's owned and-flown many of these aircraft of all vintages. Many of past MU2 customers who have moved up to other aircraft have said that they never realized until they switched how great the ride was in turbulent air. They also state that it would be their aircraft of choice in extremely rough air due to its ride and structural integrity. I tell you I do not hesitate to fly my family in a properly maintained MU2.

There is a number of long time established MU2 service centers across the USA where affordable and quality maintenance is available. These centers have technicians that have worked on the aircraft for many years and are very experienced with the MU2. Mitsubishi employs many individuals in the support role to include two full time MU2 technical representatives to address any unusual maintenance questions. There is always a place to get any maintenance situations resolved. I find the overall MU2 product support to be excellent with Turbine Air Service under contract with Mitsubishi to provide most services such as parts, service centers, training facilities, manuals, etc. This is exemplified in the various general aviation trade publications that conduct annual ratings of used aircraft product support, and consistently rate the MU2 number 1 or 2 in used aircraft product support.

I find the aircraft to be an extremely well built aircraft capable of enduring more than the normal general aviation turboprop. Some illustrations of this are, the MU2 has incredibly had only one in flight breakup in all these years as compared with any of its competitors. Also, the MU2's Marquise's empty weight is the same as the Cessna Conquest II's gross weight which means structural integrity. This translates into a dispatch reliability of the MU2 that is extremely high which is one of the reasons that the aircraft is on the Federal Reserves recommended list for check hauling operations.

Mitsubishi recently switched from Flight Safety (which started around 1978 to 2002) to Simcom in an attempt to keep simulator training available and affordable for the average operator. In the process. They invested millions of dollars in new training devices and thousands of man hours to assure quality training.

I have flown my MU2 Solitaire [Redacted] aircraft during training with gear and flaps down at 65 knots IAS while violently moving the control column with no adverse effect on controllability or stability. This aircraft is a puppy dog once you transition to its flying characteristics. It does not fly EXACTLY like a Cessna or Beechcraft in which many of us took our first flight hours, and expect all other aircraft to feel the same. Rather the Mu2 fly's very well, but it fly's like an MU2 not a Cessna or Beechcraft. The main learning characteristics of the MU2 is the difference in control wheel input and being an active person with the trim.

The single engine characteristics are good, predictable and conventional especially once you have taken a few seconds to trim the aircraft. It is a very stable IFR aircraft, and does a very good job in icing. I have never experienced any loss of control with the aircraft.

There are NO dark corners in this aircraft especially as it relates to controllability. A reasonable pilot can with training and a properly maintained aircraft fly the MU2 with confidence and safety.

I am typical of the normal Pt 91 MU2 pilot. We love our well built aircraft, its excellent product support, choice of excellent training venues, wide operational parameters, excellent controllability including on single engine, it's overall docile handling characteristics, its excellent range, great ride in turbulence and its high speed. If you take the time, you will also discover the fine attributes of this aircraft.

Please do not hesitate to call if you have any questions at [REDACTED]

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
09/12/2005 02:40 PM

Please respond to
[REDACTED]

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc

bcc

Subject Response to the FAA Mitsubishi Model MU-2B Airworthiness Concern Sheet

Mr. Doug Rudolph
FAA Small Airplane Directorate
Dept ACE-112
901 Locust Street, Room 301
Kansas City, MO 64106

Dear Mr. Rudolph:

This correspondence is in response to the FAA Airworthiness Concern Sheet dated September 2, 2005 relating to airplane design, operation, training, and maintenance of Mitsubishi Model MU-2B airplanes.

I am a professional Pilot for a Fortune 150 Flight Department. I currently have an ATP rating with over 8,500 hours of flight experience, and hold a flight instructor rating. I attend Simulator training at least twice a year on the aircraft I fly. I have been flying with a private owner of a MU-2B over the past year.

I understand the risk in flying any aircraft. However, that risk is brought to a minimum by thorough and extensive training, experience in the aircraft, adhering to proper maintenance schedules, and implementing all applicable manufacturer's technical bulletins. My experience with the MU-2 began with four very intensive days of simulator and ground training at SIMCOM in Orlando, Florida immediately followed by two full days of training in the aircraft itself

I have attended training and have flown 7 different Turboprop aircraft in the same class as the MU-2. The MU-2 has one of the best-documented maintenance and operating procedures developed for an aircraft in this class. When followed, and when the aircraft is operated within its design limitations, I believe it to be as safe to operate than any other aircraft in its class.

