101

[redacted]

09/10/2005 08:30 AM

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

[redacted]

Federal Aviation Administration
Mr. Doug Rudolph

Re:MU-2 (110-MA)

Dear Mr. Rudolph:

It has come to my attention that some congressmen are trying to brand the MU-2 aircraft as more dangerous than other planes and not airworthy. I have been pilot in command of MU-2 aircraft for more than four years and have found them to be quite stable when flown at proper airspeeds. After learning of the recent accidents in Colorado it appears that there was pilot error involved in those mishaps.

I have flown the MU-2 regularly, (approximately 150 hours per year), in all seasons, in all weather, with passengers. I always do my best to follow proper procedures and recommendations by the manufacturer and my instructor. I have great confidence in the airplane and its stability when flown according to the book.

Feel free to contact me for further information.

[redacted]

103

[redacted]

09/08/2005 09:09 PM

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

[redacted]

Dear Mr. Rudolph,

I am emailing you in response to the FAA Concern Sheet (ACS) entitled MU-2 Safety Review. I am currently an owner of an MU-2 aircraft.

I have owned and operated a single engine airplane, two twin engine pressurized piston airplanes, and now the MU-2. In thirty years of flying I have learned that there is no other airplane I want to fly for the following reasons.

The MU-2 has an extremely stable platform that handles turbulence better than any other airplane I have owned or flown. It has a climb rate with just one engine that is over two to three times that of any turbo charged piston engine airplane I have owned or operated.

I have owned my airplane for over ten years and have had no incidents to date. MU-2 owners go through extensive recurrency training yearly. We should not be penalized for pilot error. It is my belief that as long as an individual spends the time and effort to learn and understand this airplane any average pilot can learn to fly safely in an MU-2 as safely as any other aircraft.

I plan on owing and flying my airplane for many years to come. I do not wish to sell or trade my airplane for any other aircraft. It is my opinion that the MU-2 is the safest aircraft to fly.

I believe that the factory support for this airplane is equal to the support that the King Air operators enjoy. Please feel free to contact me at any time to discuss this further.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

105

[redacted]

09/07/2005 04:06 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA
cc [redacted]
bcc
Subject Mu-2

[redacted]

[redacted]

Attn Doug Rudolph
FAA small airplane directorate

Dear Mr Rudolph

In refer of the notice FAA (ACS) Mu-2 safety review

I am operating privately the Mitsubishi Mu-2 serial 509 long body for 12 years mainly between Florida and the Bahamas.

I have log more than 1000 hours as pilot in command on the Mitsubishi Mu-2 and find it in very safe in all flying conditions.

The plane is very well built and extremely reliable. If operated with proper experienced pilots and within the limitations the plane

is similar to any other twin turboprop.

Looking at the statistics the Mu-2 is actually safer than the Merlin.

The accidents analysis are pointing more toward operation than airplane control malfunctions or airplane design.

Please feel free to contact me at [redacted]

Best regards

107

[redacted]

[redacted]
09/07/2005 02:27 PM

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

MR. RUDOLPH,
I HAVE FLOWN THE MITSUBISHI MU-2B SINCE 1986 ACCUMULATING 8000 HOURS. IN ALL OF THIS TIME I HAVE NEVER ENCOUNTERED ANY LOSS OF CONTROL EITHER IN FLIGHT OR ON THE GROUND. IN MY OPINION THIS AIRCRAFT IS EXTREMELY SAFE, EFFICIENT, AND A PLEASURE TO FLY.

[redacted]

108

[redacted]

09/07/2005 01:47 PM

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

Dear Mr. Rudolph
I would like to begin by stating that I have been a pilot for 19+ years and have flown the mu2 since
1991. The mu2 is a safe aircraft to fly, the airframe is as strong as any plane made and anyone attempting to discredit it either has alternative motives or is very ill informed. The plane does require attention to detail(ie. flying the plane). The flight charisterists of the plane are straight forward and the handling is supurb.
I am an ATP rated pilot with turbojet sign offs. This plane is SAFE to fly by ANY qualified pilot.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

09/12/2005 12:47 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc

bcc

Subject MU-2 Safety Review.

