[redacted]

09/09/2005 10:44 AM

Please respond to [redacted]

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc [redacted]

bcc

Subject mu-2

[redacted]

Mr. Rudolph
The following is a statement in regards to the investigation of the Mu-2 aircraft. I know the Mu-2 is a great aircraft. I own and operate 2 of these aircraft for p135 transport of people. For the past 20 years these aircraft have served us far better than any other aircraft could have accumulating approximately 20,000 hours of accident free operations.

The construction of the aircraft exceeds that of its competitors. It is a solid simple aircraft with excellent performance profiles. I have heard it said that the only time this airplane would come apart is if it hits the ground.

Proper training is a must with additional hours in the actual aircraft to insure safe operational control. This is our policy for any new hire.

The problem isn't with the airplane, it never was. The problem is the pilots that put them in control of an aircraft they are not ready to handle. I must emphasize proper training. Some companies get away with 6 hours of riding along in the sic seat. This doesn't constitute training.

The attack on the Mu-2 aircraft is unjust. The Mu-2 is a fantastic aircraft with unparalleled performance to date. Any aircraft that is capable of high performance characteristics beyond normal aircraft needs properly trained pilots. Maybe the focus should be on individual operations and not the aircraft them selves.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Sent via the ACN WebMail system

64

42

[redacted]

09/09/2005 10:41 AM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc [redacted]

bcc

Subject Mitsubishi Aircraft

September 9, 2005

[redacted]

Mr. Doug Rudolph
FAA Small Airplane Directorate
Doug.Rudolph@faa.gov
816-329-4090 fax

Dear Doug,

I am an owner of a Mitsubishi MU2B-60. I have flown an N Model, a Solitaire, and a Marquee for the last 9 years and I have over 1000 hours in Mitsubishi airplanes alone. I am outraged at the idea that this airplane would be grounded for an FAA examination. In the past, on at least two different occasions, the FAA has done extensive assessments on the Mitsubishi for air-worthiness and reliability and the Mitsubishi has proven itself to be a safe operating airplane.

I am appalled that the Congressman would use his power to ignorantly call upon the FAA to do something completely un-necessary while clearly ignoring the fact that a Conquest and a 421 had an accident at Centennial Airport during a similar period. At first glance it is evident that pilot error was the cause of the accident of the Mitsubishi, not mechanical error. Not to mention that 421's have more fatal accidents than do Mitsubishi's.

The Mitsubishi airplane works great and does what it is supposed to if the pilot is well trained and doing his job correctly. Sadly all too often there is pilot error and the machine should not be held liable. Any twin-engine airplane will kill someone if the pilot is not properly trained. There is no fatal flaw in the Mitsubishi. The Mitsubishi is one of the finest pieces of equipment ever made.

You would kill my business as well as many other businesses by even considering this unjust cry from a Congressman who has no idea what he is talking about. I cannot overstate how sad it is that one can have so much power to cry witch and everyone goes on a witch-hunt. I am a tremendous contributor to the political arena and I will without a doubt bring down the full force of my political backing to fight this Congressman and to show that the FAA is being pushed around.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best Regards,

[redacted]

65

43

[redacted]
09/09/2005 10:40 AM

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

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 12:32 PM
To: 'dough.rudolph@faa.gov'; [redacted]
Subject: MU-2

Does anyone want to know the real MU-2 story? The MU-2 is a high performance aircraft. It has landing and takeoff speeds the same as a Lear Jet. When it was introduced, it was considered just another twin turbo-prop. Get in it, go around the pattern, a few landings and off you go legally. If you already possess a multi engine license you were good to go. This also was a time well before insurance companies required much training. Pilots needed a license period.

The aircraft has a rugged landing gear often causing a bump upon landing. The early models were noisy and with the lack of pilot training and experience, pilot error occurred and the accidents mounted all of which retarded corporate executive sales. The purchase prices dropped to extremely low levels making a high performance aircraft available to a very large segment of owner pilots low in training and experience; more accidents occurred. Even in reverse an experienced jet pilot needs training and experience in the MU-2 before transferring from 35,000 feet down to 25,000 feet and from a crew of 2 to single pilot.

