



## **Malibu-Mirage Owners & Pilots Association**

PO Box 1288, Green Valley, AZ 85622 • Phone: 520-399-1121 Fax: 866-292-7547 • russ46@cox.net

June 16, 2010

Rhett Ross, President  
Teledyne Continental Motors  
2039 Broad Street  
P.O. Box 90  
Mobile, Alabama 36615

Re: 100LL Avgas Replacement

Mr. Ross,

On behalf of the nearly 1000 members of the Malibu Mirage Owners & Pilots Association, I would like to express our serious concerns over the position TCM has recently taken to endorse 94-octane unleaded avgas as the eventual replacement for the current 100LL avgas.

As you may realize, our the PA-46 fleet is comprised of hundreds of Piper Malibus, powered by the TCM TSIO-520-BE, and the Piper Matrix/Mirages powered by the Lycoming TIO-540-AE2A engine. While these are low compression engines, they are also turbocharged and highly stressed to operate safely and reliably up to 25,000 feet. We do not believe these engines can operate safely in the Malibu airframe without significant modifications and/or operating limitations that would degrade the utility of the airplane. Of course, the aftershocks from this would be loss of aircraft values, and eventually a contraction of the piston aircraft market and pilot population. I think a significant portion of current PA46 owners would not opt for expensive modifications to use a sub-100 octane fuel, but would find this issue the straw that broke the camel's back and leave an already declining and struggling industry.

It is the position of MMOPA an unleaded fuel solution that performs at an equivalent level to 100LL avgas on a full-scale aircraft engine and is applicable to our entire fleet, and all of the General Aviation piston market in general, should be the minimum standard for a next generation aviation gasoline fuel for the time being. There are at least two potential 100UL products in development right now (one is actually flying in a Cirrus SR-22 with a turbocharged TCM engine with 8.5:1 compression ratio), and potentially others that have not yet been made public for intellectual property concerns. It seems very premature, short-sighted, and counter to the interests of general aviation industry, for TCM to take the position of endorsing a specific solution at this time, especially one that would leave many aircraft owners effectively grounded and have adverse effects on the GA market we all share.

I would ask that TCM withdraw its endorsement of any sub-100 octane solution until such time as the contenders for a 100-octane solution have been thoroughly evaluated. We regard any sub-100UL solution only viable as a last resort.

Finally, I would invite you and TCM to join a growing coalition of aircraft owner & pilot associations that are coalescing around this concern to ensure that our industry ends up with the best possible solution for everyone. A website has recently been established to organize these efforts: [www.100octane.info](http://www.100octane.info) or [www.100octaneformyplane.com](http://www.100octaneformyplane.com). Take a look.

Thanks for your consideration. I would be happy to discuss this matter with you further anytime.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jonathan R. Sisk". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jonathan R. Sisk, President  
MMOPA Board of Directors  
2048 Mercer Road  
Lexington, KY 40511  
859-351-5429  
[jsisk@mmopa.com](mailto:jsisk@mmopa.com)