

Aircraft Certification Service 2003-NM-210-AD
Transport Aircraft Directorate "Short" Domestic Worksheet

RECEIVED
SEP 11 2003
ANM - 114

DOCKET NUMBER:
TECH WRITER:

Manufacturer's Service Information/Revision/Date (Attach 2 clean copies):

PROPOSED CORRESPONDING ACTION:

<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency AD	<i>Is this action one of the following?</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Immediately Adopted AD	<input type="checkbox"/> Supersedure of AD (Docket No. TBD)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Proposed Rulemaking	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of AD (Docket No.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Final rule after NPRM <i>(If FRAN, complete Attachment A.)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental NPRM (Docket No. TBD) <i>(If any of the above is checked, complete Attachment B.)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (No-Notice Final Rule)	

04 SEP 23 11 50 AM '03
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

ACO Project Engineer Name/Title:	Wahib Mina/ Aerospace Engineer
Branch: ANM-120L	Telephone: (562) 627-5324
Backup Engineer: Mike Lee	Telephone: (562) 627-5325

1. Model, Applicability, # Airplanes (both U.S. & worldwide) - Refer to SB; state any differences for this AD:

Model: DC-9, Series 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, C-9 Military Series, Airplanes
Applicability: As listed in McDonnell Douglas DC9-57-223, dated July 21, 2003

U.S. airplanes: 396 # Worldwide airplanes: 963
Source:

AD Summary and Discussion Sections:

2. What has the manufacturer told the FAA? "The FAA has received reports indicating that..."
Describe background/events that prompted the AD in 1-2 sentences. Refer to SB 'Reason.'

Eleven have reported 12 instances of stress corrosion cracking of the center wing rear spar upper cap at station XcW=58.500.

3a. What is the unsafe condition AND its cause? "These actions are intended to prevent..."
Describe unsafe condition and its cause in 2-3 sentences (non-technical terms). Refer to SB 'Reason.'

These actions are intended to prevent cracking of the left and right center wing rear spar upper cap at station XcW=58.500.

3b. What is the end-level effect on the airplane? "...which could result in..."
Provide a 1-sentence description; use non-technical terms.

If not detected and corrected, could result in structural failure of the left and right center wing rear spar upper cap, and subsequent reduced structural integrity of the airplane.

AD Relevant Service Information Section:

4. (Yes or No) Is the corrective action required in this AD considered to be interim action?

NO

5. (Yes or No) Is this action considered 'sensitive', or is it related to a Safety Recommendation?
(If yes, state why sensitive, and/or provide copy of FAA/NSTB Safety Recommendation.)

NO

6. Does the referenced service document include reference to an "operator's equivalent procedure?"
[If yes, specify whether that procedure employed by the operator (even if not technically 'equivalent') adequately addresses the identified unsafe condition and provides an acceptable level of safety.]

No

7. AD Differences Section (if needed): *"This AD differs from the SB*
Check if: Flight with Cracks Mandate Terminating Action Contact Mgr, FAA
Compliance time Mandate AFM Action
Describe any other differences between service bulletin and this proposed FAA AD.

N/A

AD Cost Impact Section:

8a. Work hours for corrective action(s) required: (List hours or reference SB 'Manpower').

3 in SB to examine
6 Man-hours for eddy current inspection required (Ref. S/B page 18)

8b. Parts Cost, if any: (List costs or reference SB 'Material - Cost and Availability').

N/A

9. AD Body Section:

For EACH corrective action, mark up SB, if usable -OR- fill out Corrective Action Table below.

9a: Action # 1

What is the corrective action?

INSPECTION

(a) Perform high frequency eddy current inspection of the left and right center wing rear spar upper cap at station XcW=58.500, to detect cracking, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin DC9-57-223, dated July 21, 20034, Accomplishment Instructions.

IF NO CRACKING IS DETECTED

(b) Condition 1: If no cracking is detected, repeat eddy current inspection per the S/B.

IF CRACKING IS DETECTED

(c) Condition 2: If cracks are detected in the center wing rear spar upper cap, before further flight, accomplish repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office.

What is its compliance time? Prior to accumulation of 25,000 landings or within 15,000 landings or 5 years
(Add grace period if not available) after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs latest.

What is repetitive interval? Repeat inspection every 15,000 landings or 5 years whichever occurs first.

9b: Action # 2
What is the corrective action?

What is its compliance time?
(Add grace period if not available)
What is repetitive interval?

10. (Yes or No) Should corrective action(s) required in this AD to be applied to spares as well?

No

11. Should a ferry flight permit be: Permitted Permitted with limitations* Prohibited
*List limitations.

NO Change

12. With whom outside the FAA has this proposal been discussed (i.e. ATA, RAA, ALPA, etc.)?
NOTE: This item should be completed prior to submission of the AD Proposal Worksheet.

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Person Contacted</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Reaction</u>
ATA	Charlie Bautz	8/18/03	Concurred
Boeing	John Pervorse	8/18/03	Concurred

12b. (Yes or No) Was the lead airline process used in developing the requirements of this action?

Yes

13. Check the appropriate response:
Yes No Does this action affect the Presidential fleet?
Yes No Does this action affect the FAA fleet?
Yes No Was this action prompted by the use of suspected unapproved parts (SUP)?

14. Check the category that best describes the cause of the unsafe condition addressed by this AD:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design Problem	<input type="checkbox"/> Unapproved Parts	<input type="checkbox"/> Operational
<input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality Control Problem**	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____
	<input type="checkbox"/> **Reporting Reqt Needed?	_____