The accident reports support the absolute conclusion that the accidents are caused by pilot error and NOT the aircraft.

This aircraft is a beautifully designed strong reliable piece of equipment affording it the potential to be the safest aircraft in the sky. There is ABSOLUTELY NOTHING WRONG WITH THE MU-2.

I owned and piloted this aircraft for 18 years and 2,000 hours. It is a very safe aircraft; actually far better than most. Years ago I flew jet fighter aircraft in the USAF . The last was an F-102 supersonic fighter interceptor and I currently own and fly a Cessna Citation II SP single pilot. The MU-2 not unlike any high performance aircraft requires training period and without it the results are disastrous. Also ask yourself this question: why do I need a type rating for a Citation and not one for an MU-2? It is because 40 years ago the first turbine twins were piston twins converted to reliable turbine power (Queen Air/King Air – Twin Commander/Turbo Commander – Pipe etc.) They were the same plane made safer. But now as we have learned from experience and as the turbine power has been increased and the equipment more sophisticated, either a type rating or equivalent training is absolutely positively essential.

There is ABSOLUTELY NOTHING WRONG WITH THE MU-2.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

66

Doug Rudolph
FAA Small Airplane Directorate
Email: doug.rudolph@faa.gov
Fax: 816-329-4090

[redacted]

Mr. Rudolph,

Pursuant to your request I am forwarding my experiences in the MU2B-30 aircraft ([redacted] owned and operated by [redacted] over the last 4 years.

I have attended Howell Enterprises Initial MU2 classes and SIMCOM's Initial and Recurrent classes for the MU2B.
I took and passed my ATP checkride in the MU2B-30 (N617BB)
Current time in type approximately 400+ hours total time 4000+
Initial equipment at purchase thru first 12 months operations included King Gold Crown NAV/COMs + DME
Currently equipped with Garmin 430/530/330/340 and Avidyne EX500
I currently attend recurrent training at SIMCOM annually.

My companies flight profiles are:

Single Pilot
Day and Night IFR / VFR
Long / Short Range flights from 11R (home base) to ADS, AUS, TYS, LGB, TUS, ELP, BED, PVD, CXO, PIE, and many others.
We have flown the aircraft in Low IFR to include Light to Moderate Icing conditions
We fly the aircraft between the surface and FL 210. (Note –30 model certified to FL250)

Noted flight control issues: none
Noted system / procedural issues: none

The aircraft is fully controllable about all axis in all normal flight regimes.
The aircraft remains controllable below stall speed with both engines operational and easily recoverable by either adding power or lowering the nose to achieve adequate airspeed / angle of attack.
The aircraft displays more than adequate warning of impending loss of control with one engine inoperable.
(Note: I have flown the aircraft on numerous occasions for training and return to service flight check operations with one engine shut down (right and left in sequence), nts'ing thru feather and back thru in flight restart to normal operations.)
The aircraft remains easily controllable at 115KIAS with one engine inoperable and the remaining engine at full power, which is 35KIAS less than the recommended airspeed for engine out operations. This is a substantially larger margin of safety and much greater than that available in aircraft such as Cessna 400 series or Beech Barons.
The aircraft is stable and easily manageable in instrument conditions and well suited to single pilot operations including precision and non-precision approaches to minimums single and multi engine.

While the published/taught engine out control requirements to maintain actual best rate of climb are slightly different than those for other small business twin aircraft (wings level with aileron trim for the MU2 vs. 5 deg into the good engine/ zero side slip other cabin class and light twins). There is no difference in the concept of Blue Line operations (airspeed control) and VMC roll over. Having witnessed a MU2 turn thru greater than 40 degrees of heading prior to VMC roll over at SAT, and having flown our aircraft to the point of initial loss of heading control VMC demonstration in a simulated engine failure during my training and ATP checkride, I have personal knowledge that the aircraft is completely controllable by any trained and competent pilot.

