

# Rules and Regulations

Federal Register

Vol. 79, No. 247

Wednesday, December 24, 2014

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

## FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

### 11 CFR Part 110

[Notice 2014–16]

#### Aggregate Biennial Contribution Limits

**AGENCY:** Federal Election Commission.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission is adopting as a final rule, without change, an interim rule that removed regulatory limits on the aggregate amounts that an individual may contribute to federal candidates and political committees in each two-year election cycle. The Commission is taking this action in light of the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *McCutcheon v. FEC*, which held that the aggregate contribution limits are unconstitutional.

**DATES:** Effective December 24, 2014.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Amy L. Rothstein, Assistant General Counsel, or Mr. Theodore M. Lutz, Attorney, 999 E Street NW., Washington, DC 20463, (202) 694–1650 or (800) 424–9530. Documents relating to the rulemaking record are available on the Commission’s Web site at <http://www.fec.gov/fosers> (REG 2014–07 Removal of Aggregate Contribution Limits (McCutcheon)).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The Federal Election Campaign Act, 52 U.S.C. 30101–45 (formerly 2 U.S.C. 431–55) (“FECA”), imposes limits on the aggregate amounts that an individual may contribute to federal candidates, political parties, and other political committees during a two-year election cycle. 52 U.S.C. 30116(a)(3) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(3)). The Commission had implemented FECA’s aggregate limits in its regulations at 11 CFR 110.5.

On April 2, 2014, the United States Supreme Court held that the aggregate contribution limits are unconstitutional. *McCutcheon v. FEC*, 572 U.S. \_\_\_, 134 S. Ct. 1434 (2014) (plurality op.). On October 17, 2014, the Commission published an interim rule to conform its regulations to the *McCutcheon* decision. See Aggregate Biennial Contribution Limits, 79 FR 62335 (Oct. 17, 2014). In its interim rule, the Commission deleted 11 CFR 110.5 and made technical and conforming changes to 11 CFR 110.1(c), 110.14(d) and (g), 110.17(b), and 110.19.<sup>1</sup> *Id.* The Commission sought comments on these changes.

The Commission published the interim rule without advance notice and comment because it fell under the “good cause” exception of the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B). The revisions were necessary to conform the Commission’s regulations to the Supreme Court’s holding that the statutory aggregate limits are unconstitutional. See *McCutcheon*, 134 S. Ct. at 1442. Because this action did not involve any Commission discretion or policy judgments, notice and comment were unnecessary. 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), (d)(3). A pre-publication notice and comment period would also have been contrary to the public interest because the 2014 election campaigns for federal office were ongoing, and so the delay that would have resulted from such a period might have caused confusion among the public as to the enforceability of the regulations addressed in the interim rule.

For the same reasons, the revisions fell within the “good cause” exception to the APA’s delayed effective date provision and the requirements of the Congressional Review Act. 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), 808(2). Moreover, because the interim rule was exempt from the APA’s notice and comment procedure under 5 U.S.C. 553(b), the Commission was not required to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis under 5 U.S.C. 603 or 604. See 5 U.S.C. 601(2), 604(a). Nor was the Commission required to submit these revisions for congressional review

<sup>1</sup> In an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking published on the same day, the Commission requested comment on whether to begin a rulemaking to revise other regulations in light of certain language from the *McCutcheon* decision. See Aggregate Biennial Contribution Limits, 79 FR 62361 (Oct. 17, 2014). That notice will remain open for comment until January 15, 2015. *Id.*

under FECA. See 52 U.S.C. 30111(d)(1), (4) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 438(d)(1), (4)) (providing for congressional review when Commission “prescribe[s]” a “rule of law”). Accordingly, the revisions were effective upon publication in the **Federal Register**—that is, on October 17, 2014.

#### Explanation and Justification

FECA imposes two types of limits on the amount that individuals may contribute in connection with federal elections. The “base limits” restrict how much an individual may contribute to a particular candidate or political committee per election or calendar year. See 52 U.S.C. 30116(a)(1) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)). The “aggregate limits” restrict the amounts that an individual may contribute to all candidate committees, political party committees, and other political committees in each two-year election cycle. See 52 U.S.C. 30116(a)(3) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(3)). Under the aggregate limits, as indexed for inflation in the 2013–14 election cycle, an individual could contribute up to \$48,600 to candidates and their authorized committees, and up to \$74,600 to other political committees, of which no more than \$48,600 could be contributed to political committees other than national party committees. See Price Index Adjustments for Contribution and Expenditure Limitations and Lobbyist Bundling Disclosure Threshold, 78 FR 8530, 8532 (Feb. 6, 2013).

On April 2, 2014, the Supreme Court held that the aggregate contribution limits at 52 U.S.C. 30116(a)(3) (formerly 2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(3)) are unconstitutional. See *McCutcheon*, 134 S. Ct. at 1442, 1450–59. The Court’s decision did not affect the base limits. See *id.* at 1442.

Accordingly, in the interim rule, the Commission removed the regulation at 11 CFR 110.5 that implemented FECA’s aggregate contribution limits. The Commission also made technical and conforming amendments to 11 CFR 110.1(c)(3) (contributions to party committees), 110.14(d)(1) (contributions to delegates), 110.14(g)(2) (contributions to delegate committees), 110.17(b) (price index increases), and 110.19 (contributions by minors).

