

Date
13 AUG 86

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1. ADDA	✗	
2.		
3. <i>↓</i>		
4. DDA/IRO	✓	
5. DDA REGISTRY		

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

INFO PACKAGE.
D/OIS/DA RECEIVED A COPY.

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
	Phone No.

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
ROUTING SLIP**

TO:		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI				
2	DDCI				
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI				
6	DDA		X		
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC		X		
11	IG				
12	Compt		X		
13	D/OLL				
14	D/PAO				
15	D/PERS				
16	VC/NIC				
17	D/OIS/DA		X		
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
		SUSPENSE	_____		
			Date		

Remarks

Executive Secretary

12 Aug 86

Date

3637 (10-81)

STAT



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

Executive Registry
86- 2636X/1

AUG 8 1986

REGISTRY
FILE: 60-7



MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES SUBJECT TO EXECUTIVE ORDER NOS. 12291 AND 12498

FROM: Wendy L. Gramm, Administrator, OIRA *wlg*

SUBJECT: Revised June 13, 1986, Memorandum on Certain New Procedures of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs

Attached is a revised version of my Memorandum dated June 13, 1986 concerning certain new procedures primarily on the disclosure of information about our reviews under Executive Order No. 12291 and Executive Order No. 12498. This revised version, also dated June 13, 1986, is intended to be a replacement for the earlier Memorandum.

The principal change in the revised version is the inclusion of a section concerning the effective date of the new procedures. An explanation of the effective dates of the several sections of these procedures was inadvertently deleted from the original version. There are other points of clarification as well including: (1) the definition of "correspondence" in procedure #3; (2) the availability of a current list of agencies that have elected to be covered by procedures #4 through #6; and (3) the availability in the reading room of copies of draft regulatory program submissions from departments and agencies, procedure #8.

We have scheduled a public briefing for August 12, 1986, for interested persons who have questions on these new procedures. The briefing will be in Room 450, Old Executive Office Building at 10:00 a.m. Admission to the OEOB may be arranged by calling 395-5897.

Attachment



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

June 13, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES SUBJECT TO
EXECUTIVE ORDER NOS. 12291 and 12498

FROM: Wendy L. Gramm, Administrator, OIRA *wlg*

SUBJECT: Additional procedures concerning OIRA reviews
under Executive Order Nos. 12291 and 12498
[Revised]

From the time the President signed Executive Order No. 12291 on February 17, 1981, OMB has worked with the Departments and Agencies to develop and implement various procedures concerning the review of draft rules by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA). We have also developed trial procedures and supported legislative proposals concerning our reviews as we have gained experience with these Executive Orders. For example last year, we implemented on a pilot basis with the Environmental Protection Agency additional procedures concerning OIRA's communications with persons outside the Federal Government.

We have also supported an American Bar Association Resolution that endorsed the President's regulatory review efforts and recommended that more information concerning our reviews be made available to Congress and the public.

The purpose of this memorandum is to advise you of additional procedures that we have determined, as a matter of administrative discretion, to implement concerning our review of draft rules under Executive Order No. 12291 and to set forth our policy on disclosure of agency regulatory program drafts under Executive Order No. 12498.

Current Procedures

These new procedures supplement our current procedures. As you are aware, Executive Order No. 12291 establishes certain procedures; the Administrative Procedure Act sets forth procedural and substantive requirements that govern agency action; other statutes establish procedures; and OIRA has adopted its own internal rules concerning its review of draft rules under Executive Order No. 12291. Furthermore, Departments and Agencies usually have established rules or practices to implement their rulemaking activities.

Attached to this memorandum are copies of some of the relevant materials concerning our reviews and procedures. Several of the most important features of these current procedures are:

Reviews under Executive Order No. 12291

- o Rules must meet statutory requirements. Executive Order No. 12291 reviews cannot result in rules not authorized by law or rules that do not carry out statutory requirements.
- o Rulemaking decisions are made by agency heads. Executive Order No. 12291 makes it clear that the rulemaking authority of the agency head is not displaced by the Order.
- o Rules must be based on the agency record. Executive Order No. 12291 cannot cause rulemaking decisions that are not supported by the agency rulemaking record. The law requires that all agency decisions must be rationally based on information in the agency record.
- o Requirements of Executive Order No. 12291 apply only to the extent permitted by law. If there is a conflict between the Executive Order or the President's regulatory principles in Executive Order No. 12291 and the law, the law governs.

Current OIRA Procedures

- o Only the Administrator and Deputy Administrator within OIRA (or someone specifically designated by them) may communicate with someone who is not employed by the Federal Government on regulations submitted to OIRA for review under Executive Order No. 12291.
- o Written materials received from anyone not employed by the Federal Government are made available in OIRA's public reading room for review by the public.
- o OMB has advised persons who wish to send us information about regulatory proposals to send information to the rulemaking agency, with a copy to us, so that the material may be made a part of the agency record.
- o In general, OIRA provides written reasons to the agency whenever OIRA returns a regulation to an agency for further review because it is not consistent with the President's regulatory principles.
- o OIRA issues full reports annually on the disposition of all rules reviewed under Executive Order No. 12291, including a list of all returned rules.

