## Boeing 737-400, PH-BDU, 27 January 1996

## AAIB Bulletin No: 8/96 Ref: EW/G96/01/06 Category: 1.1

Aircraft Type and Registration: Boeing 737-400, PH-BDU

No & Type of Engines: 2 CFM 56-3C1 turbofan engines

Year of Manufacture: 1990

Date & Time (UTC): 27 January 1996 at 1315 hrs

Location: Block 106, London Heathrow Airport

Type of Flight: Public Transport (scheduled)

Persons on Board: Crew - 8 Passengers - 68

Injuries: Crew - None Passengers - None

Nature of Damage: Left outer mainwheel disintegrated, damageto wing leading edge slat

Commander's Licence: Airline Transport Pilot's Licence

Commander's Age: 33 years

**Commander's Flying Experience:** 5,918 hours (of which 1,175were on type)

Last 90 days - N/K

Last 28 days - 65 hours

**Information Source:** Aircraft Accident Report Form submitted by the pilot and metallurgical report submitted by airline through the Netherlands Accident and Incident Investigation Bureau

While the aircraft was taxying out for take off the crew hearda "bang" and felt a "minor bump". Shortlyafterwards a cabin attendant informed the flight crew that a passengerhad reported rubber coming off the left main landing gear. Thecrew stopped the aircraft and asked for an inspection. A groundengineer found that the left outer wheel had failed and debrishad damaged a leading edge slat. Passengers and crew were disembarkedusing the airstairs and transported to the terminal by bus. Debriswas recovered from the taxyway and a technical investigation of the wheel failure was carried out by the airline's engineeringdepartment.

When the wheel was examined it was found that the complete outerrim had detached and 5 of the 16 clamping bolts were missing. The 5 bolts were amongst debris recovered from the taxyway buttheir threaded ends and nuts were not found. No pre-existing defect was found in the wheel itself but all 5 bolts showed indications of fatigue initiating in the thread roots at the thread's

firstengagement in the nut. One bolt showed penetration by fatigueacross 60% of its cross-section and was heavily corroded. Itwas considered that the fatigue in this bolt had progressed underrelatively low loading and that this was the first bolt to fail. The other bolts showed signs of there having been a sequence of failure evidenced by less corrosion and more rapid fatiguedevelopment and it was thought that the failure of the first bolthad increased loads on the adjacent bolts and accelerated theirfailure. The wheel had completed 3,473 cycles since new and 490since inspection.

The bolts were made of a low alloy steel and hardness measurementsshowed that their material was within specification. They wereof a standard which had been used on the 737-300 but some crackinghad been experienced on the -400 aircraft and the airline hadalready initiated the incorporation of a modification (B F GoodrichService Bulletin 3-1439-32-13) to replace these bolts with anInconel 718 type of increased strength. Following the accidenta weekly inspection was implemented and the replacement programmewas accelerated. The airline's Quality Assurance Department alsoundertook to investigate the bolt inspection process in the OverhaulShop.