Any professional pilot may make an error, however the MU2 is not subject to any greater risk of error from a current competent pilot than any of the other twins I have experience with to include:

BE90, BE55, BE58, C401, C340, C414A, C421, Merlin series
The C421 actually requires greater attention, activity and skill to fly than the MU2 does.

I personally witnessed a fatal MU2 accident in San Antonio and it was having witnessed this accident and realizing how many mistakes the pilot made prior to the VMC roll over that convinced me to have my company acquire this aircraft. The plane did everything it was supposed to do, some things, like attempting to fly below VMC and below the glide path are almost always fatal, regardless of the aircraft type.

[redacted]

67

45

[redacted]

09/09/2005 09:13 AM

Please respond to [redacted]

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc [redacted]

bcc

Subject MU-2B-60 Marquise

[redacted]

Mr. Doug Rudolph,

I am retired Navy and have been working for the [redacted] in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina for the past 18 years. We own and operate a Mitsubishi MU-2B-60 Marquise. We've had this airplane for over 5 years and average 600 hrs. flight time per year. During this time I have had no problems in maintaining complete control both on the ground and in flight of this aircraft. In December 2003 I lost the right engine on the takeoff roll just as the nose wheel was leaving the ground. Except for the slight yaw to the right the plane was easy to maintain control and bring the plane to a safe stop and taxi off the runway and back on to the ramp.

I feel the annual flight training is vital to the safe operation of this aircraft and no pilot should operate this plane without first learning the systems and characteristics before attempting to fly. I have found that the pilots who speak badly about the Mitsubishis are the ones that have no experience in them and all the pilots that fly the Mits love the plane.

The Marquise is a solid well built airplane and requires very limited maintenance that should be changed from a 100 hour program to a 200 hour program.

[redacted]

Marlin Crane, Inc.

1884 South Morgantown Road
Greenwood, IN 46143
(317) 882-0556

September 8, 2005

Doug Rudolph
FAA Small Airplane Directorate

VIA EMAIL: doug.rudolph@faa.gov

Dear Mr. Rudolph:

I am sending this letter in response to the situation with the Mitsubishi MU2s. As an MU2 pilot and aircraft owner, I have flown the MU2 approximately five and a half years and have completed my recurrent training on an annual basis as well as have kept up with maintenance on the airplane with an authorized Mitsubishi maintenance shop. I have not experienced any unexpected situations or incidents with the airplane. I have used the aircraft in both my business and personal travels in and out of several small and large airports and in IMC weather. I do not feel this aircraft is in anyway inferior to any other twin-engine airplane. I have also had very good and economical success as this plane is low maintenance and very dependable.

The situations in Colorado seem to be related to pilot error or lack of proper maintenance; which, in my opinion, should be addressed on any aircraft. I think the past history of Mitsubishi aircraft has proven time after time that it is not the airplane that is inferior; it is the lack of proper maintenance and training. It appears to me that there are a few individuals who have focused their attention on attempting to prematurely ground this particular aircraft when the preliminary investigative information indicates that the two accidents in Colorado could have been related to pilot error.

Mitsubishi Heavy Industries has supported this aircraft as well as or better than most manufacturers and has emphasized and encouraged proper training and maintenance which have greatly improved the safety record and performance of this airplane. I think it is very unfair to place all blame on this particular make and model of airplane because a few pilots or aircraft owners may not have complied with the proper requests and instructions.

Sincerely,

MARLIN CRANE, INC.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

09/08/2005 01:25 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc [redacted]

bcc

Subject MU2

[redacted]

Doug Rudolph
FAA Small Airplane Directorate
Email: doug.rudolph@faa.gov
Fax: 816-329-4090

Dear Sir:

I am responding to recent request for operations information concerning the Mitsubishi MU-2 aircraft. I currently own and operate a MU2-35 J model aircraft. I have owned the aircraft for 4 years. During this time I have found this aircraft to serve as excellent transportation when flown as designed and instructed by the company.

