

**PART 71—DESIGNATION OF CLASS A, B, C, D, AND E AIRSPACE AREAS; AIR TRAFFIC SERVICE ROUTES; AND REPORTING POINTS**

1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 40103, 40113, 40120; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389.

**§ 71.1 [Amended]**

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9V, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated August 9, 2011, effective September 15, 2011, is amended as follows:

\* \* \* \* \*

*Paragraph 6005 Class E airspace areas extending upward from 700 feet or more above the surface of the earth.*

\* \* \* \* \*

**ASO FL E5 Orlando, FL [Amend]**

Orlando Executive Airport, FL  
(Lat. 28°32'44" N., long. 81°19'58" W.)  
Orlando VORTAC

(Lat. 28°32'34" N., long. 81°20'06" W.)

Orlando International Airport

(Lat. 28°25'44" N., long. 81°18'57" W.)

Kissimmee Municipal Airport

(Lat. 28°17'24" N., long. 81°26'14" W.)

That airspace extending upward from 700 feet above the surface within a 7-mile radius of Orlando Executive Airport and within 3.1-miles each side of Orlando VORTAC 067° radial, extending from the 7-mile radius to 9.5-miles northeast of the VORTAC and within a 7-mile radius of Orlando International Airport and within 3 miles each side of Orlando VORTAC 176° radial extending from the 7-mile radius to 19 miles south of the VORTAC, and within a 7-mile radius of Kissimmee Municipal Airport.

Issued in College Park, Georgia, on March 14, 2012.

**Barry A. Knight,**

*Manager, Operations Support Group, Eastern Service Center, Air Traffic Organization.*

[FR Doc. 2012–6846 Filed 3–21–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Food and Drug Administration**

**21 CFR Part 73**

[Docket No. FDA–2012–C–0224]

**E. & J. Gallo Winery; Filing of Color Additive Petition**

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Notice of petition.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is announcing that E. & J. Gallo Winery has filed a petition proposing that the color additive regulations be amended to provide for the expanded safe use of mica-based pearlescent pigments as color additives in certain distilled spirits.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Raphael A. Davy, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–265), Food and Drug Administration, 5100 Paint Branch Pkwy., College Park, MD 20740–3835, 240–402–1272.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (section 721(d)(1) (21 U.S.C. 379e(d)(1))), notice is given that a color additive petition (CAP 2C0294) has been filed by E. & J. Gallo Winery, c/o Keller and Heckman LLP, One Embarcadero Center, Suite 2110, San Francisco, CA 94111. The petition proposes to amend the color additive regulations in 21 CFR 73.350 to provide for the safe use of mica-based pearlescent pigments prepared from titanium dioxide and mica as color additives in distilled spirits containing not less than 18% and not more than 23% alcohol by volume but not including distilled spirits mixtures containing more than 5% wine on a proof gallon basis.

The Agency has determined under 21 CFR 25.32(k) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required.

Dated: March 13, 2012.

**Francis Lin,**

*Acting Director, Office of Food Additive Safety, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition.*

[FR Doc. 2012–6854 Filed 3–21–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4160–01–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

**Coast Guard**

**33 CFR Part 114, 116, 118**

[Docket No. USCG–2008–1188]

**RIN 1625–AB36**

**General Bridge Regulation; Amendment**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is withdrawing its rulemaking concerning

amendments to the general bridge regulations. The rulemaking was initiated to clarify the statutory responsibilities of bridge owners to remove their bridges from navigable waterways when they are no longer being used for land transportation functions. The Coast Guard will initiate a new rulemaking on this matter when an appropriate methodology, which might include an investigation and meetings, to be used in determining whether an unused bridge is an unreasonable obstruction to navigation is developed.

**DATES:** The proposed rule is withdrawn on March 22, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** The docket for this withdrawn rulemaking is available for inspection or copying at the Docket Management Facility (M–30), U.S. Department of Transportation, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. You may also find this docket on the Internet by going to <http://www.regulations.gov>, inserting USCG–2008–1188 in the “Keyword” box, and then clicking “Search.”

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** If you have questions about this notice, call or email Mr. Chris Jaufmann, Bridge Program, U.S. Coast Guard, telephone 202–372–1511, email [Josef.C.Jaufmann@uscg.mil](mailto:Josef.C.Jaufmann@uscg.mil). If you have questions on viewing material in the docket, call Renee V. Wright, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone 202–366–9826.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

There were no documents published in the **Federal Register** for this rulemaking, but this rulemaking was announced in the Unified Agenda of Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions beginning in fall agenda 2009. The Coast Guard does not currently have regulations describing the processes of requiring alteration or removal of unused bridges. This rulemaking would have proposed making amendments to the general bridge regulations to articulate the responsibility of the bridge owner to alter or remove unused bridges, and to describe the Coast Guard processes to require alteration or removal of those bridges.

**Withdrawal**

The Coast Guard is withdrawing this rulemaking in order to ascertain the appropriate due process, which might include an investigation and meetings, to be used in determining whether an