Aviation Safety Investigation Report 199801372

British Aerospace Plc BAe 146-200A

17 April 1998

Readers are advised that the Australian Transport Safety Bureau investigates for the sole purpose of enhancing transport safety. Consequently, Bureau reports are confined to matters of safety significance and may be misleading if used for any other purposes.

Investigations commenced on or before 30 June 2003, including the publication of reports as a result of those investigations, are authorised by the Executive Director of the Bureau in accordance with Part 2A of the Air Navigation Act 1920.

Investigations commenced after 1 July 2003, including the publication of reports as a result of those investigations, are authorised by the Executive Director of the Bureau in accordance with the Transport Safety Investigation Act 2003 (TSI Act). Reports released under the TSI Act are not admissible as evidence in any civil or criminal proceedings.

NOTE: All air safety occurrences reported to the ATSB are categorised and recorded. For a detailed explanation on Category definitions please refer to the ATSB website at www.atsb.gov.au.

	100001272	о т	т 1 (
Occurrence Number:	199801372	Occurrence Type:	Incident		
Location:	Darwin, Aerodrome				
State:	NT	Inv Category:	4		
Date:	Friday 17 April 1998				
Time:	0610 hours	Time Zone	CST		
Highest Injury Level: None					
Aircraft	British Aerospace	Plc			
Manufacturer:					
Aircraft Model:	BAe 146-200A				
Aircraft Registration:	VH-JJP			Serial	E2037
				Number:	
Type of Operation:	Air Transport Dor	mestic High Capacit	y Passenger		
	Scheduled				
Damage to Aircraft:	Nil				
Departure Point:	Darwin NT				
Departure Time:					
Destination:	Groote Eylandt N	Г			

Approved for Release: Monday, July 13, 1998

As the aircraft reached approximately 20 kts during the take-off roll, No 2 engine failed. The takeoff was rejected. No other damage to the aircraft was reported.

The engine examination by the aircraft operator revealed that all first-stage blades had failed adjacent to their blade platforms. The damage was most likely caused by failure of blade No 35, which failed in high cycle fatigue emanating from the blade trailing edge.

The operator experienced several similar failures previously. The engine manufacturer was aware of the problem and was undertaking corrective action.