

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**Food and Drug Administration****21 CFR Part 73****[Docket No. FDA-2024-C-2295]****Lonza Greenwood LLC; Filing of Color Additive Petition****AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.**ACTION:** Notification of petition.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA or we) is announcing that we have filed a petition, submitted by Lonza Greenwood LLC, proposing that the color additive regulations be amended to provide for the safe use of sodium copper chlorophyllin in dietary supplement capsules in an amount ranging from 0.08 to 0.4 percent of the weight of the capsule, and to add fescue grass (*Festuca arundinacea*) as a permitted source of the color additive.

DATES: The color additive petition was filed on March 26, 2024.

ADDRESSES: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <https://www.regulations.gov> and insert the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document into the "Search" box and follow the prompts, and/or go to the Dockets Management Staff, 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen DiFranco, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, Food and Drug Administration, 5001 Campus Dr., College Park, MD 20740, 240-402-2710.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 721(d)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379e(d)(1)), we are giving notice that we have filed a color additive petition (CAP 4C0330), submitted by Intertek Health Sciences, Inc. on behalf of Lonza Greenwood LLC, 2233 Argentia Rd., Suite 201, Mississauga, ON, Canada L5N 2X7. The petition proposes to amend the color additive regulations in 21 CFR 73.125, *Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification: Sodium copper chlorophyllin* to provide for the safe use of sodium copper chlorophyllin in dietary supplement capsules in an amount ranging from 0.08 to 0.4 percent of the weight of the capsule, and to add fescue grass (*Festuca arundinacea*) as a permitted source of the color additive.

The petitioner claims that this action is categorically excluded under 21 CFR 25.32(k) because the substance is

intended to remain in food through ingestion by consumers and is not intended to replace macronutrients in food. In addition, the petitioner states that, to their knowledge, no extraordinary circumstances exist. If FDA determines a categorical exclusion applies, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required. If FDA determines a categorical exclusion does not apply, we will request an environmental assessment and make it available for public inspection.

Dated: May 14, 2024.

Lauren K. Roth,*Associate Commissioner for Policy.*

[FR Doc. 2024-10888 Filed 5-16-24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4164-01-P**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY****Internal Revenue Service****26 CFR Part 1****[REG-101552-24]****RIN 1545-BR09****Election To Exclude Certain Unincorporated Organizations Owned by Applicable Entities From Application of the Rules on Partners and Partnerships; Hearing Cancellation****AGENCY:** Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.**ACTION:** Cancellation of a notice of public hearing on a proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing.

SUMMARY: This document cancels a public hearing on proposed regulations that would modify existing regulations to allow certain unincorporated organizations that are organized exclusively to produce electricity from certain property to be excluded from the application of partnership tax rules.

DATES: The public hearing scheduled for May 20, 2024, at 10 a.m. ET is cancelled.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vivian Hayes of the Publications and Regulations Section, Associate Chief Counsel (Procedure and Administration) at (202) 317-6901 (not a toll-free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A notice of proposed rulemaking and a notice of public hearing that appeared in the **Federal Register** on March 11, 2024 (89 FR 17613), announced that a public hearing being held in person and by

teleconference was scheduled for May 20, 2024, at 10 a.m. ET. The subject of the public hearing is under 26 CFR part 1.

The public comment period for these regulations expired on May 10, 2024. The notice of proposed rulemaking and notice of public hearing instructed those interested in testifying at the public hearing to submit a request to testify and an outline of the topics to be addressed. We did not receive a request to testify at the Public Hearing. Therefore, the public hearing scheduled for May 20, 2024, at 10 a.m. ET is cancelled.

Oluwafunmilayo A. Taylor,*Section Chief, Publications and Regulations Section, Associate Chief Counsel (Procedure & Administration).*

[FR Doc. 2024-10996 Filed 5-15-24; 4:15 pm]

BILLING CODE 4830-01-P**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY****Internal Revenue Service****26 CFR Part 301****[REG-123376-22]****RIN 1545-BQ74****Disclosures of Return Information Reflected on Returns to Officers and Employees of the Department of Commerce, Including the Bureau of the Census, for Certain Statistical Purposes and Related Activities; Correction****AGENCY:** Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking; correction.

SUMMARY: This document corrects a notice of proposed rulemaking (REG-123376-22) published in the **Federal Register** on March 29, 2024, containing proposed amendments to the regulations relating to the disclosure of specified return information to the Bureau of the Census (Bureau).

DATES: The deadline for submitting written or electronic comments on the proposed rule was April 29, 2024.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Concerning the proposed regulations, contact Elizabeth Erickson of the Office of the Associate Chief Counsel (Procedure and Administration), at (202) 317-6834 (not a toll-free number); concerning submissions of comments or the public hearing, Vivian Hayes, (202) 317-6901 (not toll-free number) or by email to publichearings@irs.gov (preferred).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The notice of proposed rulemaking (REG–123376–22) that is the subject of this correction is under section 6103 (j)(1)(A) of the Code.