I have owned other aircraft prior to my recent ownership and have found that in all cases to operate any aircraft it is necessary to maintain the aircraft properly and to have current up to date pilot training on an annual basis to keep the pilot's skills up to date.

I have found the MU-2 to be an easy and forgiving aircraft when flown within the designed parameters. During my training I have found that the aircraft handles predicatably during emergency procedures and does not over tax the pilot using proper operations during these emergencies.

This aircraft is a high performance plane and accordingly it is important that pilots maintain annual training to keep and hone these skills.

After my review of the accident cases that have spurred this investigation, it appears to me that equipment and pilot error are the factors that have caused these unfortunate accidents. Do not blame the MU-2 for human short commings and errors. It appears that the pilot was operating the aircraft outside of the safe operating envelope in both cases. It also appears that the pilots used poor or improper judgement during emergency procedures. I have noticed that the MU-2 has been utilized for cargo operations quite heavily. Many of these operators do not keep these aircraft properly maintained and therefor expose those pilots flying these airplanes to higher than normal probability to mechanical failure. Also, many times the pilots flying these aircraft have many hours commonly acquired in a relatively short period of time, but have not kept their piloting skills up to date with IFR training and emergency procedure training.

As I indicated the MU-2 has flown very predictably for me and others who fly my aircraft. It provides very economical transportation. Please review these accidents carefully and do not ground an excellent aircraft because of poor decisions by one operator.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

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

September 8, 2005

Re: MU2 airworthiness concern sheet

Dear Mr. Rudolph,

I first owned and operated an MU2K aircraft in 1981. Due to business conditions I was forced to sell it about a year later. In 1995 I was once again in a position to purchase a turboprop aircraft and based upon my previous experience with this fine airplane I purchased a Solitaire. I have enjoyed owning and operating this outstanding aircraft for the past ten years. I am located in the Northeast and operate in all types of weather, both day and night, and under frequent IMC conditions.

I am a retired USAFR Colonel. I have over 12,000 pilot hours including over 2000 hours as an Air Force instructor and check pilot. In addition I have owned and operated at least a dozen civilian aircraft, including a Beech Debonair, Piper Aztec, Cessna 310, 340, 414(2), 421(2), Beech Baron and Duke, Commander 681 Hawk, and the two MU2's. I consider the MU2 the safest and most efficient of all these aircraft to operate.

I have never experienced a control problem or issue in the approximately 1500 hours that I have flown this aircraft. In fact I was very impressed by my instructor's demonstration of a single engine stall recovery when I went through my initial training. This is not a maneuver that can be safely performed in any airplane, and certainly demonstrates the roll control and docile nature of this aircraft.

I have found the MU2 to be a very rugged solid airplane, ideal in turbulence and an outstanding instrument platform. I have always been a strong supporter of training in any airplane that I fly, and feel that it is very important to train in this airplane as well. In fact, I serve on the MU2 Training Advisory Board and we are constantly trying to get more pilots to attend formal training, and particularly simulator based training. The other approved training courses for this aircraft, do not include simulator training and thus trainees are unable to practice some emergency procedures that are important for increasing the pilot's proficiency and comfort levels. Obviously, this situation would be true for any type of aircraft, not just the MU2.

The two most recent MU2 accidents were both aircraft that were used in freighter operations. In general, these pilots are trained in-house, or by training organizations that do not have an MU2 simulator. While I supposed it would be naive of me to think that simulator based training would prevent all future accidents in the MU2 as well as in other aircraft, I know from my experience that it goes a long way towards helping reduce accident rates.

I believe that both of these recent MU2 accidents can not be blamed upon the aircraft. It would be as foolish to blame the December 2004 accident on the airplane as it would be to blame the engine manufacturer for building an engine that failed. In reading the accident report, it appears to be a result of a violation of the basic principal that steep banks and low airspeeds do not mix. We are taught this principal from the day we start flying. The August 2005 accident appears to be a CFIT accident. How can the MU2 be blamed for this? It certainly was not the aircraft's fault. In fact I understand that there have been two additional accidents of an identical nature at this same airport involving other types of airplanes. Instead of singling out the MU2, **WHY HASN'T AN EMERGERCY NOTICE** been issued to prevent the use of the ILS 35R approach at APA in actual instrument conditions? How many aircraft accidents does it take to get your attention?