The MU-2 has a relatively low overall cost of ownership, making it particularly attractive to smaller, short-haul commercial freight companies, which have an economic need to keep them fully utilized. Such an environment brings forward an incentive to keep maintenance costs as low as possible, and to push pilots into flying in marginal conditions and for longer hours mostly at night. That can contribute to pilot fatigue, loss of situational awareness, and mistakes in judgment that could lead to a crash. MU-2's seem to be operated by these short-haul commercial freight companies more than any other Turboprop.

As I understand it, the FAA's Safety Review is prompted by the request of a Colorado Congressman following two fatal accidents in the Denver area within the past year. One of those incidents appears to be a VMC stall after an engine failure during takeoff, and the second appears to be a controlled flight into terrain while inside the outer marker on an ILS approach. I find it interesting that both of these aircraft were owned and operated by

short-haul commercial freight companies and occurred at night. Further research tells me that air taxi or freight services, the very same environment that I described in the preceding paragraph operated five of the last six fatal accidents involving the MU-2-60. The sixth was a crash on takeoff of the first flight after installation of a new and untested engine.

I have no doubt that this is a safe airplane. I also believe that what may appear to be a high accident rate is the result of how these planes are used by small air taxi and freight companies. Rather than grounding the MU-2, I believe the FAA should focus its attention on training.

Sincerely,

A thick, black horizontal bar redacting the signature of the sender.

129

[Redacted]



[Redacted]

09/12/2005 02:42 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc

bcc

Subject Safety Evaluation Mitsubishi Model MU-2B

Mr. Rudolph,

I have flown the short body MU2 for a month. I love this airplane. I am an ATP A&P AI CFIIME, Land Sea Glider etc. with 7,500 hours and 30 years in aviation. I time flown 86 aircraft models and hold Type Ratings in the EMB-110 and the Lear Jets. My Mitsubishi training was through Sim Com in Orlando. The training was through and I felt competent in the airplane upon completion of training. My training was divided between the classroom, simulator and the airplane.

I have not experienced any loss of control tendencies in this airplane.

I am quite green as an MU2 pilot but I would like to interject a point in this review process. The MU2 looks different than and fly different than most other airplanes. Does that make it an un-airworthy -no just different. I remember a flight some Twenty years ago. An airline pilot wanted to fly my Taylorcraft. He could not, initially, deal with the differences between the rag wing tail-dragger and the Boeing 727. He required "Differences" training. My years as an air carrier Check Airman and Operations Director left me with an understanding and respect for the term "Differences Training". Does the fact that the airline pilot required differences training make either the Taylorcraft or the B-727 un-airworthy? Probably not.

[Redacted]

130



[Redacted]

09/12/2005 02:49 PM

Please respond to [Redacted]

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA
cc
bcc
Subject MU2 Safety Review

[Large redacted area]

September 12, 2005

Mr. Doug Rudolph, Aerospace Engineer
FAA Small Airplane Directorate
ACE-112
901 Locust Street, Room 301
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

RE: Safety Evaluation Investigation Concerning Mitsubishi MU-2B Airplanes

Dear Mr. Rudolph:

I am a US Commercial and Australian ATP rated pilot and have logged approximately 8500 hours of total flight time, 5000 hours of Garrett 331 powered aircraft, and 3300 hours total in all manufactured models of Mitsubishi MU2 aircraft.

I started flying and operating Mitsubishi MU-2B aircraft in 1986 by purchasing five (5) MU2's in the U.S.A. and personally flying them across the Pacific to Australia to use in my air charter business. During the term of operating my business in Australia, I was the chief pilot and training pilot of our operation, which performed approximately 4,000 hours per year. After selling my Australian operation, I moved to the United States and am now the owner of Air 1st Aviation Companies, Inc.

Air 1st operates a contract for the United States Air Force flying 4,200 hours per year with a fleet of eight (8) Mitsubishi MU-2B-25 and MU-2B-26 aircraft at Tyndall Air Force Base in Florida since 1998. Air 1st aircraft support the 325th Training Squadron for live air intercept training. Air 1st also provides airborne drone control relay systems for the Gulf range drone control upgrade system and provides a low slow target for F15 visual identification training missions.

