**SUMMARY:** This notice announces the availability of and request for comments on a proposed advisory circular (AC) which provides information and guidance for obtaining a type certificate in the restricted category, under 14 CFR part 21, § 21.25, for small piston and turbo-propeller driven airplanes, which will be used for agricultural special purpose operations. The AC provides an acceptable means, but not the only means, of meeting the requirements of part 21 for the issuance of a type certificate in the restricted category. This procedure incorporates the appropriate normal category airworthiness standards of 14 CFR part 23, Airworthiness Standards: Normal, Utility, Acrobatic, and Commuter Category Airplanes. This material is neither mandatory nor regulatory in nature and does not constitute a regulation. Because the information and guidance presented in this AC is not mandatory, the term "must" used in this AC only applies to an applicant who chooses to follow these procedures. The applicant may elect to follow an alternate procedure provided the Administrator finds it to be acceptable. DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 8, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Send all comments on the proposed AC to: Federal Aviation Administration, Attention: Standards Office, ACE–100, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certificate Service, 601 East 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terre Flynn, Regulations and Policy Branch, ACE–111, at the address above, telephone number (816) 426–6941.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Any person may obtain a copy of this proposed AC by contacting the person named above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.** 

### Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to submit such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Commenters must identify the AC and submit comments to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered by the Standards Staff before issuing the final AC. Comments may be inspected at the Standards Office, ACE-110, Suite 900, 1201 Walnut, Kansas City, Missouri, between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. weekdays, except Federal holidays.

#### Background

The current philosophy concerning type certification of restricted category

agricultural airplanes is historically based on part 8 of the Civil Air Regulations (CAR). Under this part, the applicant for a new aircraft was required to show compliance with all of the airworthiness requirements of any other aircraft category prescribed by the CAR, except those requirements which the Administrator found inappropriate for the special purpose for which the aircraft was to be used. This part also established new standards for the issuance of type certificates, alterations to type certificates, and type certification procedures. The preamble for part 8 stated that for such restricted operations where public safety is not endangered it appears unreasonable to require the same level of safety as that required for passenger carrying aircraft. The intent of part 8 was to place the minimum possible burden consistent with public safety on the applicant for a type certificate in the restricted category. Since the inception of part 8 of the CAR and following recodification of the CAR into the CFR, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has continued using the basic concepts of that part. On February 8, 1965, the FAA issued AC 20-33. This AC notified the public that policy information contained in Civil Aeronautics Manuals (CAM) 1, 3, 4a, 4b, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14 could be used in conjunction with specific sections of the CFR, which correspond with the sections of the CAR to which the policies were applicable. Approximately 10 years later, in March 1975, AC 20-33A temporarily deleted the reference to CAM 8 in AC 20-33 from being applied to any sections of the FAR. However, in two months time, AC 20-33B reinstated CAM 8 for use with part 21, § 21.25, for small restricted category agricultural airplanes. This policy continued until July 1981 when FAA Order 8130.2, Airworthiness Certification of Aircraft and Related Approvals, eliminated CAM 8 from being used for certificating new restricted category agricultural airplanes.

In October of 1992 two manufacturers of small restricted category agricultural airplanes petitioned the FAA to develop a new set of certification requirements strictly for agricultural airplanes. In February of 1993 representatives from the FAA's Small Airplane Directorate met with a representative for the Agricultural Airplane Manufacturers who had petitioned the FAA to discuss the certification problems that had developed between the Agricultural Airplane Manufacturers and the FAA. At this meeting a draft AC that had been developed by the Small Airplane

Directorate to solve the certification problem was presented to the Agricultural Airplane Manufacturer's representative. It was mutually agreed upon between the two parties that the development of an AC that addressed the certification of new restricted category agricultural airplanes would be the quickest way of resolving the issues that had developed between the FAA and the Agricultural Airplane Manufacturers. After several months of discussion between both parties, it was agreed that the most efficient way for the FAA to revise the draft AC was to form a team of engineers and pilots. This team would then visit agricultural operators and pilots out in the field and interview them to determine what their needs were for newly certificated agricultural airplanes. The Agricultural Airplane Certification Team that was formed visited many agricultural operators and pilots across the south from Georgia to Texas. The team finished performing these interviews in the summer of 1994 and met in the fall of 1994 to review their experiences and revise the existing draft AC. In January of 1995 the team met with representatives of the Agricultural Airplane Manufacturers, at the Small Airplane Directorate's Office, to discuss the revised AC and portions of its policy. The AC that has been developed is a product of the combined efforts of the FAA's Agricultural Airplane Certification Team and representatives of the Agricultural Airplane Manufacturers.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on January 31, 1996.