While I haven't reviewed all of the accident reports that you have, I find it hard to believe that as you stated in the ACS, over half the MU2 fatal accidents were attributed to loss of control of the aircraft as a primary cause. I don't think it's fair to attribute such accidents as an in-flight tip tank failure, improper rigging of the flaps, or loss of a cockpit windshield on the aircraft. These accidents were all a result of improper maintenance, and any airplane would likely not be flyable after experiencing these problems.

I am also quite distressed about the pressure that congressmen who may be well meaning but uninformed, can put on your agency. Obviously these gentlemen know little about aviation and much less about the MU2. The MU2 has undergone at least two very through reviews by the FAA not counting the certification process itself. In all of these examinations this airplane was determined to be safe and airworthy. In fact, according to a well known accident statistician, the MU2 has a safety record that is comparable to other twin engine turbo-prop aircraft, and a slightly better record than pressurized piston twins!

It seems to me that instead of conducting a witch hunt for some mysterious "coffin corner", logic would prevail regarding these MU2 accidents. The MU2 as all aircraft, must be flown within the safe operating envelope. If the pilot community flying all types of airplanes abides by the limitations set forth in the AFM/POH and attend simulator training on a regular basis, the safety record of general aviation would be significantly improved!

Very truly yours,

[redacted]

71

[redacted]

49

[redacted]

09/08/2005 10:13 AM

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

I am an owner operator of a MU2 N-model and am writing concerning the pending action initiated by the Colorado Congressmen.
The aircraft is safe and reliable if flown by a well trained and current pilot. I was trained by Shawn McDonnell, who has a training facility in Salina, KS, and his ability and knowledge is second to none. His training is full of countless ways to fly the MU2 in a safe and efficient manner. If a person is willing to undergo this training, and to stay current, there is no reson he shouldn't be able to enjoy and utilize his aircraft without restriction. It is unjust to condemn an aircraft for pilot mistakes.
Please give this your thoughtful consideration. Thank you.

[redacted]

MU2 [redacted]

[redacted]

09/08/2005 10:55 AM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc

bcc

Subject Airwothiness Concern MU-2

History: This message has been forwarded.

Dear Doug,

My name is [redacted] and I was writing to address your MU-2 airworthiness concerns. I have owned 2 of these aircraft over the last four years and have approx. 250hrs in the short body versions. I think the most scary point I have ever encountered with my aircraft was the 2 years of sorting through the all of the wild rumors I had heard about this aircraft. I studied every source of info in the internet, every accident report and made in depth analysis of both the MU2 series and the King Air series (which by the way when you search King Airs you must pull up the B200, B90, C90,B100, B300 and B1900 all individually, which makes a quick comparison difficult and unbalanced if you just pull up one model). I think that you will see that percentage wise the type accidents that the MU2 experience is very similar to the King Airs and that controlled flight into terrain is absolutely one of the most common accidents there is of any aircraft. Also that for VMC loss of control is THE BIG problem with any twin and is a common event to all the twin engine aircraft. What is going on here. Could it possible be the airport? Why so many crashes at this location? Maybe runway FOD, poorly designed approaches? No one seems to be concerned about the Cessna 421 which has a much worse record! I feel you are not telling these uninformed congressman how it really is because of their political pull.

Now to answer your question. The fear factor in my opinion is the strongest issue there is with an MU 2, I was extremely nervous prior to my first hour of flight in my aircraft due to all this BS, but after the first series of stalls, steep turns, recoveries, engine out and vmc demos, my fears we erased. This aircraft
flew through all it's paces just as I had experienced in other twins. As a mater of fact I found the loss of an engine to be less of an event than that of a Beech Baron, because of the auto feathering system of the aircraft. I think from the pilots comments in the MU2 vmc accident in APA shows that he was scared to death. Roll the Trucks and HURRY! I feel the fear caused him to loose his focus on doing what we all know to do first, and that is fly the airplane.