[redacted]

I am responding to some disturbing news that a safety review requested by four Congressmen is currently being done as a first step in the potential grounding or placing other restrictions on operation of the Mitsubishi MU-2. I have flown this aircraft, short and long body, for over fifteen years. I have over 14,000 hours of flying in all types of military high performance aircraft and almost nine thousand in the MU-2. I have found the MU-2 to be as predictable as any other light twin I have flown and in some cases more so. I have reviewed most of the MU-2 accidents and for the majority of these, the pilot was the primary contributor to the accident. Almost all of the loss of control accidents were caused by the pilot exceeding the aircraft parameters in a critical phase of flight. Loss of control because VMC was violated, flight into the ground because approach parameters were not met, flight into icing conditions with equipment not operating or the equipment not turned on.

The MU-2 is a high performance aircraft, it was designed to be so, and pilots who fly the airplane safely know this and do not fly it like a Cessna 172. I have flown this aircraft with an engine out on a few occasions, one was an engine failure on takeoff, and have found it to be very reliable and predictable as long as you stay within the flight envelope and maintain airspeed that is required to maneuver the aircraft safely. Several of the accidents I reviewed showed that an airplane that had flying airspeed was allowed to get below VMC and go out of control because the pilot lost airspeed in maneuvers after the engine failure. That is basic flying that is drilled into folks that I work with who fly this aircraft-do not maneuver unless you have the flying speed to do so. I find this aircraft to handle fine with an engine out. Every year the company I work for (Air 1st Aviation) requires at least one flight with a qualified MU-2 instructor so we can demonstrate our ability to fly the aircraft in an engine out situation and practice maneuvering at slow speeds. If you experience one of these situations, at least you have been there before in a controlled environment and have a better understanding of what the airplane can and cannot do.

Night, weather, ice, thunderstorms all require the pilot of any airplane to stay on top of the situation. I have seen all of this while flying the MU-2 and have not found it to have any characteristics that keep you from operating in and around these environments safely. Trained pilots and good maintenace and upkeep of the airplane take care of most of the problems. I do not see faulting an aircraft like the MU-2 for a mistake that a pilot made that results in an accident. As you know, all accidents have a chain of events that lead up to the final result and we as pilots can step in at anytime and stop it, if we are paying attention.

The MU-2 is a fine aircraft. It is shown itself to be very reliable and safe. I love to fly it and see no reason to keep putting the MU-2 in the spotlight as a dangerous airplane when it has proven it's reliability and airworthiness many times over to the FAA. I do not think they would have been allowed to produce them if they were not safe.

[redacted]

[redacted]
09/12/2005 04:05 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA
cc [redacted]
bcc
Subject MU2 FAA Safety Review letter.doc

[redacted]

September 12, 2005

Doug Rudolph
FAA Small Airplane Directorate

RE: FAA MU2 Safety Review

Dear Mr. Rudolph;

I am writing in response to the review of the safety of the MU2 aircraft. When you receive a letter from an unknown person, some qualifications need to be brought to bear if anything they say can be considered worthwhile. First of all, I am [redacted] I am 71 years of age and have a few thousand hours of flying time having started my flying at age 15. I am of course multi-engine rated. I have two years of college at Clemson University toward a mechanical engineering degree. I taught A & P mechanics in the Air Force on heavy cargo and heavy bomber aircraft. By doing this, I have a good working knowledge and understanding of most aircraft systems. I have been in civilian aviation for 47 years. While I am known in the industry for my electronic expertise, I feel that I am qualified to have you take note of my opinion about the MU2 even though I do not own one nor am I certified to fly one.

