To prevent structural degradation of the attachment of the horizontal stabilizer to the fuselage, accomplish the following:

(a) For Model Viscount 744 and 745D airplanes: Within 3,000 landings or 3 years after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, perform a high frequency eddy current (HFEC) inspection to detect cracking of the bolt holes on the top fittings of the root joint of the tailplane spar, in accordance with British Aerospace Alert Preliminary Technical Leaflet (PTL) 264, Issue 3, dated September 1, 1992. Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 3,000 landings or 3 years, whichever occurs first.

(b) For Model Viscount 810 airplanes: Within 1,000 landings or 1 year after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first, perform an HFEC inspection to detect cracking of the bolt holes on the top fittings of the root joint of the tailplane spar, in accordance with British Aerospace Alert PTL 127, Issue 3, dated June 1, 1992. Repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 3,000 landings or 3 years, whichever occurs first.

(c) If any cracking is found during the inspections required by paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD, prior to further flight, replace the cracked fitting with a serviceable part, in accordance with British Aerospace Alert PTL 264, Issue 3, dated September 1, 1992 (for Model 744 and 745D airplanes), or Alert PTL 127, Issue 3, dated June 1, 1992 (for Model 810 airplanes); as applicable.

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

(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 25, 1995.

James V. Devany,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–10587 Filed 4–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing

24 CFR Ch. IX

[Docket No. N–95–3858; FR–3647–N–04]

RIN 2577–AB44

Vacancy Rule: Notice of Cancellation of Third Meeting of Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing, HUD.

ACTION: Notice of cancellation of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Department has established a Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee to discuss and negotiate a proposed rule that would change the current method of determining the payment of operating subsidies to vacant public housing units. The Committee met in March and April 1995, after publishing notices of these meetings. This notice announces that a third meeting that had been scheduled for May 2 and 3, 1995, has been cancelled, pending a determination by the Committee of whether an additional meeting is necessary.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John T. Comerford, Director, Financial Management Division, Public and Indian Housing, Room 4212, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 431 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20410–0500; telephone (202) 708–1872, or (202) 708–0850 (TDD). (These telephone numbers are not toll-free.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 24, 1995 (60 FR 10339), the Department published a notice of establishment of a Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee to discuss and negotiate a proposed rule that would change the current method of determining the payment of operating subsidies to vacant public housing units. The February 24 notice also announced the first meeting of this committee, which was held on March 7–9, 1995, in Washington, DC.

On March 20, 1995 (60 FR 14707), the Department published a notice of the second and third meetings of the committee, to be held in April and May 1995. The second meeting was held on April 4 and 5, 1995, as scheduled; however, at the April meeting the committee determined that it would not meet on the dates announced for May 1995. If an additional meeting is necessary to ensure consensus by the committee, an announcement of the rescheduled meeting will be published in the **Federal Register.**

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 1437g, 3635(d).

Dated: April 26, 1995.

Joseph Shuldiner,

Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing.

[FR Doc. 95–10666 Filed 4–27–95; 9:26 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–33–M

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

29 CFR Part 2200

Rules of Procedure

AGENCY: Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission proposes to revise its rules governing simplified proceedings and to institute a pilot E–Z Trial program. This program would be instituted on a limited basis for a one year trial period. After the trial period, the Commission would evaluate the results and determine whether it should continue the E–Z Trial program and, if so, what modifications should be made. As the name implies, E–Z Trial would simplify and accelerate the adjudicative process for cases that warrant a less formal, less expensive process. The most significant change to the rules would strengthen the role of Commission judges in determining whether a case is tried under simplified proceedings. The Commission has concluded that the current underutilization of simplified proceedings could be remedied through a mechanism by which the Chief Administrative Law Judge or the judge assigned to an individual case could unilaterally direct that a case be tried under simplified proceedings. Thus, under the E–Z Trial program, the Commission's Chief Judge would have the authority to determine whether a case would proceed by either conventional proceedings or the E–Z Trial program. This should result in greater use of simplified proceedings while preserving the use of conventional proceedings where needed. E–Z Trial should reduce the time and expense of litigation in such cases. However, the presiding judge may discontinue E–Z Trial proceedings and reinstate conventional procedures if the