livestock producers where forage was adversely affected by drought in counties reaching D3 or D4 Drought on the U.S. Drought Monitor, during March 7 to August 31, 2006, in the States of: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Wisconsin and Wyoming. Under the Livestock Assistance Grant Program, FSA will provide grants to the State governments of these States to assist livestock producers who suffered forage losses as part of a farming operation in eligible counties. The amount of each grant will be based on the number of adult beef cattle and sheep from each eligible county uniformly prorated to ensure that available funding is not exceeded. Producers in eligible counties in those States who suffered forage losses as part of a farming operation are eligible for assistance under these grants. Among other conditions of these grants, assistance provided by a State under such a grant to an applicant shall not exceed $10,000, except for general partnerships and joint ventures in which case assistance shall not exceed $10,000 times the number of members that constitute the general partnership or joint venture.

Teresa C. Lasseter, Administrator, Farm Service Agency.
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Statement of Policy: “Purpose of Disbursement” Entries for Filings With the Commission

AGENCY: Federal Election Commission.

ACTION: Statement of Policy.

SUMMARY: Political committees and other persons required to file campaign finance reports with the FEC must itemize certain disbursements and, for each itemized disbursement, must provide information including a brief description of the purpose of the disbursement. The “purpose of disbursement” entry, when considered along with the identity of the disbursement recipient, must be sufficiently specific to make the purpose of the disbursement clear. The Commission’s regulation requiring a description of the purpose of each itemized disbursement includes examples of descriptions that are acceptable (e.g., “dinner expenses,” “salary,” “travel expenses”) and examples that are unacceptable (e.g., “advance,” “miscellaneous”). Neither list is exhaustive.

The Commission solicited comments on a draft of this policy statement on November 2, 2006. Two comments were received. After reviewing the comments received, the Commission has decided to publish the policy statement with one change. As suggested by a commenter, the Commission has added “Consulting-Polling” to the examples of generally insufficient descriptions. In light of this change, the Commission has also added examples of descriptions that would be generally sufficient, such as “Consulting-Media,” “Consulting-Fundraising,” “Consulting-Legal” and “Consulting-Get-Out-The-Vote.”

The Commission recognizes that the “purpose of disbursement” entries, when linked to information provided about the recipient of the payment, may provide sufficient disclosure. For example, a disbursement to an office supply vendor for the stated purpose of “Supplies” provides adequate and acceptable disclosure, while a disbursement to a campaign staff member for the same purpose of “Supplies” would likely trigger a

---

(b) Applicants must certify and provide adequate proof that the expenses incurred to eligible fruit trees, bushes, or vines occurred during the applicable disaster period and that the loss or damage was a direct result of a 2005 hurricane, as set forth in §760.101.

(c) The quantity and kind of fruit trees, bushes, or vines that died or were damaged as a result of the applicable disaster may be documented by: purchase records; bank or other loan documents; Federal Emergency Management Agency and National Guard records; IRS records; property tax records; private insurance documents; and similar documents.

§760.504 Payment calculation.

(a) TIP payments shall be calculated by multiplying the following national payment rate for the applicable tier by the number of eligible acres, excluding but not limited to such things as drainage ditches and canals, in a stand of fruit trees, bushes, or vines by the producer’s share in such crop:

1. Tier I—$750;
2. Tier II—$300;
3. Tier III—$200; and
4. Tier IV—$90.

(b) If the actual expenses incurred for damage are greater than the value associated with the tier based on the location of the stand, the applicant may submit documentation to FSA to request payment at a lower tier. Regardless of the expenses incurred the stand can only be placed in the next lower-numbered tier.

Subpart H—2006 Livestock Assistance Grant Program

§760.701 Funds availability.

FSA will administer a limited program to provide assistance to livestock producers where forage was adversely affected by drought in counties reaching D3 or D4 Drought on the U.S. Drought Monitor, during March 7 to August 31, 2006, in the States of: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Wisconsin and Wyoming. Under the Livestock Assistance Grant Program, FSA will provide grants to the State governments of these States to assist livestock producers who suffered forage losses as part of a farming operation in eligible counties. The amount of each grant will be based on the number of adult beef cattle and sheep from each eligible county uniformly prorated to ensure that available funding is not exceeded. Producers in eligible counties in those States who suffered forage losses as part of a farming operation are eligible for assistance under these grants. Among other conditions of these grants, assistance provided by a State under such a grant to an applicant shall not exceed $10,000, except for general partnerships and joint ventures in which case assistance shall not exceed $10,000 times the number of members that constitute the general partnership or joint venture.
request for a more complete description of the purpose of the disbursement. In the former case, it is obvious to the reader what type of supplies were purchased, while in the latter case, it is not.