I feel that the training that is available for the MU2 could be a possible problem. As I trained, I found two AFM which in certain areas did not jive. Also we have 3 major training facilities, Shawn Mc Donnell, Reece Howell, and Simcom. They all understand and explain the systems well, how ever they seem to all have different ideas and techniques for handling the aircraft, kind of learned over the years through experience instead of a clear concise best technique from the designers of the aircraft. This left me with a confusion feeling I had to figure it out for myself. (Not Good) I feel everybody

needs to be on the same page when it comes to these training facilities. Then there is the issue of these freight operators doing their own training, (what are they doing?) and look who is having so much problems lately! I feel there was not enough aerodynamic training concerning small highly loaded wings, effects of angles of banks on stalling speeds, and the importance of the flaps to safe operation.

As for flying the aircraft it is the finest I have ever flown, I have never experienced any type of departure from controlled flight. I have found the aircraft to respond instantly to any control or power input. It flies approaches with ease and if I have ever found myself below the glide slope correction and speed adjustment is easily handled. As a matter of fact the aircraft may handle too well because it can tend to make you feel that your are not flying such a heavy and sophisticated aircraft. One other thing that seems to fool me is there is no wind sound to help you be alerted to a speed change. In other words the only indication of a speed change is the airspeed indicator. I did not realize how much I used that wind speed noise to alert me to a dive or a slow down until I flew this aircraft. The airspeed indicator is much more in my scan now. This aircraft files fine, you must fly it, not it fly you. It is very stable and dependable in all phases of flight. Look at the training, not the aircraft. I had a delta captain fly with me for several hours and boy did he fill in the gaps, on how to fly this type of aircraft. I also attended high performance aircraft training in Florida, that gave me more knowledge than I received in the MU2 courses, concerning these issues.

Now way is the problem the aircraft!

Thanks

[redacted]

73

51

[redacted]

09/08/2005 12:14 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc

bcc

Subject MU-2 aircraft

[redacted]

Dear sir,

In reference to the MU-2 handling characteristics, in 1,000 hour of logged MU-2 time, I have not found the aircraft to be beyond the control of a well trained pilot. When asked by other pilots as to how it flys, my response has always been: "You will do just find as long as you keep three important things UP , training, maintenance, and speed."

For single pilot operation considerations, after 1,000 hours of logged time in each aircraft, I find the Metro III aircraft to be more demanding than the MU-2.

Yours Sincerely,

[redacted]

78

[redacted]

September 7, 2005

Mr. Doug Rudolph
FAA Small Airplane Directorate
Department ACE-112
901 Locust Street, Room 301
Kansas City, MO 64306

Dear Mr. Rudolph,

I am writing in response to your request for information concerning loss of control incidents or other peculiarities of the MU-2B aircraft. I am the owner and pilot of a MU-2B, serial number 286. This is the short bodied MU-2, which has slightly different flight characteristics from the long bodied aircraft, but still exhibits similar control input responses to various flight regimes. I have owned and flown this aircraft for nearly 9 years. Prior to buying this MU-2, which is used in our business, I was a Navy pilot, flying several different high performance carrier based attack aircraft. I was also an acceptance test pilot and post maintenance check pilot. As an instructor in the A-6 Intruder series aircraft, I was the Carrier Qualification Phase head and a dissimilar air combat maneuvering instructor. I flew 11 different Naval aircraft, commanded a Squadron and retired as a Captain with a history of zero accidents. I felt it important to list my background as I have spent literally hundreds of hours experiencing and instructing recoveries from out of control flight situations and am frankly shocked that the MU-2 is receiving such intense scrutiny.