During the years of 2002 and 2003, I was an owner and Director of Operations for Air 1st Aviation Companies of Oklahoma, Inc., which operated a Federal Reserve contract and on-demand charter.

During my years as an operator of Mitsubishi MU-2B aircraft I have been responsible for approximately 42,000 hours, in which there have had no accidents. During that 42,000 hours of operation we have unfortunately had two (2) incidents; one, a pilot landed gear up and the other a

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

121



[Redacted]
09/12/2005 03:12 PM
Please respond to
[Redacted]

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

[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Dear Mr. Rudolph

Reference MU-2 ACS.

I am a private pilot who operates an MU-2, P model. This is the second MU-2 I have operated. I have flown my family and myself for over 1000 hours in the MU-2 aircraft. This airplane is very safe when you operate the aircraft by the POH. I attend flight training every year, I have found this aircraft to be a very capable aircraft during all phases of flight and on single engine operation. As a private pilot, operating this aircraft single pilot, I fly the way you were taught. If you fly this aircraft like a light twin or you get behind the aircraft, you are going to have problems.

I am going to personally contact my Congressman, Butch Otter and Mike Simpson and make them aware of how safe I feel this aircraft is. Congressman Simpson has flown in my MU-2

Sincerely

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

--

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG Anti-Virus.

Version: 7.0.344 / Virus Database: 267.10.22/97 - Release Date: 9/12/2005

132



[Redacted]
[Redacted]
09/12/2005 03:20 PM

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

[Large redacted area in the top right corner]

12 September 2005

Sir:

It is my understanding that the Mitsubishi MU2 is again being singled out for special review of its flight characteristics. Although I am not an extremely high time pilot with regard to the MU2, I find the aircraft extremely easy to fly when the aircraft flight manual is followed and some reasonable application of common sense is applied.

I have had the opportunity to fly the Beech A90(U-21) and B200(C12) extensively and find that, although different, the MU2 responds to reasonable handling by an average pilot like myself with no unusual flight characteristics that are different than the Beech B200 save for the ability of the MU2 to handle asymmetrical ice accumulation to level that the B200 could not achieve. I am sure that this is due to the ability of the MU2 to deploy the spoiler and aileron trim to effect control when only aileron deflection and trim can be applied with the B200. Just watching the icing video that the FAA has required all MU2 pilots (Are B200 pilots required to watch this? They and all high performance aircraft pilots should be) to view would make a believer out of many skeptics!

Like any turbine aircraft, the MU2 requires a level of training above that of the average small single engine or twin engine aircraft, that is why the insurers of these aircraft require training at established training centers for new and recurrent training which I attend every year. Those who do not attend, for the most part are not insured. Training can not stop people who profess to be pilots from doing very stupid things while flying ANY airplane, as I am sure you are aware. If you do not train for engine out conditions, aborted takeoffs, go-arounds, instrument approaches of all types, loss of cockpit altitude, smoke and fire emergencies, holding, etc. then you will not be ready to accomplish these things safely or worse, you will do the exact opposite of what is required because of "habit transfer".

The MU2 is easy to set up and fly on departure. It is a very solid instrument platform, requiring only minor trim adjustments to accommodate fuel burnoff in cruise. I fly most instrument approaches at 120 KIAS at 20deg flap and find this extremely stable. Engine out training has shown me that this aircraft is very predictable and stable. Stalls are non events. Vmc is easily handled with appropriate procedures. I can think of no flight regime where this aircraft is "tricky" to manage.

Maintenance at the MU2 Support Centers is excellent; support by Mitsubishi is excellent; support in the form of PROP seminars is excellent. In short, I fly my family members in this aircraft and have no reservations or concerns about its flight characteristics or the quality and integrity of the MU.

Last but not the least, take some training flights in the MU2, IT IS ONE OF THE GREAT AIRCRAFT OF THE LAST YEARS.

[Redacted signature block]



[Redacted]

09/12/2005 03:43 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc [Redacted]

bcc

Subject Airworthiness Concerns on MU-2B

[Redacted]

Dear Mr. Randolph,

Pursuant to your informational sheet dated September 2, 2005, which I have just received this morning, regarding comments in which you are soliciting by September 12, 2005, below is my response to your request. However, due to the late arrival of the e-mail and my response, I will be as brief as possible and cover as much information as I think is prudent.