As a rule of thumb, filers should consider the following question: “Could a person not associated with the committee easily discern why the disbursement was made when reading the name of the recipient and the purpose?” For example, a person not associated with the committee could not easily discern the purpose of a disbursement made to a vendor for “Consulting” (unless the vendor’s name makes the purpose clear, e.g., Smith Fundraising Consulting, Inc.). As discussed above, however, if the committee were to provide additional detail with respect to the type of consulting the vendor provided (e.g., “Fundraising Consulting”), an unassociated person would have no difficulty discerning the purpose of the disbursement.

All information on campaign finance reports submitted to the FEC, including the entries for “purpose of disbursement,” are reviewed by analysts in the Reports Analysis Division (RAD). Some campaign finance reports, particularly those filed by presidential campaign committees accepting public funding, are also reviewed by auditors in the Audit Division. In practice, the RAD analysts and the auditors often work closely with RAD analysts and the auditors often work closely with the committee to ensure that the purpose of disbursement is clearly stated.

The Commission does not intend to provide a list of acceptable and generally unacceptable descriptions. Therefore, in order to provide further guidance to filers and to encourage consistency between filers, the Commission is publishing lists of additional generally acceptable and generally unacceptable descriptions.

The Commission does not intend to request that a committee provide additional information about a purpose of disbursement entry if the committee uses those descriptions listed below as providing sufficient detail. However, if a committee uses a description that is listed as lacking sufficient detail, a RAD analyst may review the report more closely but the Commission would not automatically take any particular action. In most instances, the Commission will merely contact the reporting committee and the committee may then amend its report. In the rare circumstances in which the Commission deems it necessary to pursue the matter further, the Commission will conduct a separate review of the sufficiency of the description of purpose to determine whether it meets the requirements of 11 CFR 104.3(b).

Any future revisions to these lists will be posted on the Commission’s Web site at http://www.fec.gov/law/policy.shtml. Committees with questions can contact either their assigned RAD analyst (phone: (800) 424–9530 (press 5)) or the FEC Information Division (phone: (800) 424–9530 (press 6); e-mail: info@fec.gov).

**Descriptions of purpose that provide sufficient detail:**

- “Salary” for a disbursement to a staff member.
- “Media” for a disbursement to a television or radio communication company.
- “Polling” for a disbursement to a research/communications company.
- “Travel,” “Travel Expenses,” or “Travel Expense Reimbursement” for a disbursement to a staff member.
- “Printing” for a disbursement to a printing company.
- “Phone Banks” for a disbursement to a vendor providing phone bank services.
- “Dinner Expense” for a disbursement to a restaurant.
- “Catering Cost” for a disbursement to a hotel or restaurant where a fundraiser was held.
- “Party Fees” or “Party Annual Dues” for a disbursement to a National Party Committee for their annual dues.
- “Exit Polling,” “Door-to-Door Get-Out-the-Vote,” “Get-Out-the-Vote Phone Calls,” or “Driving Voters to the Polls” to individuals or vendors contracted for get-out-the-vote or voter registration activity.
- “Supplies” for a disbursement to an office supply vendor.
- “Consultant-Media,” “Consultant-Fundraising,” “Consultant-Out-of-State,” “Consultant-Legal,” or “Consultant-Polling” for a disbursement to a consultant or consulting company.

**Descriptions of purposes that generally lack sufficient detail:**

Administrative Expenses
- Admin.
- Advance
- Bonus
- Bounty
- Campaign Expense
- Campaign Material
- Charges
- Collateral
- Collateral Materials
- Commission
- Compensation (other than committee staff)
- Consultant
- Consultant-Political
- Consulting
- Consulting Non-FEA
- Consulting Service
- Contract
- Contract Labor
- Contractual Services
- Convention Expenses
- Convention Services
- Costs
- Delegate
- Delegate Expenses
- Design
- Discount Fees
- Election Day Expense
- Entertainment
- Event
- Event Expense
- Event Reimbursement
- Event Supplies (if to an individual)
- Expenses
- Expense Reimbursement
- Fees
- Fundraising (if to an individual)
- Fundraising Event
- Fundraising Expense (if to an individual)
- Fundraising Fees (if to an individual)
- Fundraising Supplies (if to an individual)
- General Advice
- General Consulting
- Generic Campaign Activity
- Generic Consulting
- Get-Out-The-Vote or GOTV
- GOTV Expenses
- GOTV Labor
- Invoice
- Labor
- Literature
- Meeting (if to an individual)
- Meeting Expenses (if to an individual)
- Meeting Supplies (if to an individual)
- Miscellaneous or Misc.
- Miscellaneous Expense
- Office Expense (if to an individual)
- Office Services
- Outside Services
- Operating Expenses
- Other Expenses
- Production
- Professional Fees
- Professional Fees—Consulting
- Professional Services
- Promotional Material
- Publication
- Push Card
- Reimbursement
- Rendered Service
- Services
- Services Rendered
- State Convention
- Supplies (if to an individual)
- Voter Bounty
- Voter Contact
- Voter Drive
- Voter Identification or Voter ID
- Voter Registration
- Worker