Mr. Rudolph, the MU2 is one of the most structurally sound aircraft I have ever been associated with. I became familiar with this aircraft when it was introduced into the USA some 38 years ago. I see no difference between the MU2 and many other turboprop aircraft that I am acquainted with except it is built better. By the FAA's own review, it handles extremely well in icing conditions. I am sure you are familiar with the testing to attempt to cause the horizontal stabilizer to stall out prematurely. This aircraft has an excellent track record in flying many hours without costly maintenance. It is extremely rare when this aircraft can not fly a mission because of some pop up maintenance problem. This aircraft like many other ageing aircraft does suffer from lack of qualified maintenance. Many owners will take an older aircraft to the cheapest place available instead of an aircraft manufactures recommended service center. This is the fault of the FAA and not the fault of the aircraft design. We have made it too easy for shade tree mechanics to work on high performance aircraft when they are not qualified to do so.

As the chief inspector for [redacted] I do all of the fly outs when aircraft have been worked on for autopilot squawks. I see lots of different age pilot's with varying backgrounds attempt to fly aircraft for me. **Regardless of aircraft type,** I have seen a noticeable, measurable decrease in the quality of pilots over the last 30 years. Our training and monitoring programs are

no longer adequate for the high performance aircraft available to the flying public today. The excellent avionics packages which I install give a false sense of safety to the end user. In the final analysis, it is the human factors that generally cause an aircraft to crash.

In my opinion the MU2 does not call on a pilot to be more proficient just because it is an MU2. We simply, across the board, are not producing knowledgeable pilots like we once were.

I feel very strongly that the FAA needs to take a hard look at the requirements to fly a turboprop or jet aircraft. I would say, based on my weekly experience, that 80% of the pilot's I fly with have inadequate system knowledge of their aircrafts systems. I would also say that 50% have little or no safe cockpit procedures.

Please give thoughtful consideration to the many letters and E-mails that I hope you are receiving in defense of the MU2.

Sincerely,

112

"Roger Rivard"
<phinius@comcast.net>
09/12/2005 11:46 AM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA
cc <anacondads@aol.com>
bcc
Subject MU-2 Airworthiness Concerns

My name is [redacted] I am a pilot employed by [redacted] I manage our company's MU-2 freight operations for the Federal Reserve Bank. I have accumulated nearly 8,500 hrs. in multi-engine aircraft, civilian and military. I have 4,400 hrs. flown in various models of the MU-2.

I have flown this aircraft in all types of weather, snow, ice, rain, and, strong winds. I have experienced engine failures without mishap. I even had one occasion where the gear doors would not open because of ice accumulation. I was still able to land without incident.

On one occasion, one of my fellow pilot's experienced a propeller blade seperating from the propeller hub. The blade enterred the fuselage, and the resultant propeller imbalance nearly tore the entire engine from the aircraft's wing. The pilot was able to land the aircraft successfully.

Epps Aviation has been involved with the MU-2 for over 15 years with only one recent fatality. An extremely experienced pilot who it appears tried to make a sharp turn while low and slow. This resulted in what was believed to be an accellerated stall with insufficient altitude for recovery.

It doesn't matter what type of aircraft is flown. Critical mistakes can have dire consequences. It happens to new pilot's, and it happens to those with many thousands of hours in type.

I have flown this aircraft for over 15 years , and I can assure you that the MU-2 is not the problem. Why pilot's lose focus at critical times is a mystery; but it happens to pilot's in all types of aircraft, not just MU-2 pilots.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

112

[redacted]

09/13/2005 07:19 AM

Please respond to [redacted]

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc

bcc

Subject MU 2

[redacted]

Mr. Rudolph,

The MU-2 is the most well built and strongest of all the light turboprops. My experience in all models of this aircraft includes over 5000 hours of flight time over the past thirty years plus direct contact with a large number of personal and corporate operators relating to flight and maintenance issues.

There is nothing unsafe about this aircraft and another review of it's airworthiness would be a waste of time and money.

