

from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition; or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent reduced structural integrity of the wing leading edge skin and wing anti-ice fluid distribution panel (TKS panel) interface joint, which could adversely affect the flight characteristics of the airplane, accomplish the following:

(a) Accomplish the actions specified in paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(3), and (a)(4) of this AD within the time schedule indicated in each paragraph, and in accordance with Corporate Jets Limited Service Bulletin S.B. 57-77, dated May 20, 1993, or Raytheon Corporate Jets Service Bulletin S.B. 57-77, Revision 1, dated October 28, 1993:

(1) Within 24 months since airplane manufacture, or within 12 months after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform a detailed visual inspection to detect corrosion of the polished surface of the top and bottom leading edge skins on each wing, in accordance with either service bulletin.

(i) If any corrosion is detected and the corrosion is within the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, remove the corrosion in accordance with either service bulletin.

(ii) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion exceeds the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair the wing leading edge skins in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(2) Prior to further flight after accomplishing the actions required by paragraph (a)(1) of this AD, conduct a detailed visual inspection to detect corrosion of the wing anti-ice fluid distribution panel (TKS panel) rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing, in accordance with either service bulletin.

(i) If any corrosion is detected and the corrosion is within the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, remove the corrosion in accordance with either service bulletin.

(ii) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion exceeds the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(3) Prior to further flight after accomplishing the actions required by paragraph (a)(2) of this AD, conduct a dye penetrant inspection to detect corrosion of the TKS panel rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing, in accordance with either service bulletin.

(i) If any corrosion is detected and the corrosion is within the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, remove the corrosion in accordance with either service bulletin.

(ii) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion exceeds the limits specified in the service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(4) Prior to further flight after accomplishing the actions required by paragraph (a)(3) of this AD, accomplish both of the following actions in accordance with either service bulletin:

(i) Apply enhanced protective treatment to the TKS panel rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing; and

(ii) Conduct a flight check of the airplane stall warning system and stall characteristics.

(b) Accomplish the actions specified in paragraphs (b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3) of this AD within the time schedule indicated in each paragraph, and in accordance with Raytheon Corporate Jets Service Bulletin S.B. 57-77, Revision 1, dated October 28, 1993:

Note 2: Any inspection specified in paragraph (b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3) of this AD that was conducted prior to the effective date of this AD in accordance with Corporate Jets Limited Service Bulletin S.B. 57-77, dated May 20, 1993, is considered to be in compliance with this paragraph.

Note 3: The actions required by paragraph (b) of this AD may be accomplished in conjunction with the actions required by paragraph (a) within the compliance time required by paragraph (a).

(1) Within 2 years after the effective date of this AD, conduct a detailed visual inspection to detect corrosion of the landing/taxiing lamp window assembly recess and the stall vane spoiler rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) If any corrosion is detected and the corrosion is within the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, remove the corrosion in accordance with the service bulletin.

(ii) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion exceeds the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(2) Prior to further flight after accomplishing the actions required by paragraph (b)(1) of this AD, conduct a dye penetrant inspection to detect corrosion of the landing/taxiing lamp window assembly recess and the stall vane spoiler rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing, in accordance with the service bulletin.

(i) If any corrosion is detected and the corrosion is within the limits specified in either service bulletin, prior to further flight, remove the corrosion in accordance with the service bulletin.

(ii) If any corrosion is detected and that corrosion exceeds the limits specified in

either service bulletin, prior to further flight, repair in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

(3) Prior to further flight after accomplishing the actions required by paragraph (b)(2) of this AD, accomplish both of the following actions in accordance with the service bulletin:

(i) Apply enhanced protective treatment to the landing/taxiing lamp window assembly recess and the stall vane spoiler rebate and radius, on the top and bottom leading edge skin section on each wing; and

(ii) Conduct a flight check of the airplane stall warning system and stall characteristics.

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

Note 4: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 11, 1995.