Mr. Randolph, [Redacted] operates two MU-2s located out of Portsmouth, VA, one being an "L" model, the other a Marquis. To answer your question directly, "has there been any loss of control" as stated in paragraph two, the answer to that question is absolutely not. We have been operating two MU-2 aircrafts over the last 9 years and have never witnessed, seen or experienced any type of control problems.

In all the information which has been forwarded to me in regards to the MU-2, in relationship to the accident which took place in Denver, CO, it appears on the surface that this is an example of pilots that are not properly trained on a high performance type of aircraft. In our operation, both of our pilots attend yearly training schools, one provided by Reese Howell in Smyrna, TN, the other one provided by SimCom out of Orlando, FL. We feel, in using both of those schools, that we bring back as much information to share among our pilots so that they are aware of the different styles by both organizations. Our pilots are high time MU-2 pilots that have come up through the ranks of other aircrafts, including Cessnas, Navajos, Lear jets, etc. Both respect this aircraft for what it is, a high performance aircraft. Being the owner of the MU-2s, I can assure you that we pay a lot of attention to our pilot training, pilot service, on call status and other areas of concern in which I have read in previous accidents and which seem to be the leading factors of airplane crashes. If I am not mistaken in the information which I read, Epps had an MU-2 go down in Baltimore on approach and it appears that, on the surface, this was caused by the pilot falling asleep during approach. This indicates to me that long hours of service are responsible for these type of instances. I don't claim to be an expert on the MU2s, I can only give you the facts

as they have been related to me. I respect the aircraft and its capabilities, if the aircraft is flown within its envelope it is simply a fine aircraft and presents no problems within the aviation field. I request that additional correspondence be sent to my e-mail address so that I may be kept apprised of any information in regards to the MU-2, as well as, any other air worthiness concerns.

If there is additional information I can provide to you in regards to the above, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this e-mail message may be privileged and confidential information and is intended only for the use of the individual and/or entity identified in the address or this message. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are requested not to print, distribute or copy this communication. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone or return e-mail and delete the original message from your system. Thank you.



[REDACTED]
 09/12/2005 03:47 PM
 Please respond to
 "Thomas"
 [REDACTED]

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA
 cc
 bcc
 Subject Mitsubishi MU 2 - 60

[REDACTED]

Mr. Doug Rudolph
 FAA Small Airplane Directorate
 Dept ACE-112
 901 Locust Street, Room 301
 Kansas City, MO 64106

Dear Mr. Rudolph:

This correspondence is in response to the FAA Airworthiness Concern Sheet dated September 2, 2005 relating to airplane design, operation, training, and maintenance of Mitsubishi Model MU-2B airplanes.

I am a private owner/operator of an MU-2-60 aircraft that I purchased within the past year. As with any significant investment, my decision to purchase the aircraft was made only after what I consider to be very extensive research into the aircraft, its specifications, characteristics, and especially its safety record.

Certainly, there is inherent risk in flying any aircraft. However, that risk is brought to a minimum by thorough and extensive training, experience in the aircraft, adhering to proper maintenance schedules, and implementing all applicable manufacturer's technical bulletins. My experience with the MU-2 began with four very intensive days of simulator and ground training at SIMCOM in Orlando, Florida immediately followed by two full days of training in the aircraft itself. I have now logged approximately 120 hours in the aircraft, and am confident that my decision to select the Mitsubishi was the correct one.

One of the factors that led me to select the MU-2 is the extent of the documented maintenance and operating procedures developed for this aircraft. When followed, and when the aircraft is operated within its design limitations, I believe it to be as safe, if not safer, to operate than any other aircraft in its class.

The MU-2 has a relatively low overall cost of ownership and short-field landing capability, making it particularly attractive to smaller, short-haul commercial freight companies which have an economic need to keep them fully utilized. Such an environment brings forward an incentive to keep maintenance costs as low as possible, and to push pilots into flying in marginal conditions and for longer hours. That can contribute to pilot fatigue, loss of situational awareness, and mistakes in judgment that could lead to a crash.