[redacted]

116

[redacted]

09/13/2005 02:50 AM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc [redacted]

bcc

Subject MITSUBISHI MU-2 RESPONSE TO ACS (Airworthiness Concern Sheet)

PLEASE FULLY EXPAND PAGE FOR CORRECT TABULATIONS

[redacted]

September 12, 2005

Doug Rudolph
FAA Small Airplane Directorate

Dear Mr. Rudolph:

I am amazed to again find myself in defense of the MU-2. This is truly a waste of time, tax dollars, and money for many individuals.

My name is [redacted] I have been employed as a Corporate Pilot in MU-2s for the same employer since 1982 (23 years). Our flights have originated in the extremely busy Los Angeles airspace for over 35 years without incident.
While not an MU-2 zealot, I do admire and respect the airplane. My experience may be of some use for the impending FAA re-re-re-evaluation. If you recall, the MU-2 was singled out not too long ago when "icing" was making other airplanes crash. The MU-2 passed all tests with brilliant results.

Mr. Rudolph, I'm sure you are very busy, so to expedite I will try to keep my email in a format that is as brief as possible.

1. My flying background.
2. My employment chronology with the MU-2.
3. Emergency and failures I have experienced, their effects, and resolutions.
4. My evaluation of the airplane.

1. FLYING BACKGROUND AND MU-2 EXPERIENCE.

Commercial Pilot, Airplane, Single/Multiengine Land. Instrument Rating.
5900 TT 4000 Multi 3790 MU-2 35 Jet 85 Simulator (MU-2)
15 visits to FSI Houston. 2 visits to SIMCOM Orlando.
I have attended ALL Mitsubishi sponsored "PROP" seminars.
Commercial Aviation Degree. MTSAC + Electronics 2 years.
United States Coast Guard Merchant Marine Captain's License. 200 Ton. My avocation.

2. EMPLOYERS.

	YEAR	TOTAL	AIRCRAFT MODEL
[redacted]	1982 to Present	(23years)	Mitsubishi MU-2-F Short Body. Currently employed.
[redacted]	1992 to 1993	(1 year)	Mitsubishi MU-2-P Short Body Concurrent
[redacted]	1987 to 1988	(1 year)	Mitsubishi MU-2-M Short Body. Concurrent
[redacted]	1984 to 1988	(5 years)	Mitsubishi MU-2-M Short Body. Concurrent

employment.
Liberty Aviation Svc 1984 to 1985 (1 year) Misubishi MU-2-J Long Body. Concurrent employment.

3. IN-FLIGHT MALFUNCTIONS AND EMERGENCIES EXPERIENCED IN MU-2s OVER A PERIOD OF 23 YEARS.

P=PROBLEM R=RESOLUTION

1. **P.** Loss of oil through faulty prop dome seal. MU-2F
   R. Shut down engine. Declared emergency. Flew from San Diego to Los Angeles on "one." Landed with no incident. Oily mess on right wing.

2. **P.** Explosive Decompression. Door seal failure. MU-2F.
   R. Descended to lower altitude. Place pax on O2. Landed with no incident. Door seal delaminated. Memorable ear pain.

3. **P.** Engine explosion and fire due to torque sensor failure. Occurred while taxiing "into position" MU-2 M
   R. Evacuated aircraft. Actuated starter to crank engine & extinguish fire. Expensive fix. Torque sensor came apart. Honeywell & not Mitsubishi at fault.

4. **P.** Landing gear jammed while retracting (post maintenance). MU-2 F
   R. Manually extended landing gear. Declared emergency. Landed with no incident. Bad Nose Landing Gear relay to blame.

5. **P.** Flap extension failure on IFR approach at minimums in pouring rain. MU-2 M
   R. Landed acft at 110 kts "flaps up." Scary. Skidding & sliding, required entire 5000 ft rwy to stop in rain. Flap circuit breaker was bad.

6. **P.** Severe tip tank fuel imbalance. Happened 2 days after maintenance release. MU-2F
   R. Activated "fuel dump" system to equalize. Precautionary landing with "Low fuel advisory." Counterfeit fuel cap seals installed at last inspection.

