

Monroe Rosalind

From: Joshi Deepak
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2005 4:43 PM
To: Monroe Rosalind
Cc: Moye Melba
Subject: FW: NTSB NPRM 427

Another one.....

-----Original Message-----

From: L. Federico [mailto:copter86@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2005 4:40 PM
To: Joshi Deepak
Cc: R Fox
Subject: Fw: NTSB NPRM 427

----- Original Message -----

From: L. Federico
To: Deepak Joshi
Cc: rfox@bellhelicopter.textron.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2005 5:34 PM
Subject: NTSB NPRM 427

Mr. Deepak Joshi
Lead Aerospace Engineer (Structures)
National Transportation Safety Board
490 L'Enfant Plaza, SW
Washington, DC 20594
joshed@ntsb.gov

Dear Sir:

I am 100 % opposed to NTSB NPRM 427, "that proposes to eliminate ground rotor blade strike exemption from the "Substantial Damage" definition of 47 CFR 830.2., for the following reason:

1. Incident and substantial damage inspections are spelled out in all helicopter manufactures maintenance manuals to maintain continues aircraft airworthiness and safety for the public.
These inspections have been working and in effect for many, many years and have proven very effective when these inspections are performed in accordance with the manufacture recommendations.
2. To eliminate "Incident" would serve no purpose other than reduce the effectiveness of the service that the helicopter provides in today global market.
3. The only possible benefit is to the NTSB who can claim that they are investigating a larger number of accidents.

Federico Helicopters, Inc
Leonard A. Federico, CFO
4955 E. Andersen Drive, Suite: 115
Fresno, CA 93727

03/11/2005

Joshi Deepak

From: L. Federico [copter86@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2005 5:50 PM
To: Joshi Deepak
Cc: R Fox
Subject: Fw: NTSB NPRM 427

Mr. Deepak Joshi
Lead Aerospace Engineer (Structures)
NTSB

Sir:

As and after thought, does this mean that all propeller driven aircraft that incurred an "prop strike" and all turbo-jet powered aircraft that incurred foreign object damage "FOD" would now be classified as an accident? Has the additional financial burden to FAA Flight Standards that has the responsibility to investigate accidents been evaluated ???????

Regards,

Leonard A. Federico, CFO
Federico Helicopters, Inc.

----- Original Message -----

From: L. Federico
To: Deepak Joshi
Cc: R Fox
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2005 1:46 PM
Subject: Fw: NTSB NPRM 427

----- Original Message -----

From: L. Federico
To: Deepak Joshi
Cc: R Fox
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2005 1:39 PM
Subject: Fw: NTSB NPRM 427

----- Original Message -----

From: L. Federico
To: Deepak Joshi
Cc: rfox@bellhelicopter.textron.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2005 5:34 PM
Subject: NTSB NPRM 427

Mr. Deepak Joshi
Lead Aerospace Engineer (Structures)
National Transportation Safety Board
490 L'Enfant Plaza, SW
Washington, DC 20594
joshed@ntsb.gov

3/14/2005

Dear Sir:

I am 100 % opposed to NTSB NPRM 427, "that proposes to eliminate ground rotor blade strike exemption from the "Substantial Damage" definition of 47 CFR 830.2., for the following reason:

1. Incident and substantial damage inspections are spelled out in all helicopter manufactures maintenance manuals to maintain continues aircraft airworthiness and safety for the public.

These inspections have been working and in effect for many, many years and have proven very effective when these inspections are performed in accordance with the manufacture recommendations.

2. To eliminate "Incident" would serve no purpose other than reduce the effectiveness of the service that the helicopter provides in today global market.

3. The only possible benefit is to the NTSB who can claim that they are investigating a larger number of accidents.

Federico Helicopters, Inc
Leonard A. Federico, CFO
4955 E. Andersen Drive, Suite: 115
Fresno, CA 93727
copter86@sbcglobal.net

3/14/2005