

## MU2 FACTS

-The Mitsubishi MU2 is a cabin-class, twin-engine, propeller-driven business aircraft produced between 1967 and 1985. The aircraft can carry between 7 and 10 people in executive configuration, and is used to carry both passengers and cargo.

-Despite ceasing production of the MU2 in the 1980s (as did all manufacturers of comparable aircraft with the sole exception of Beechcraft/Raytheon), Mitsubishi continues to this date to provide unmatched support of the MU2 as evidenced by:

\*\*Best in class ranking in all of *Aviation International News*' Product Support and Service Surveys (2000, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006)(Best for all turboprops 2003, 2005 and 2006, for twin-engined turboprops in 2000 and 2004)

\*\*Multi-million dollar sponsorship and support of state-of-the-art simulator training facilities at Simcom, Orlando, Florida – brand-new in 2002

\*\*Creation and sponsorship of free "Pilot's Review Of Proficiency" ("PROP") Safety Seminars biennially since 1994

-These aggressive efforts have played a large part in making the MU2 the safest aircraft in its class today, as is apparent from the following:

### *Cabin-Class Accidents-Incidents by Manufacturer – 1997 to Present*

2007 (to date)	Accidents	Fatal Accidents	Fatalities
Swearingen SA-226, 227 (d)	2	0	0
King Air 90/100/200/300 (c)	1	1	1
Piper PA31-42 Series	1	1	1
2006 (to date)	Accidents	Fatal Accidents	Fatalities
Cessna 400 Series	20	10	36
King Air 90/100/200/300 (c)	11	3	11
Cessna 208 Caravan (a)	9	5	16
Piper PA31-42 Series	7	2	6
Swearingen SA-226,227 (d)	5	1	1
Mitsubishi MU2 Series	3	3	4
Commander 500-600 Series (b)	3	2	7
2005	Accidents	Fatal Accidents	Fatalities
Cessna 400 Series	20	4	11
Cessna 208 Caravan	17	3	11
Piper PA31-42 Series	16	5	23
Commander 500-600 Series	8	3	4
King Air 90/100/200/300	5	3	10
Mitsubishi MU2 Series	5	4	8
Swearingen SA-226, 227	4	1	2

2004			
Cessna 400 Series	23	6	17
Piper PA31-42 Series	16	8	22
King Air 90/100/200/300	16	5	20
Cessna 208 Caravan	13	2	9
Mitsubishi MU2 Series	7	4	6
Swearingen SA-226, 227	6	1	3
Commander 500-600 Series	5	4	14
2003			
Cessna 400 Series	33	17	43
Cessna 208 Caravan	14	1	1
Piper PA31-42 Series	11	4	13
Commander 500-600 Series	10	3	5
King Air 90/100/200/300	9	3	17
Swearingen SA-226, 227	7	2	2
Mitsubishi MU2 Series	1 (e)	0	0
2002			
Cessna 400 Series	19	8	18
Piper PA31-42 Series	14	6	11
Commander 500-600 Series	11	4	10
King Air 90/100/200/300	11	3	12
Cessna 208 Caravan	11	5	8
Swearingen SA-226, 227	4	1	2
Mitsubishi MU2 Series	3	1	2
2001			
King Air 90/100/200/300	19	8	31
Cessna 400 Series	19	5	19
Cessna 208 Caravan	12	5	27
Piper PA31-42 Series	8	4	11
Commander 500-600 Series	6	4	18
Swearingen SA-226, 227	5	3	14
Mitsubishi MU2 Series	4	3	5
2000			
Cessna 400 Series	22	8	16
Piper PA31-42 Series	20	7	33
King Air 90/100/200/300	18	6	18
Cessna 208 Caravan	9	3	12
Swearingen SA-226, 227	7	1	1
Mitsubishi MU2 Series	5	3	7
Commander 500-600 Series	4	1	7
1999			

Cessna 400 Series	23	8	39
PA31-42 Series	17	6	16
King Air 90/100/200/300	14	8	29
Commander 500-600 Series	12	4	11
Cessna 208 Caravan	8	3	24
Swearingen SA-226, 227	4	0	0
Mitsubishi MU2 Series	2	1	2
1998			
Cessna 400 Series	17	7	31
PA31-42 Series	17	7	12
King Air 90/100/200/300	13	4	16
Commander 500-600 Series	12	4	7
Cessna 208 Caravan	8	3	3
Swearingen SA-226, 227	4	3	17
Mitsubishi MU2 Series	2	1	2
1997			
Cessna 400 Series	30	8	27
King Air 90/100/200/300	19	7	18
PA31-42 Series	11	0	0
Cessna 208 Caravan	9	5	26
Swearingen SA-226,227	6	2	11
Commander 500-600 Series	5	2	4
Mitsubishi MU2 Series	1	1	2

**Source:** [www.nts.gov](http://www.nts.gov) (as of 1/12/07)

#### Footnotes

- (a) The Cessna 208 Caravan is the only single-engine aircraft in this table. However, it is commonly used in cargo carriage for missions similar to the cargo-configured MU2. It is also the only single aircraft type displayed in this table, with the rest of such aircraft being an entire series of aircraft.
- (b) The manufacturer name for the Commander series at various entries appears as “Twin Commander”, “Rockwell Commander”, “Aero Commander” and “Gulfstream Commander”
- (c) The manufacturer name for the King Air series appears as “Beechcraft”, “Beech”, “Raytheon” or “Raytheon Corporate Aircraft”
- (d) The manufacturer name for the SA-226 and 227 appears as “Swearingen” or “Fairchild”
- (e) The NTSB for 2003 includes as a “Fatal” an accident where a person walked into an MU2 propeller while the engine was operating on the ground, omitted here.

An astute reader of the aforementioned table will note that piston-engine aircraft from Cessna, Piper, and Commander have been included with the turbine-engine aircraft. If

one is considering the risks to human life, or more than one, this is a legitimate comparison as the piston-engine versions offer no more utility than the turbine-engine versions save for lower cost (a legitimate reason to risk more loss of life?). One could bring helicopters and their horrible statistics in here, but helicopters offer obvious utility and capability not available from fixed-wing aircraft.

-The single most common factor in recent MU2 accidents has been the absence of formal MU2 training, either that simulator training sponsored by Mitsubishi at Simcom or in-aircraft training provided by Howell Enterprises or Professional Flight Training, in the accident pilot's operation. This may be in conjunction with such pilot's operation lacking insurance or the decision by an underwriter insuring a fleet of cargo-only MU2s not to require such training. Mitsubishi and the FAA are working toward mandating such training.

-It is also noteworthy that cargo-only operations (including, of course, those with MU2s) are held to a lesser standard of safety-oriented equipment, including not requiring autopilots or ground-proximity warning equipment, by the FAA than are aircraft carrying passengers or a certain number of passengers.

-There are one or more plaintiff's attorneys who specialize in bringing lawsuits involving every type of aircraft built, regardless of accident particulars. Two such attorneys, who are partners in the same law firm but will likely try to appear to be independent sources, may well contact you, possibly as a first step in obtaining representation of surviving family members and attempting to create a negative impression with potential jurors. They will most likely have no information (at the time of initial media contact) on this particular crash or aircraft or operator. ***Information published in NTSB reports is often (if not always) at odds with the theories they offer prior to publication of such reports.***