7. **P.** Numerous in flight engine shutdowns (over 20 shutdowns). Required for maintenance releases.
   R. No incidents to report. All successful.

8. **P.** MIS-rigged flaps (post maintenance) at LAX. Aircraft was extremely difficult to control. Full yoke deflection and half rudder to fly straight.
   R. Called May Day, returned immediately after a tight pattern at LAX. Shop at fault after finding the right flap rigged slightly lower than the left after screw jack nut replacement. The MIS-rigged difference was near imperceptible on pre--flight.

MY THOUGHTS AND HONEST EVALUATION OF THE AIRPLANE.

The MU-2 has different flying requirements than most multiengine aircraft. In a "Takeoff" engine failure scenario, nearly all Mutiengine aircraft require flap retraction to clean up the drag. In the MU-2 flap retraction could result in loss of control unless proper speeds are attained. The MU-2 has full span flaps to allow for exceptional short field performance. This design requires full knowledge of all performance parameters including temperature and density altitude factors. Hot temperatures coupled with high altitude field elevations require judiciousness in this or any aircraft. The MU-2 manuals state these requirements clearly. In the Colorado accidents the field elevations are in the mile high range.

When we first acquired the airplane in 1982, the MU-2 was going through the first FAA reevaluation due to a spike of accidents. Insurance rates hiked up abruptly. Back then, the majority of new pilots were not using formal training methods. There had never been an FAA or insurance ruling preventing an individual

with a fresh Multiengine rating attained in a basic trainer with a whopping 20 total hours of Multi Engine time to go out and purchase an MU-2 and whizz off into the wild blue. After the first reevaluation, insurance carriers required a minimum of 20 flight hours with an MU-2 rated pilot and a sign off. Of course, formal "Initial training" course with simulator was required. Since then, the training levels have increased. The PROP program was conceived by Mitsubishi, and accidents declined dramatically. However, some MU-2 operators and pilots still manage to squeeze through or ignore these requirements.

I have noticed that the 4 bladed models feel a lot heavier to handle than the 3 bladed earlier models. Perhaps the added mass of the 4th prop blade increases the gyroscopic effect. The 3 bladed versions feel much lighter, nimble, and easier to handle. The 4 bladed models feel more like the aircraft is guiding the pilot than the pilot guiding the aircraft.

Our airplane can be very demanding at times. The F model has a Jurassic period Bendix M4-C autopilot that is now 33 years old with no flight director, altitude select, altitude alert, vertical rate or airspeed control, it has made me look bad at times. The later model autopilots were highly improved.

There is a myriad of emergency scenarios that were taught at Flight Safety International and now demonstrated at Simcom. All scenarios are "generic," meaning that they could happen in any make and model aircraft. Scenarios such as engine failures, landing gear problems, pressurization, starting problems, electrical, fires, etc.

I can only think of 2 MU-2 F specific weaknesses.
1.The dreaded "gray zone." The MU-2 F is usually rotated around 93 to 98 kts (20 flaps) depending on weight. After lift off, the MU-2 must be accelerated to 130 knots to achieve VYSE with 20 flaps. This acceleration can take about 10-15 seconds. If the engine failure occurs between lift off and 130 kts and the end of the runway has slipped behind you, the outlook is not good. Other models vary and the later more powerful versions fare better, but they all seem to have the highly undesired "gray zone." If this happens at Denver's altitude, the aircraft better not be heavily loaded.
2. Split flap scenario. If the flap drive system fails, the airplane can attain an uncontrollable roll rate very quickly. If the pilot is not ready or properly trained, it is a lethal scenario. FSI and SIMCOM instruct pilots to keep the hand on the flap lever during transition so in the event of a failure the lever can quickly be returned to the last working position.

These are the ONLY MU-2 specific weaknesses. All other problems would fall under "generic failures" or "powerplant failures."

