



RECORD OF CONVERSATION

Jennifer Rodi
Air Safety Investigator
Central Region

Person Contacted: Arch Pequet – Co-owner
NTSB Accident Number: CEN17FA362

Narrative:

During the conversation, Dr. Pequet stated the following:

Dr. Pequet had co-owned several Mitsubishi aircraft with the pilot since 2000. Previously they owned a P model and then purchased the accident airplane in December of 2006. He estimated the pilot had logged about 2,500 hours in the MU-2 during that time.

When they purchased the airplane, it had about 1,500 hours. All maintenance was performed at Jet Air in Wisconsin. The most recent maintenance was started August 28th and completed around September 5th. May Day Avionics performed work on the avionics packages as required.

The airplane had very few problems. In April they had an issue with the GPS and the autopilot control trip. Both issues were addressed by May Day Avionics and they did not have problems following that maintenance. They also had an issue in the past with the engines going into Beta on landing; however, they were happy with the maintenance that had been done and had not seen that problem since maintenance.

On the Wednesday prior to the accident, during a flight from Kenosha or LaCross, Wisconsin, the pilot reported to Dr. Pequet that he encountered a transient flag with the Chelton system. Dr. Pequet did not know if this problem was encountered en route or on the ground. He knew that the pilot was going to speak with May Day Avionics and would take it in for maintenance following the North Dakota trip.

Dr. Pequet spoke with the pilot on the morning of the accident. The pilot did not express any concerns that morning – he was going to go pick up his dog.

He had flown with the pilot for at least 500 hours. He had no concerns about the pilot's flying habits, the pilot was always well prepared. They trained together for the past 17 years – first flying at Flight Safety and then at SIMCOM. Their most recent training at SIMCOM was in June 2017 and included an instrument proficiency check.

He stated that the pilot was not a risk taker; he could not imagine the pilot departing with a known anomaly with the airplane. He also stated that it would have been highly unusual for the pilot to take off IFR and then pick up a flight plan while en route.

He was not aware of any health concerns with the pilot and was not aware of any professional or personal issues that would have been a distraction.