Need for Correction

As published, the notice of proposed rulemaking (REG–123376–22) contains errors that needs to be corrected.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the notice of proposed rulemaking (REG–123376–22) that is the subject of FR Doc. 2024–06756, published on March 29, 2024, is corrected on page 22106, in § 301.6103(j)(1)–1, in the first column, the third line of paragraph (b)(3)(iii) is corrected to read, “pursuant to paragraph (b)(1)(ii)(H)(1), (2),”.

Oluwafunmilayo A. Taylor,

Section Chief, Publications and Regulations Section, Associate Chief Counsel (Procedure and Administration).

[FR Doc. 2024–10871 Filed 5–16–24; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4830–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 165

[USCG–2024–0346]

RIN 1625–AA00

Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Virginia Beach Oceanfront, VA; Air Show

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DHS.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Coast Guard is proposing to establish a temporary safety zone for certain waters in the vicinity of the Virginia Beach oceanfront. This action is necessary to provide for the safety of life on these navigable waters during an air show. This proposed rulemaking would prohibit persons and vessels from entry in the safety zone unless authorized by the Captain of the Port Sector Virginia (COTP) or a designated representative. We invite your comments on this proposed rulemaking.

DATES: Comments and related material must be received by the Coast Guard on or before June 17, 2024.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by docket number USCG–2024–0346, using the Federal Decision-Making Portal at <https://www.regulations.gov>. See the “Public Participation and Request for Comments” portion of the

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section for further instructions on submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions about this proposed rulemaking, call or email LCDR Ashley Holm, Chief, Waterways Management Division, U.S. Coast Guard; 757–617–7986, Ashley.E.Holm@uscg.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Table of Abbreviations

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
DHS Department of Homeland Security
FR Federal Register
NPRM Notice of proposed rulemaking
§ Section
U.S.C. United States Code

II. Background, Purpose, and Legal Basis

On April 4, 2024, the National Air, Sea, and Space Foundation notified the Coast Guard that the 2024 NATO Joint Power Demo Air Show will be occurring Tuesday, August 20, 2024, to Wednesday, August 21, 2024, from 2 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. each day. The air show includes an aerial performance area over a portion of the Virginia Beach oceanfront, where high powered jet aircraft will perform aerobatic maneuvers. The Captain of the Port, Sector Virginia (COTP) has determined that, due to the hazards associated with the air show, a safety zone is needed to ensure the safety of vessels on the navigable water. The Coast Guard is proposing this rulemaking under authority in 46 U.S.C. 70034.

III. Discussion of Proposed Rule

The COTP is proposing to establish a temporary safety zone to protect the public from potential hazards associated with an air show. The safety zone would cover all navigable waters from the shoreline of the Atlantic Ocean at the Virginia Beach Oceanfront contained within the following points: 36°53'10" N, 075°58'57" W; 36°53'27" N, 075°57'22" W; 36°51'31" N, 075°56'48" W; 36°51'14" N, 075°58'23" W. The safety zone would be in effect for two days, but it would only be enforced for a half hour each day. The enforcement periods are intended to ensure the safety of vessels on these navigable waters during the air show and to limit the impact of the safety zone on vessel traffic to the time the air show is taking place. No vessel or person would be permitted to enter the safety zone without obtaining permission from the COTP or a designated representative. The regulatory text we are proposing appears at the end of this document.

IV. Regulatory Analyses

We developed this proposed rule after considering numerous statutes and Executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on a number of these statutes and Executive orders, and we discuss First Amendment rights of protestors.

A. Regulatory Planning and Review

Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 direct agencies to assess the costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives and, if regulation is necessary, to select regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits. This NPRM has not been designated a “significant regulatory action,” under Executive Order 12866. Accordingly, the NPRM has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

This regulatory action determination is based on the size, location, duration, and time-of-day of the safety zone. Vessel traffic would be able to safely transit around this safety zone which would impact a small, designated area of the Atlantic Ocean at the Virginia Beach oceanfront while the air show is taking place. Moreover, the Coast Guard would issue a Broadcast Notice to Mariners via VHF–FM marine channel 16 about the zone, and the rule would allow vessels to seek permission to enter the zone.

B. Impact on Small Entities

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, 5 U.S.C. 601–612, as amended, requires Federal agencies to consider the potential impact of regulations on small entities during rulemaking. The term “small entities” comprises small businesses, not-for-profit organizations that are independently owned and operated and are not dominant in their fields, and governmental jurisdictions with populations of less than 50,000. The Coast Guard certifies under 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

While some owners or operators of vessels intending to transit the safety zone may be small entities, for the reasons stated in section IV.A above, this proposed rule would not have a significant economic impact on any vessel owner or operator.

If you think that your business, organization, or governmental jurisdiction qualifies as a small entity and that this proposed rule would have a significant economic impact on it, please submit a comment (see **ADDRESSES**) explaining why you think it qualifies and how and to what degree this rule would economically affect it.