Powerplant weakness Honeywell / Garrett TPE-331.
Perhaps this is where you should focus your investigation since Honeywell engines permeate the turboprop market. The following potential problems can occur not only on the MU-2, but also King Air 100s, Commanders, Fairchild Merlin /Swearingen, etc...
The two most severe powerplant induced problems are the NTS system failure, and the fuel pump drive spline failure. Both of these failures can bring any make and model of aircraft to the ground in a more than ungraceful manner. Furthermore, they occur so fast and violently that even the best pilots may not be able to recover. In these types of engine failures, any airplane could come to the ground like a "Frisbee." For many years Flight Safety International would not demonstrate the NTS failure to me in the simulator. Probably thinking "if this guy sees this, he'll hang up his wings."

Cadillac or Corvette ? This analogy is the core of what you are asking. Any insurance agency will rate Cadillacs vs.Corvette with a wide risk margin. We all know the Cadillac will have a much lower accident and claim rate than the Corvette. The MU-2's high performance requires considerably more attention and finesse than the average aircraft. Like the Corvette, the MU-2 has a higher insurance premium. The MU-2 attracts individuals with the means to elevate just one more step. Why buy a Beech Baron when an MU-2 with 300+ MPH speed, and air conditioned pressurization comfort can be attained for near the same price? When our Company bought the MU-2 in the 1980s, the performance of the MU-2 was unmatched by anything else on the market.

Unfortunately, 33 years later, the MU-2's performance is no longer the best, but they are still the most bang for the buck. Many new designs have emerged with performance that blow the MU-2 away, but the acquisition prices are 7 digits. With the new generation of Very Light Jets on the horizon, the MU-2 along with most other turboprops will again take a few steps back in value and performance.

I am still amazed that every now and then, after a long duty day, I find myself staring at the MU-2 resting in the hangar.
I admire the lines and construction of the bird. The front of the airplane has always reminded me of a dolphin. There are many compound metal curves and welds. Truly inspiring engineering, metalworking and construction quality.
If one knocks on the side of the fuselage in certain spots, the sound emitted resembles concrete. It is truly a tank. In my bolder younger years I flew some horrendous weather in this wonderful machine and it got me through it. I'm talking near black cloud IMC with heavy rain, icing and lightning every 2 seconds plus "god's wrath" nasty "get me outa here" type turbulence. I'll never do that again, but thanks to a good weather radar and a strong airframe, I'm typing this letter. There is no other airplane like it. I feel a sense of reverence that the performance of this machine has provided me with my adult livelihood. I feel very lucky to have flown a legend for 23 years, It's been a great ride.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

120

[redacted]

[redacted]

09/12/2005 09:58 AM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc

bcc

Subject Airworthiness Concern Sheet MU2B-60

Dear Mr. Rudolph,

I just received a copy of the concern sheet today and wanted to respond. I am the Director of Operations for a Part 135 operation that uses the MU2B in cargo hauling operations. We have been operating the MU2 for fifteen years with only two incidents that involved control issues:

In one incident, we had a control issue due to the separation of a propeller blade in night IFR conditions. The blade entered the fuselage of the aircraft cutting through the power leads from the battery and the generators causing a complete loss of electrical power. The blade cut through the floor and came to rest on the control cables leading to the tail control surfaces. The pilot, using a handheld radio, was able to get directions to an airport and land gear up with no loss of life or injury. He had momentary control issues as the asymmetric engine tore itself apart but was able to maintain full control of the aircraft. The result was that the propeller manufacturer issued an AD regarding the propeller and to my knowledge there have since been no other issues of this kind.

In the other incident, much more recently (see NTSB IAD04FA021), we lost an aircraft due to loss of control caused by the pilot's failure to maintain airspeed and subsequent stall. The aircraft was entering the pattern at KBWI. The pilot attempted a steep banking turn while to low, to slow, and while not being configured to land. The result was a stalled wing without enough room for a proper recovery. This pilot was experienced and had been trained on the proper technique for a stabilized approach. His complacency and disregard for procedure bit him. If you do not fly within the prescribed envelope that is approved for the aircraft accidents can happen.