S.R. Miller,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95-9349 Filed 4-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 94-NM-244-AD]

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10 Series Airplanes and KC-10A (Military) Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the supersedure of an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10 series airplanes and KC-10A (military) airplanes, that currently requires the implementation of a program of structural inspections to detect and correct fatigue cracking in order to ensure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes as they approach the manufacturer's original fatigue design life goal. This action

would require, among other things, clarification of some Principle Structural Elements (PSE) and some non-destructive inspection (NDI) procedures. This proposal is prompted by new data submitted by the manufacturer indicating that certain revisions to the program are necessary in order to clarify some PSE's and some NDI procedures. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent fatigue cracking that could compromise the structural integrity of these airplanes.

DATES: Comments must be received by June 6, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94-NM-244-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, P.O. Box 1771, Long Beach, California 90801-1771, Attention: Business Unit Manager, Technical Administrative Support, Department L51, M.C. 2-98. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maureen Moreland, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM-121L, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627-5238; fax (310) 627-5210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket Number 94-NM-244-AD." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94-NM-244-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

On August 25, 1993, the FAA issued AD 93-17-09, amendment 39-8680 (58 FR 54949, October 25, 1993), applicable to McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10 series airplanes and KC-10A (military) airplanes, to require implementation of a program of structural inspections to detect and correct fatigue cracking in order to ensure the continued airworthiness of these airplanes as they approach the manufacturer's original fatigue design life goal. That action was prompted by new data submitted by the manufacturer indicating that certain revisions to the program are necessary in order to clarify some Principal Structural Elements (PSE) and some non-destructive inspection (NDI) procedures. The requirements of that AD are intended to prevent fatigue cracking that could compromise the structural integrity of these airplanes.

Since the issuance of that AD, the manufacturer has issued McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26-012, "DC-10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID)," Volume I, Revision 5, dated October 1994; Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994; and Volume III-94, dated November 1994. This revision of the SID revises the sampling program by:

1. Clarifying some PSE titles;
2. Moving portions of some PSE's under a different PSE designator;
3. Clarifying some non-destructive inspection (NDI) procedures;

4. Including some revised alternative NDI procedures for previously existing PSE's; and

5. Updating the planning data continued in Volume III-94.

The FAA has reviewed and approved the revised SID and has determined that these revised procedures must be incorporated into the affected operators' SID programs in order to provide an acceptable level of confidence that cracks in PSE's do not exist in the fleet.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would supersede AD 93-17-09 to require clarifying some PSE titles and some NDI procedures, and updating the planning data. The actions would be required to be accomplished in accordance with the service document described previously.

There are approximately 419 Model DC-10 series airplanes and KC-10A (military) airplanes of the affected design in the worldwide fleet. The FAA estimates that 249 airplanes of U.S. registry and 13 U.S. operators would be affected by this proposed AD. Incorporation of the SID program into an operator's maintenance program, as required by AD 93-17-09 is estimated to necessitate 1,270 work hours (per operator), at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost to the 13 affected U.S. operators to incorporate the SID program is estimated to be \$990,600.

The incorporation of the revised procedures proposed in this AD action would require approximately 20 additional work hours per operator to accomplish, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost to the 13 affected U.S. operators to incorporate these revised procedures into the SID program into an operator's maintenance program is estimated to be \$15,600.

The recurring inspection costs, as required by AD 93-17-09, are estimated to be 365 work hours per airplane per year, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the recurring inspection costs required by AD 93-17-09 are estimated to be \$21,900 per airplane, or \$5,453,100 for the affected U.S. fleet.

Since no new recurring inspection procedures have been added to the program by this proposed AD action, there would be no additional economic burden on affected operators to perform additional recurrent inspections.

Based on the above figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$5,468,700 for the first year, and \$5,453,100 for each year thereafter. These "total cost

impact" figures assume that no operator has yet accomplished any of the requirements of this AD. However, it can be reasonably assumed that a majority of the affected operators have already initiated the SID program (as required by AD 93-17-09).