The Commission received three comments on the interim rule. One commenter argued in favor of “limiting

contributions that can be made by one person/corporation” and by non-profit organizations. A second commenter urged the Commission to evaluate “anti-corruption and small donation/public financing proposals,” including those at the state and local levels, and to “petition the Congress and the Administration for a change.” In response, the Commission notes that, as explained above, the revisions made in the interim rule were necessary to conform the Commission’s regulations to the Supreme Court’s holding in *McCutcheon*, see 134 S. Ct. at 1442, and did not involve any Commission discretion or policy judgments. The Commission is considering whether to commence a separate rulemaking to address other issues related to the *McCutcheon* decision. See *supra* n.1.

A third comment, filed by a national party committee, supported the revisions made in the interim rule. The commenter agreed that the changes made in the interim rule were necessary to conform Commission regulations to the *McCutcheon* decision, and the commenter stated that the interim rule “completely implements the *McCutcheon* decision.”<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, after consideration of the comments, and for the reasons set forth above and in the interim rule, the Commission is adopting, as a final rule and without change, the revisions made to Commission regulations by the interim rule.

#### List of Subjects in 11 CFR Part 110

Campaign funds, Political committees and parties.

#### PART 110—CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE LIMITATIONS AND PROHIBITIONS

Accordingly, the interim rule amending 11 CFR part 110, which was published at 79 FR 62335 on October 17, 2014, is adopted as a final rule without change.

On behalf of the Commission,

Dated: December 18, 2014.

**Lee E. Goodman,**

*Chairman, Federal Election Commission.*

[FR Doc. 2014–30222 Filed 12–23–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6715–01–P**

<sup>2</sup> Additionally, the comment asked the Commission to take action in several other rulemakings that are unrelated to the final rule addressed here and to refrain from further revising its regulations in light of the *McCutcheon* decision.

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. FAA–2014–0759; Directorate Identifier 2014–CE–028–AD; Amendment 39–18052; AD 2014–26–01]

RIN 2120–AA64

#### Airworthiness Directives; Alpha Aviation Concept Limited Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Department of Transportation (DOT).

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** We are adopting a new airworthiness directive (AD) for Alpha Aviation Concept Limited Model R2160 airplanes. This AD results from mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) issued by an aviation authority of another country to identify and correct an unsafe condition on an aviation product. The MCAI describes the unsafe condition as paint adherence defects inside the engine air intake box and cohesion defects inside the laminated ducting from the filter to the air intake box. We are issuing this AD to require actions to address the unsafe condition on these products.

**DATES:** This AD is effective January 28, 2015.

The Director of the Federal Register approved the incorporation by reference of a certain publication listed in the AD as of January 28, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** You may examine the AD docket on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov/#/documentDetail;D=FAA-2014-0759>; or in person at Document Management Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Docket Operations, M–30, West Building Ground Floor, Room W12–140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590.

For service information identified in this AD, contact Alpha Aviation, 59 Hautapu Road, RD 1, Cambridge 3493, New Zealand; telephone: +64 7 827 0528; fax: +64 7 929 2878; Internet: [www.alphaaviation.co.nz](http://www.alphaaviation.co.nz). You may review this referenced service information at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. For information on the availability of this material at the FAA, call (816) 329–4148.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Karl Schletzbaum, Aerospace Engineer, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329–4123; fax: (816) 329–4090; email: [karl.schletzbaum@faa.gov](mailto:karl.schletzbaum@faa.gov).

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### Discussion

We issued a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to amend 14 CFR part 39 to add an AD that would apply to Alpha Aviation Concept Limited Model R2160 airplanes. The NPRM was published in the **Federal Register** on October 2, 2014 (79 FR 59465). The NPRM proposed to correct an unsafe condition for the specified products and was based on mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) originated by an aviation authority of another country. The MCAI states:

To prevent loss of engine power due to a possible paint adherence defect inside the engine air intake box, accomplish the following:

Inspect the engine air intake box (including the deflection flap) and the engine air intake ducting (include the area downstream of the filter) per Alpha Aviation Service Bulletin No. AA–SB–71–007 dated August 2014 or later approved revisions.

If any defects are found, replace affected parts per SB No. AA–SB–71–007 before further flight.

The MCAI can be found in the AD docket on the Internet at: <http://www.regulations.gov/#/documentDetail;D=FAA-2014-0759-0002>.

### Comments

We gave the public the opportunity to participate in developing this AD. We received no comments on the NPRM (79 FR 59465, October 2, 2014) or on the determination of the cost to the public.

### Conclusion

We reviewed the relevant data and determined that air safety and the public interest require adopting the AD as proposed except for minor editorial changes. We have determined that these minor changes:

- Are consistent with the intent that was proposed in the NPRM (79 FR 59465, October 2, 2014) for correcting the unsafe condition; and
- Do not add any additional burden upon the public than was already proposed in the NPRM (79 FR 59465, October 2, 2014).

### Costs of Compliance

We estimate that this AD will affect 10 products of U.S. registry. We also estimate that it would take about 1 work-hour per product to comply with the basic requirements of this AD. The average labor rate is \$85 per work-hour.

Based on these figures, we estimate the cost of this AD on U.S. operators to be \$850, or \$85 per product.

In addition, we estimate that any necessary follow-on actions would take