I accumulated over 3500 hours in the A6 Intruder which actually has a similar control surface configuration as the MU-2. Both aircraft have a similar highly loaded wing and both use spoilers for roll control. This is a highly effective solution which allows high cruise speeds combined with large flaps for slow speed approaches and spoilers which provide excellent roll control at slow speeds and even into the stall. I have flown the MU-2 into every corner of its approved flight envelope and can report that it is a brilliantly designed, capable aircraft that, properly flown, exhibits no unsafe or undesirable flight characteristics. Yet, why does this aircraft receive all the scrutiny? I understand that there have been recent accidents that have been attributed to loss of control after engine failures. The airplane flight manual lists Vmc (Velocity, minimum control) for each model of the MU-2. I have performed many approaches to stalls and recoveries with one and both engines and can report that above Vmc, the aircraft recovers from the stall with little loss of altitude and spoilers remain effective throughout the maneuver. A below Vmc single engine stall recovery produces the expected result – the

aircraft will roll toward the failed engine with the roll rate roughly proportionate to the rapidity at which the power is added on the good engine.

Pilots new to the aircraft should receive proper training on loss of engine and stall recoveries. I feel strongly that this training should include flight in an aircraft and not in a simulator alone. The simulator is an effective training aid, but there is no substitute for experiencing a simulated loss of an engine, under controlled conditions, in the actual aircraft.

In nine years of flying the MU-2, I have not experienced one instance of loss of control or out of control flight that was not self induced in a training environment. This is a solidly built, exceptionally well designed and capable aircraft that exhibits safe, predictable responses to control and engine inputs throughout its approved flight envelope. Please feel free to contact me if you require further information.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]
09/08/2005 08:53 AM

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

----- Message from [redacted] on Thu, 8 Sep 2005 09:38:42 EDT -----

To: doug.rudolph@faa.gov

cc: [redacted]

Subject: MU2

From [redacted]

Dear Mr. Rudolph:

As an MU2 owner and operator for the past 10 years serial [redacted] It's been brought to my attention, that several Colorado congressman recommended grounding the fleet. I am totally confused by this action.

Let me state, that in my 10 years in thousand of hours flying of MU2 long and short body that I have never experienced an on the ground or in flight loss of control due to the aircraft ability and safety. I have attended flight safety and Simcom for initial and recurrent training as well as many Mitsubishi sponsored free prop seminars. The MU2 is a plane that requires proper training and attention in order to transition safely too.

Many of the systems, such as spoilers in place of airelon and airelon trims are different then most commonly used turbo prop. The plane is very powerful and unmatched torque situation can create asymmetrical thrust. Piloting skills and proper training create an extremely utilitarian aircraft. This is probably why, Flightline, Chose to use the MU2 for their Freight Service. The plane's ability, far exceeds all other aircraft in it's category. One would only hope, that proper training is offered to young pilots who regularly fly in serious IMC conditions. It's unfortunate that the MU2 as had these recent accidents, but from my own personal experience I would have to point you in the direction of insufficient training, versus aircraft reliability.

In closing, I personally find the MU2 to be the most reliable and well engineer aircraft that I have had the pleasure of flying. It is my hope, that you'll focus your attention on the training aspect rather then trying to prove a well engineer aircraft at fault.

Sincerely

[redacted]

80

[redacted]

[redacted] 54

September 7, 2005

In reply to: Safety Evaluation Investigation MU-2B

Doug Rudolph
Small Airplane Directorate
Dept ACE-112
901 Locust Street
Room 301
Kansas Cit. 64106

Doug Rudolph:

This is a response to the Airworthiness Concern Sheet that I received.

I read with interest the concerns that the FAA has with the MU-2B fleet, and the appearance of a problem with either the aircraft or the operators. The FAA has asked for comments about any control problems and my response is there are none; in my experience I have had no loss of control in any phase of flight.

I believe at this time a little background of my experience is in order.