As I understand it, the FAA's Safety Review is prompted by the request of four Colorado

Congressmen following two fatal accidents in the Denver area within the past year. One of those incidents appears to be a VMC stall after an engine failure during takeoff, and the second appears to be a controlled flight into terrain while inside the outer marker on an ILS approach. I find it interesting that both of these aircraft were owned and operated by short-haul commercial freight companies and occurred at night. Further research tells me that five of the last six fatal accidents involving the MU-2 were operated by air taxi or freight services, the very same environment that I described in the preceding paragraph. The sixth was a crash on takeoff of the first flight after installation of a new and untested engine.

I have no doubt that this is a safe airplane. I also believe that what may appear to be a high accident rate is the result of how these planes are used by small air taxi and freight companies. Rather than grounding the MU-2, I believe the FAA should focus its attention on training. I, for one, am very strongly in favor of simulator training such as the course I completed at SIMCOM, and would encourage the FAA to require more simulator training on a regular basis for MU-2 pilots.

Sincerely,





09/12/2005 04:16 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA
cc
bcc
Subject Response to Airworthiness Concern Sheet

Mr. Rudolph;

I have been flying since 1967 and have approximately 17,000 hours in aircraft ranging from military helicopters to light corporate jets. My multi engine time is in excess of 10,000 hours with over 8,000 hours in the MU-2. My experience in the MU2 is in virtually all models. I am an ATP rated pilot with multi engine and type rating in the MU-300 / BE-400. I have been certified since 1971 as a flight instructor in airplanes land and sea, helicopters and am a CFII. I am an FAA Designated Examiner since 1974 and hold authorizations for PE, CIRE, ATPE, FIE Airplane. My LOAs are for the MU-2 and the MU-300/BE-400 and I have been an Accident Prevention Counselor since the beginning of the program in 1972.

I served with Mitsubishi for several years as a demonstration pilot and was responsible for training new demo pilots and for the construction of safety seminar events, including the first PROP seminars in 1982. During that period of time, the training for new demo pilots included maneuvers that extended to the outer edges of the certification envelope in order to prepare them for any event that might take place during a pilot demo. At no time did I experience any control problem or issue in any configuration or flight condition.

In 1992 and 1993, I was involved in the natural icing flight testing done by Mitsubishi and flew approximately 150 hours in search of icing conditions, 50 of which were logged "in natural icing" flight conditions. During those flights, on board data collection devices and camera equipment and were employed to record the information and all areas of the flight envelope were investigated with varying degrees of ice adhesion to wings, tail surfaces and unprotected airframe areas. Maneuver included all flight envelope speeds with stalls in all configurations and full flap push-over maneuvers. At no time did I experience any control problems or issues, with or without ice and the aircraft remained controllable during all testing.

I have taken part in numerous other flight testing activities, including those as a safety pilot, flying with FAA test pilots during the 1997 FFSCR activities. During those flights, FAA test pilots flew the MU-2 through numerous test card activities, again with no controllability issues. My other flight testing activities include: dive trim test flight, ice detector certification flight tests and. ICTS testing with natural icing and artificial ice shapes.

During filming for the PROP seminars and as directed by Mitsubishi or the FAA for flight test purposes, I have accumulated over 50 hours of time with one shut down and have made approximately 30 actual single engine landings.

The MU-2 is probably the most tested turboprop in history and I have been involved in a great deal of those activities. If some mysterious control problem exists, I have not found it, considering that at least part of my flying responsibility was to test for it.

During the PROP seminars, held every two years since 1994, our attendance had been over 75% of the owners and operators of the MU-2. I have had the opportunity to talk with most of the pilots over the years, including those that operate the 50 plus aircraft that fly at night and in all weather, in support of the Federal Reserve Bank. Not once have I ever heard of anyone experiencing a loss of control.

You state that you are looking for a root cause for MU-2 accidents. Loss of control, as stated in the NTSB list of probable causes, is not a root cause. Most accidents in all aircraft are as a result of the pilot losing control of the aircraft at some point. Loss of control probably caused the aircraft to crash in a non-survivable attitude or speed, but that does not explain why the pilot made the decision that led to the

ultimate loss of control. You must look deeper into the human factors side of the accident to find out why the pilot used poor judgment and made bad decision which resulted in a chain of errors leading to accident. Without that, it is next to impossible to capsulate "loss of control" as a root cause. I suspect that if you look back into the NTSB causal factors for most accidents in all aircraft, you will see that there are a high percentage of findings that list loss of control as a causal factor. The MU-2 is not alone in that regard.