We have found the MU2 to be a safe and reliable aircraft throughout the fifteen years that we have been operating it. We wouldn't send our friends out to fly it every night if we were not convinced of this fact. You must be trained, must be current, and you must know the limits and fly by them. I personally believe the aircraft to be safe.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

09/12/2005 10:40 AM

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

[redacted]

To: Mr. Doug Rudolph
Aerospace Engineer
Dept: ACE-112
901 Locust Street Room 301
Kansas City, MO. 6406

E-Mail Direct

September 12, 2005

Topic: Flight Experience With Mitsubishi Twin Turbo Prop

Please allow me to follow-up on comments concerning the operation(s) of the Mitsubishi aircraft with the years of experience I have:

*the MU2 aircraft is a stable flying aircraft under all conditions of flight as with any aircraft while in ca pable hands. I also fly a medi-vac helicopter and can say with confidence that all high performance a ircraft command some level of training and professionalism.

*an early on experience, I slowed up while flying the pattern with gear out and flaps down. I cut the pattern short while trying to lose airspeed and altitude to help out crowded airspace. The inside wing dipped and I thought I would not get it back up but I did.
My next trip to flight school, I mentioned this to my instructor. He explained to me that I wasn't flying a single engine plane anymore and to forgo my instincts to simply push the nose down hard and rely on my training in the MU2.
Mind you now, I have since had to expedite my landing for crowded airspace, but I can enjoy doing so in the MU2 simply by adding a little power to push air over the wings. The learned lesson of course was that we are flying an airship with spoilers on the wings, they work great but they are not ailerons. Also flyng with the ball in the middle is simply a necessity to proficiency, it's keeps the MU2 in a stabilized environment.

After generations of stagnant growth in both airframe and engine progress, new design/aircraft gaining the best interest will have highly loaded wings that demand the attention of the pilot.
A loss of the MU2's to the flying community would be immense and send the wrong message to aviators. When a crash occurs and the pilot or airport can broad brush over underlying responsibility what will the FAA do, hold the pilot harmless and blame the aircraft thereby punishing every other pilot who takes the time to do it right.
Just find a Congressman willing to ignore all pertinent facts and the FAA will become ineffective. The MU2's that crashed in Colorado did not cause the other planes at the same airport to crash, but those crashes are nearly identical to the one MU2 crash. Why is that fact being left out so blatantly off the table.
Bad piloting is not conclusive to the Mitsubishi Aircraft, the professional minded pilot has always known such and we trust the FAA knows it too.

Thank you for allowing these comments to be part of the official record of response.

[redacted]

124

[redacted]

09/12/2005 11:36 AM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA

cc

bcc

Subject MU2 Control issues

[redacted]

Dear Mr. Rudolph

This letter is in response to your recent Airworthiness Concern Sheet regarding MU2 control issues.

I have owned and operated s/n 297 for about five years. I have flown the aircraft regularly and have observed no peculiarities or undocumented issues with the aircraft, nor have I ever experienced any control problems. My flying experience spans 40 years in a wide variety of aircraft types.

The seminars provided by MHIA are extremely useful and I attend them regularly. The level of support for the aircraft far exceeds that available for any other out of production aircraft, and the company's attention to safety issues is, in my opinion, unsurpassed.

Like many other aircraft types, the MU2 has seen a significant portion of the fleet become "working airplanes" which are often crewed by minimally experienced pilots, who are under pressure (either subtle or overt) to complete a mission. Rather than focusing on the aircraft itself, the emphasis should be placed on analyzing the training and experience of the pilots involved in the recent accidents.