Michael Gallagher,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96–2632 Filed 2–7–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4810–13–M

## **Federal Railroad Administration**

[FRA Waiver Petition Docket No. PB-95-3; Notice No. 2]

### **Petition for Waivers of Compliance**

**AGENCY:** Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Change of hearing date.

**SUMMARY:** On November 30, 1995, FRA published in the Federal Register a notice that the FRA received from the American Railway Car Institute (ARCI) a request for waiver of compliance with certain requirements of the Railroad Power Brakes and Drawbars Regulations.

The ARCI seeks a permanent waiver of compliance from section 232.2 of the Railroad Power Brakes and Drawbars Standards (49 CFR Part 232). That section states in part: "The maximum height of drawbars for freight carsshall be 341/2 inches, and the minimum height of drawbars for freight cars on such standard-gauge railroads—shall be 311/2 inches,—ARCI is requesting to Increase the maximum allowable coupler height one inch from 34.5 inches to 35.5 inches for bottom shelf E couplers and top and bottom shelf E couplers only. ARCI states that the granting of this waiver will allow railroads and car builders to build safer and more efficient cars. It claims industry's need for safer suspension systems is being hampered by the small range of allowable coupler heights. Railroads, truck manufacturers, and freight car manufacturers know that rail worthiness of many cars would be improved if spring travel could be increased. For example, cars negotiating changes in super-elevation as they enter and exit curves would be subject to less wheel unloading if they had softer, more complaint, longer travel suspensions. Wheel unloading is most undesirable in curves, as the wheel set is often developing high lateral forces. High lateral forces combined with wheel unloading can result in derailment. The small range of allowable coupler heights severely limits the use of longer travel springs. By increasing the allowable range of coupler height by one inch would allow designers to make a significant improvements in rail worthiness.

FRA has determined that a public hearing will be held in this matter. Due to extreme weather conditions which closed Federal buildings in Washington, DC., FRA was unable to hold the public hearing scheduled for January 10, 1996. As a consequence, FRA is rescheduling the public hearing to 10:00 a.m. on February 28, 1996. The hearing location remains the same and will be held in room 8236–8238 of the Nassif Building, DOT Headquarters Building, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC. We apologize for any inconvenience this rescheduling may cause.

The hearing will be informal and will be conducted in accordance with Rule 25 of the FRA Rules of Practice (49 CFR Part 211.25), by a representative designated by the FRA. The hearing will be a nonadversary proceeding in which all interested parties will be given the opportunity to express their views regarding this waiver petition.

Interested parties are invited to participate in these proceedings by submitting written views, data or

comments. All communications concerning these proceedings should identify the appropriate docket number (e.g., Waiver Petition Number PB–95–3 and must be submitted in triplicate to the Docket Clark, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

Issued in Washington, DC on February 1, 1996.

Phil Olekszyk,

Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation. [FR Doc. 96–2740 Filed 2–7–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–06–M

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**

#### **Internal Revenue Service**

## Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

summary: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Currently, the IRS is soliciting comments concerning Form 3115, Application for Change in Accounting Method.

**DATES:** Written comments should be received on or before April 8, 1996 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Garrick R. Shear, Internal Revenue Service, T:FP, room 5571, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection should be directed to Martha R. Brinson, (202) 622–3869, Internal Revenue Service, T:FP, room 5571, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Application for Change in Accounting Method.

*OMB Number:* 1545–0152. *Form Number:* 3115.

Abstract: Form 3115 is used by taxpayers who wish to change their method of computing their taxable income. The form is used by the IRS to

determine if electing taxpayers have met the requirements and are able to change to the method requested.

Current Actions: Form 3115 is revised to encourage the submission of detailed and complete information from applicants. Many of the questions have been reorganized by category to simplify preparation. Some of the general questions have been clarified and a number of questions in the various schedules have been eliminated or combined.

*Type of Review:* Revision of a currently approved form.

Affected Public: Individuals, corporations, cooperatives, qualified personal service corporations, exempt organizations, partnerships, S corporations, and insurance companies.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 6.400.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 42 hrs., 16 min.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 270,490.

Request for Comments: Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Written comments should address the accuracy of the burden estimates and ways to minimize burden including the use of automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology, as well as other relevant aspects of the information collection request.

Approved: January 31, 1996. Garrick R. Shear, IRS Reports Clearance Officer. [FR Doc. 96–2656 Filed 2–7–96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4830–01–U

## UTAH RECLAMATION MITIGATION AND CONSERVATION COMMISSION

# Utah Lake Wetland Preserve; Notice of Availability

**AGENCY:** Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for Establishment of the Utah Lake Wetland Preserve is available for review. The EA addresses the establishment of a preserve through acquisition from willing sellers of private land, water rights, or other property interests occurring in a specific area along the southern shore of Utah Lake, Utah County, Utah. This establishment would entail limited management to restore and protect