In my opinion, the most obvious common thread of most of the accidents that have happened in the MU-2 is poor or no training coupled in some cases with poor maintenance. In the current FAA regulatory environment, a pilot with a fresh multi engine rating added to his pilot certificate, can purchase and fly a high performance turboprop like the MU-2. Aviation technology over the last 30 years has produced numerous new airframes that don't qualify for a type rating under the 12,500 rule, yet these aircraft are every bit as complex as many of the light jet aircraft of the same period. Any certification environment that does not call for more thorough training and/or certification for pilots in high performance, complex turboprop aircraft, is going to produce a host of pilot that purchase well above their skill and ability level. Those pilots that are serious about their upgrade into these aircraft will obtain good initial and recurrent training, hopefully simulator training, to bring their knowledge and skill levels up to the task. Those that don't, and that number is large, are operating in an area of potential disaster. I am speaking about all high performance turboprop aircraft, but specifically regarding the MU-2, you should be looking at a requirement for training, not unlike that necessary for a type rating. A type rating or a mandated program through the FITS area would work, although FITS is currently a voluntary program.

Having worked with Mitsubishi for so many years and having dealt with inquiries from the FAA, such as your "Airworthiness Concern Sheet", I realize that the pressure being exerted on the FAA generally comes from a political source which is, in most cases, fired by plaintiffs attorneys with their pocketbook in mind. This has little to do with safety and diverts the efforts of many fine FAA personnel from other, more pressing certification tasks and creates continuing bad will between industry and the FAA.

I have spent most of my career working with this incredible airplane and will continue doing so until I can't fly anymore. In the meantime, if I can be of further assistance, please feel free to call on me at any time.

Sincerely;



126
95
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
September 12, 2005

Doug Rundolph
Aerospace Engineer
Small Airplane Directorate
Department ACE-112
901 Locust Street, room 301
Kansas City Mo. 64106

Mr. Rudolph,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into your safety evaluation of the MU-2B aircraft. [REDACTED] has been operating an MU-2B-60 aircraft, serial number 740SA, registration number [REDACTED] since Mar 1997. During which time we have logged over 2500 hours without any incidents of loss of control, during any phase of flight or ground operations.

I am an ATP rated pilot and hold the following type ratings Lear Jets, CL 600, DA10. Over 5000 hours in turbo-prop aircraft with most of that time in aircraft powered by the Honeywell TPE-331 Engine, this is also the engine used on the MU-2B aircraft. I have currently logged over 15,000 hours and hold an Instructors certificate, CFII multi and single engine land.

I have personally spoke with many MU-2 pilots and have never encountered one who has experienced a loss of control issue in a properly rigged and maintained aircraft.

I do believe it is important to include all other turbine powered multi-engine aircraft as you conduct this evaluation, to determine if it is any better or worse than any other.

MAINTENANCE:

You requested a response to maintenance issues. In a recent issue of the trade journal, AIN, was published the results of a survey, conducted by them, on customer satisfaction of certified service centers. The result of that survey placed Mitsubishi above all other manufactures of turbo-prop aircraft for the second year in a row. I don't believe you are going to find that maintenance is going to be a major factor in your evaluation, if the work has been accomplished at a Mitsubishi Certified Service Center.

TRAINING:

As with any aircraft, training is paramount in its safe operation, the MU-2 is no exception! Without having the training records of the crews involved in the fatal accidents sited it is difficult to address this issue, however I feel sure that as you conduct your Safety Evaluation you will factor that data into the equation. If the FAA had looked at the complexity of the MU-2 and decided that, it was one that needed more than casual training when it was first certified, I suspect that we would not find ourselves in this position today. This is a Jet airplane, which just happens to have propellers, and needs to be treated and flown as such, anything less, puts the aircraft, crew and passengers at undue risk.

DESIGN:

The MU-2B family of aircraft has been examined by the FAA more than any turbo-prop either in or out of production, and has proven it's self to be as safe and reliable as any other turbine aircraft. I am sure just as with the reexamination of the MU-2 for operation in known icing, and the NTSB review conducted in 1983, this too will only reinforce the proven design of this airframe.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]