Additionally, the number of required work hours for each proposed inspection (and the SID program), as indicated above, is presented as if the accomplishment of those actions were to be conducted as "stand alone" actions. However, in actual practice, these actions for the most part will be accomplished coincidentally or in combination with normally scheduled airplane inspections and other maintenance program tasks. Therefore, the actual number of necessary additional work hours will be minimal in many instances. Further, any cost associated with special airplane scheduling can be expected to be minimal.

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by removing amendment 39-8680 (58 FR 54949, October 25, 1993), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), to read as follows:

McDonnell Douglas: Docket 94-NM-244-AD. Supersedes AD 93-17-09, Amendment 39-8680.

Applicability: Model DC-10 series airplanes and KC-10A (military) airplanes, certificated in any category.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To ensure the continuing structural integrity of these airplanes, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 6 months after November 24, 1993 (the effective date of AD 93-17-09, amendment 39-8680), incorporate a revision into the FAA-approved maintenance inspection program which provides for inspection(s) of the Principal Structural Elements (PSE's) defined in Section 2 of Volume I of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26-012, "DC-10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID)," Revision 3, dated December 1992, in accordance with Section 2 of Volume III-92, dated October 1992, of the SID. The non-destructive inspection (NDI) techniques set forth in Section 2 and Section 4 of Volume II, Revision 3, dated December 1992, of the SID provide acceptable methods for accomplishing the inspections required by this paragraph. All inspection results (negative or positive) must be reported to McDonnell Douglas, in accordance with the instructions contained in Section 2 of Volume III-92, dated October 1992, of the SID. Information collection requirements contained in this regulation have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2120-0056.

(1) For those Fleet Leader Operator Sampling (FLOS) PSE's which do not have a Normal Maintenance Visual Inspection specified in Section 4 of Volume II, Revision 3, dated December 1992, of the SID, the procedure for general visual inspection is as follows: Perform an inspection of the general PSE area for cleanliness, presence of foreign objects, security of parts, cracks, corrosion, and damage.

(2) For PSE's 53.10.055/.056E, 55.10.013/.014B, 53.10.005/.006E, 53.10.031/.032E, 53.10.047/.048E, 57.10.029/.030E: The ENDDATE for these PSE's is October 1993. (For these PSE's disregard the June 1993 ENDDATE specified in Section 2 of Volume III-92, dated October 1992, of the SID.)

(b) Within 6 months after the effective date of this AD, replace the revision of the FAA-approved maintenance inspection program

required by paragraph (a) of this AD with a revision that provides for inspection(s) of the PSE's defined in Section 2 of Volume I of McDonnell Douglas Report No. L26-012, "DC-10 Supplemental Inspection Document (SID)," Revision 5, dated October 1994, in accordance with Section 2 of Volume III-94, dated November 1994, of the SID.

(1) Prior to reaching the threshold (N_{th}) specified for any PSE listed in Volume III-94, dated November 1994, of the SID inspect each PSE sample in accordance with the NDI procedures set forth in Section 2 and Section 4 of Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994. Thereafter repeat the inspection for that PSE at intervals not to exceed DNDI/2 of the NDI procedure that is specified in Volume III-94, dated November 1994, of the SID.

(2) The NDI techniques set forth in Section 2 and Section 4 of Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994, of the SID provide acceptable methods for accomplishing the inspections required by this paragraph.

(3) Visual inspections of all PSE's on airplanes listed in Volume III-94, dated November 1994, of the SID planning data, are required by the fleet leader-operator sampling (FLOS) program at least once during the interval between the start date (SDATE) and the end date (EDATE) established for each PSE. These visual inspections are defined in Section 4 of Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994, of the SID, and are required only for those airplanes that have not been inspections previously in accordance with Section 2 of Volume II, Revision 5, dated October 1994, of the SID.