This Federal Register notice represents a general statement of policy.
announcing the general course of action that the Commission intends to follow. This policy statement does not constitute an agency regulation requiring notice of proposed rulemaking, opportunities for public participation, prior publication, and delay in effective date under 5 U.S.C. 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"). As such, it does not bind the Commission or any member of the general public. The provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which apply when notice and comment are required by the APA or another statute, are not applicable.

Dated: December 27, 2006.

Robert D. Lenhard,
Vice Chairman, Federal Election Commission.

[FR Doc. E7–8–5 Filed 1–8–07; 8:45 am]
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Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 206A, B, L, L–1, L–3, and L–4 Helicopters

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment supersedes an existing airworthiness directive (AD) for the specified Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (BHTC) model helicopters. The existing AD currently requires certain inspections and checks of the tail rotor blade (blade) for a deformation, a crack, and a bent or deformed tail rotor weight (weight). Also, that AD requires, before further flight, replacing each blade with an airworthy blade if a deformation, a crack, or a bent or deformed weight is found. This action contains the same actions as the existing AD. Also, when we issued AD 2004–24–08, we intentionally did not include the long-term requirement (no later than April 27, 2007) for removing and sending the affected blades to Rotor Blades, Inc. as specified by the manufacturer. We are including a long-term requirement in this AD that the affected blades be replaced on or before April 27, 2007, as terminating action. Additionally, in AD 2004–24–08, we inadvertently omitted blade serial numbers 10102 through 10114 from the applicability. We are correcting that oversight with this action.

Since issuing AD 2004–24–08, BHTC has issued Alert Service Bulletin 206–100–100–81–001–005 for Bell Model 206A and B helicopters, and 206L–04–127 for Bell Model 206L series helicopters, both Revision C, both dated March 5, 2005 (ASB). These ASBs add two warnings in the compliance section specifying returning the blade for balancing to Rotor Blades, Inc., and introduce new skin damage limits that supersede the previous damage limits. The ASB also gives a new address for Rotor Blades Inc.

Transport Canada, the airworthiness authority for Canada, notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on these helicopter models. Transport Canada advises of three reports of skin cracks originating near the blade trailing edge balance weight. Two of the occurrences caused a loss of the weight and a strip of material along the trailing edge leading to an imbalance, which caused the fracture of three of the four tail rotor gearbox attachments. One of these occurrences resulted in the gearbox shifting that caused failure of the drive shaft and resulting loss of yaw control. Transport Canada issued AD No. CF–2004–05R1, dated June 28, 2004, to ensure the continued airworthiness of these helicopters in Canada.

These helicopter models are manufactured in Canada and are type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of 14 CFR 21.29 and the applicable bilateral agreement. Pursuant to the applicable bilateral agreement, Transport Canada has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of Transport Canada, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of these type designs that are certificated for operation in the United States.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. No comments were received on the proposal or the FAA’s determination of the cost to the public. The FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed, except for a change in paragraph (f) of the AD to add additional contact information. This change will neither increase the economic burden on any operator nor increase the scope of the AD.

The FAA estimates that this AD will:

• Affect 2194 helicopters of U.S. registry.
• Take about ¼ work hour for a blade check or inspection, and
• Take 3 work hours to replace a blade at an average labor rate of $65 per work hour.
• Cost about $5848 per helicopter. (In its ASB, the manufacturer states it will give warranty credit based on hour usage on the blade with remaining life hours and other restrictions.)

Based on these figures, we estimate the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators to be $19,989,973. Costs assume—200 pilot checks, 26 mechanic inspections, and one blade replacement for 90 percent of the fleet with a nonconforming blade.

Regulatory Findings

We have determined that this AD will not have federalism implications under Executive Order 13132. This AD will not have a substantial direct effect on