In 1985 I started flying an MU-2-60 for a company in Nashville, Tennessee and went to Flight Safety HOU for my Initial training. Since that time I have been through rec. training each year for the last 20 years and just completed recurrent training on the MU-2B with Howell Enterprises September 6. I have accumulated a total of 7000 hours in MU-2B's, models F, J, K, L, M, P, -40, -60, I am also type rated in a Falcon 10 and IA-JET (Westwind 1124) of which I do yearly recurrent training on all three aircraft. My ratings are ATP multiengine #3067970, CFI MEII # 3067970CFI, with 13,000 hr total time, 1200 jet, and 10,500 multiengine.

At the present time, I am a full time contract pilot and as such work for companies in various parts of the country. I am on the board of directors and Chief Pilot for Nashville Jet Center, an MU-2B Service Center. Part of my duties at Nashville Jet Center are to test fly and evaluate MU-2B's before and after work has been preformed both airframe and engines; major and minor repairs.

Those flight checks include flight controls, flaps, gear, avionics, airborne "NTS" checks (in-flight shut down and re-starting) etc.

During my years of flying MU-2B's (outside of the test flights) there have been times when the need arose for an in-flight shut down of an engine for whatever reason, and a subsequent single engine landing, flap malfunctions and a no flap landing, aileron trim motor failures, fuel indicator failures, SRL computer failures, autopilot servo failures, EGT/ITT failures, generator failures, blown tires, brake failures. This list is by no means a condemnation of the MU-2B; these problems have occurred over a 20-year period of personal experience. Many of these problems were also encountered in other types of aircraft not just the MU-2B.

My point is; at no time have I encountered any control problems that could be contributed to the design of the MU-2B. The training received over the years has given me the tools to cope with the problems I have confronted. The MU-2B is neither better nor worse than any other aircraft, but it must be flown properly and if you cannot put into practice what you have been taught; then yes, you are going to have

control problems. You can teach someone to pilot the aircraft and what to do in an emergency, but you cannot teach common sense.

The aircraft has gone through re-certification twice by the FAA and both times the aircraft has passed the process. The POH and the AFM have been improved over the years and include a wealth of information. Pilots need to not only read them, but also put into practice the information contained within these manuals.

To put a different angle on this issue look at the BE-90, this aircraft has had more total accidents than the MU-2B, but because there are a greater number BE-90's in service than the MU-2B the percentage is lower, there is a finite number of MU-2B's. The LEAR JET is another aircraft that has had a lot of accidents, but I do not hear the outcry that this aircraft needs re-certification.

I hope that I have conveyed my idea that this is a great aircraft. Granted the fleet is getting older, but with proper maintenance, proper training they will continue in service.

Please contact me if you should need any information on this subject or clarification on what I have written.

Sincerely;

[redacted]

[redacted]

09/07/2005 04:35 PM

Please respond to [redacted]

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc

bcc

Subject Airworthiness Concern: MU-2B

Mr. Rudolph,

I am the owner/operator of an MU-2B-26A, SN 362SA. I am responding to your Airworthiness Concern memo dated 9/2/05.

Specifically, after 200 hours of flying the MU-2B during the past 15 months including insurance required "in-aircraft" initial training with many simulated engine failures, several actual engine shutdowns, slow flight, stalls, and "emergency descents", I have NEVER experienced any control issues whatsoever. I fly the aircraft as a single pilot, IMC, night and day.

I will add that prior to acquiring an MU-2, I reviewed every NTSB accident record relating to this aircraft and satisfied myself that the airplane can be flown safely. This was followed by approved initial training and the annual recurrent training utilizing the manufacturer's recommended simulator facility.

With all due respect to the parties to those concerned with the airworthiness of the MU-2, the Colorado accidents stimulating this concern appear to be completely "generic", tragic but "generic". The issues include a engine failure followed by unnecessary agressive low level maneuvering and controlled flight into terrain. Indeed, I believe there is yet another accident involving the same company with engine flame-outs following a long descent and initial approach through icing conditions with the igniters and other deicing equipment in the off position.....the pilot was found to have high blood levels of strong medications and an addiction history.

Thus, it is my opinion and experience that the MU-2B can be flown safely and predictably with reasonable discipline and training. I am certainly not aware of any recent occurences including the Colorado accidents that speak to the contrary.

[redacted]