(4) For those Fleet Leader Operator Sampling (FLOS) PSE's which do not have a Normal Maintenance Visual Inspection specified in Section 4 of Volume II, Revision 3, dated December 1992, of the SID, the procedure for general visual inspection is as follows: Perform an inspection of the general PSE area for cleanliness, presence of foreign objects, security of parts, cracks, corrosion, and damage.

(5) For PSE's 53.10.055/.056E, 55.10.013/.014B, 53.10.005/.006E, 53.10.031/.032E, 53.10.047/.048E, 57.10.029/.030E: The EDATe for these PSE's is June 1998. (For these PSE's, disregard the June 1996 EDATe specified in Section 2, of Volume III-94, dated November 1994, of the SID.)

(6) All inspection results (negative or positive) must be reported to McDonnell Douglas in accordance with the instructions contained in Section 2 of Volume III-94, dated November 1994, of the SID. Information collection requirements contained in this regulation have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and have been assigned OMB Control Number 2120-0056.

(c) Any cracked structure detected during the inspections required by paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD must be repaired before further flight, in accordance with a method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.

Note 1: Requests for approval of any PSE repair that would affect the FAA-approved

maintenance inspection program that is required by this AD should include a damage tolerance assessment for that PSE repair.

(d) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Los Angeles ACO. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angles ACO.

Note 3: Alternative methods of compliance previously granted for amendment 39-8680, AD 93-17-09, continue to be considered as acceptable alternative methods of compliance with this amendment.

(e) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 10, 1995.

S.R. Miller,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95-9350 Filed 4-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 95-NM-36-AD]

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 Series Airplanes and C-9 (Military) Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Model DC-9 series airplanes and C-9 (military) airplanes. This proposal would require an inspection of the driver links of the thrust reverser door to determine whether the driver links are chamfered, an inspection to detect damage of the overcenter links, and follow-on corrective actions, if necessary; and replacement or rework of the driver links. This proposal is prompted by reports of a thrust reverser door that failed to operate properly due to improperly manufactured (missing chamfers on the) driver links. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent damage to the overcenter links due to missing chamfers on the driver links, which may result in uncommanded opening of the thrust reverser door, and subsequently,

adversely affecting controllability of the airplane.

DATES: Comments must be received by June 9, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95-NM-36-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, P.O. Box 1771, Long Beach, California 90801-1771, Attention: Business Unit Manager, Technical Administrative Support, Dept. L51, M.C. 2-98. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Baitoo, Aerospace Engineer, Propulsion Branch, ANM-140L, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627-5245; fax (310) 627-5210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report summarizing each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: "Comments to Docket Number 95-NM-36-AD." The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 95-NM-36-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

Discussion

Recently, an operator of McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 series airplanes reported that the thrust reverser door would not close after an airplane landed. Subsequently, this same operator reported that the thrust reverser door, on the same airplane, opened partially after takeoff. Investigation revealed that driver links of the thrust reverser on this airplane were bent or broken, apparently due to a manufacturing defect. These driver links were missing chamfers, which caused damage to the adjoining overcenter links, and eventually led to the failure of the overcenter link assembly. This condition, if not corrected, could result in uncommanded opening of the thrust reverser door, which may adversely affect controllability of the airplane.

The FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas DC-9 Alert Service Bulletin A78-67, dated February 27, 1995, which describes procedures for a one-time visual inspection of the driver links of the thrust reverser door to determine whether the driver links are chamfered. For driver links that are not chamfered, this alert service bulletin describes procedures for removal of the driver link and an inspection to determine serviceability of the driver link. This alert service bulletin also describes procedures for a one-time visual inspection to detect damage of the overcenter links, and an inspection to detect damage of the drive mechanism, if necessary. Additionally, this alert service bulletin describes procedures for replacement or rework of the driver links.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other products of this same type design, the proposed AD would require a one-time visual inspection of the driver links of the thrust reverser door to determine whether the driver links are chamfered, and a one-time