[redacted]

125

[redacted]

09/12/2005 11:42 AM

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

[redacted]

Doug Rudolph
Faa

Doug,

It was recently brought to my attention about the unfortunate aircraft mishaps that have happen at Centennial Airport in the Denver Colorado area.
Anytime we lose aircraft and lives it's a no-win situation for everyone involved. The whole industry takes a beating. I myself have two Mitsibushi's
in which I use for my own business and personal use of hauling my family . I am recently new to the mu-2 group of owners just shy of two years
now.
I researched alot of aircraft before purchasing my first mu-2. I went to a Props seminar in Scottsdale Arizona, took the Garrett engine 3 day course
and toured the Garrett facilities at Phoenix Skyharbor Airport. I had heard aledged hear-say rumors about the mu-2s. So I called the insurance
carriers to see what they thought. Training, and yearly re-current training was a must, I agree 100 % with the underwriters on the issue. Before I
bought my first Robinson Helicopter I had heard the same things about the Robinson equipment.

Every aircraft needs to be flown in the flight envelope for which it was designed, anything out of that and you become your own test pilot. Any
high performance aircraft demands respect and a competant pilot at the reigns. The mu-2 is no different than flying my T-6 or L-39ZA jet. I feel that it
is a disgrace to punish the Mitsibushi from those who have not personally had the pleasure of flying such a marvelous piece of equipment.

In my opinion it's the best kept secret out there. I'm just disappointed that I did not buy one earlier. I enjoy my yearly training with Reese Howell
of Howell Enterprises in Smyna Tennessee.

[redacted]

126

85

[redacted]
09/12/2005 02:06 PM

To Doug Rudolph/ACE/FAA@FAA
cc [redacted]
bcc
Subject MU2 Investigation

[redacted]

Dear Mr. Rudolph
I would like to take a minute of your time to give you my experience with the MU2. I own a business that covers eleven states and use the MU2 for transportation of myself, customers and our staff. I currently own a MU2B-26 M model with a dash ten engine conversion. I moved to the MU2 eight years ago from a twin bonanza. At the time I had accumulated approximately 1500 hours with 1000 of it in a Bonanza and approximately 500 multi engine. I have a private license with instrument and multi-engine privileges. I attended school at Howell enterprises and continue to do recurrent training annually. I have done simulated single engine flight and actual. The training is thorough and informative. One of the reasons I purchased the MU2 was for the higher level of support with flight training and maintenance. I fly the airplane around 200 hours a year. Between studying the flight manual, classroom instruction and flight training I feel confident and proficient at flying the airplane. Previous to owning the Twin-Bonanza I had a V-tail Bonanza. There was similar feelings about the V-tail in the aviation community as we are hearing about the MU2. When I hear negative comments I will ask if the person has experience in the airplane. Without exception, they have not actually flown the airplane.

I fly the airplane in all conditions. I have found it to be an excellent instrument airplane. The recent accident's that have generated the renewed interest in the safety of the airplane do not warrant an investigation of the airplane. I would be more likely to investigate the company flying the airplane. Were they attending annual training, quality of maintenance, recurrent training? Who was giving check rides and what was the pilots proficiency? Like all airplanes, when they are operated outside the recommended envelope you could have problems.

A qualified, trained and proficient pilot, flying the airplane within the parameters of the flight manual and the instruction that I have received would not have crashed in the two examples that occurred recently at Denver. I have flown the airplane single engine and found it to be predictable and relatively easy to handle. CFIT is a problem in all airplanes and is being addressed with more emphasis in training and awareness in publications as well as the TAWS equipment that we have in our airplane.

The MU2 is a well built high performance airplane that has provided reliable safe transportation to our company. I purchased the airplane because of feedback from pilots that had been trained properly and had accumulated time in the aircraft. Being safe in the MU2 is a matter of discipline. I believe that the FAA's previous review of the airplane was accurate and extensive. I also believe that the FAA and the NTSB are professionally trained and qualified to determine airworthiness and crash investigation. I am disappointed to see other branches of the government spending time and effort in an area they know nothing about. You and I

would probably like to investigate some of what they are doing.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my experience with the MU2 .In summary, it has been a great airplane to operate. Mitsubishi, the service center and Howell enterprises have provided the highest level of support of any airplane I have owned previous to this one. I have no hesitaiton at flying our customers, staff or family in this airplane.

Sincerely,

[redacted]