New Procedures

1. OIRA will make available, upon written request made to OIRA after publication of an ANPRM or NPRM in the Federal Register, copies of any draft of the ANPRM or NPRM submitted for OIRA's review under Executive Order No. 12291;

2. Similarly, OIRA will make available, upon written request made to OIRA after publication of the final rule in the Federal Register, copies of any draft of the final rule submitted for OIRA's review under Executive Order No. 12291;
3. OIRA will make available, upon written request made to OIRA after the ANPRM, NPRM or the final rule is published in the Federal Register, all written correspondence concerning the draft submitted for OIRA's review under Executive Order No. 12291 that is exchanged between OIRA and the agency head. "Correspondence" means any documents exchanged between OIRA and the head of an agency.

These procedures are derived from provisions in S. 2433, as reported from the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, with Administration support, in 1984. The Report on S. 2433 (No. 98-576, 98th Congress, 2d. Sess.) contains explanatory material as to how these provisions would have been interpreted had S. 2433 been enacted. We will be guided by that material in implementing these first three provisions.

4. OIRA will send EPA copies of all written material concerning EPA rules that OIRA receives from persons who are not employees of the Federal Government;
5. OIRA will advise EPA of all oral communications concerning EPA's rules, e.g., meetings, telephone calls, that OIRA (i.e., the Administrator and Deputy Administrator) has with persons who are not employees of the Federal Government; and
6. OIRA will invite EPA to all scheduled meetings with such persons concerning EPA's rules;

In May 1985, we instituted with EPA on a trial basis other procedures to better conform our Executive Order No. 12291 review procedures to EPA's somewhat unique internal procedures and statutory provisions concerning rulemaking. (See attached letter dated May 30, 1985, Attachment D). These procedures are practical, and EPA believes that they are useful. This Memorandum revises those procedures with EPA and makes them a part of OIRA's current procedures.

(Note: These procedures do not apply to information collection requests under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, even if such requests are a part of a proposed agency rule. Other procedures apply to such matters, see 5 CFR Part 1320.)

7. OIRA will apply these procedures (#4 through #6) to any other Department or Agency that is subject to Executive Order No. 12291 if that agency elects to institute these procedures, or any part of them.

Procedures #4 through #6 presently apply only to EPA. Although patterned upon EPA's statutory and internal procedures nonetheless, OIRA is prepared to extend these procedures to other agencies if the head of the agency so requests. A current list of agencies that have requested coverage will be maintained in the public reading room.

In addition,

8. OIRA will make available upon written request to OIRA made after the Regulatory Program is published, any agency draft submission sent to OIRA under Executive Order No. 12498. A copy will be available in the public reading room;
9. OIRA will continue to publish a complete annual accounting of Executive Order No. 12291 activities;
10. OIRA will make available upon written request to OIRA made after the end of a calendar month, a list of all draft ANPRMs, NPRMs and draft final rules for which OIRA has completed review under Executive Order No. 12291 during the preceding month (and the length of our review for each); and
11. OIRA will place in its public reading room: all written material received from persons outside the Federal Government concerning agency rules; a list of all meetings with persons outside the Federal Government pertaining to rules of an agency if that agency elects to participate in procedure #6; and a list of all other communications with persons outside the Federal Government pertaining to rules of any agency if that agency elects to participate in procedure #5.

Effective Date of New Procedures

The effective date of these new procedures is June 13, 1986, as explained below.

For purposes of new procedures #1 through #3, OIRA will make available in accordance with the conditions of those procedures, all drafts of the rule (and written correspondence referred to in procedures #3) if the review under Executive Order No. 12291 began on or after June 13, 1986, or was under review on that date. OIRA reviews of draft ANPRMs, NPRMs and final rules will be separate actions for purposes of disclosure. For example, copies of a draft NPRM under procedure #1 will be available in accordance with the conditions of procedure #1 after publication of the NPRM, if it was pending on or submitted after June 13, 1986 for review under Executive Order No. 12291. Disclosure of the draft NPRM would not be delayed until publication of a final rule. The reviews are distinct events for disclosure purposes. Similarly, if a review under Executive Order No. 12291 of a draft NPRM was completed prior to June 13, 1986, it would not be covered by these new procedures. Drafts of the final rule would be subject to procedure #2 if the final rule was pending on or submitted after June 13, 1986.

For purposes of procedures #4 through #6, the effective date will be the date of receipt of the request by the head of an agency to have these procedures apply. They apply as of June 13, 1986, for EPA. (Trial procedures with EPA have been effective since May 30, 1985).

Procedure #8 will apply to drafts of the agency submissions for the 1986 Regulatory Program and thereafter. The annual accounting referenced in procedure #9 is an Appendix to the annual Regulatory Program. The lists referred to in procedure #10 and #11 will be available in OIRA's public reading room and upon written request on the 10th day of the month following the month for which the list is made. The first list will be available August 10, 1986. All written material pertaining to rules subject to Executive Order No. 12291 review received from persons not employed by the Federal Government as described in procedure #11 will be available within 3 to 5 days of receipt by OIRA.

These new procedures and OIRA's existing procedures are intended only to improve the internal management of the Federal Government, and are not intended to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers or any person.

Attachments

- A - Department of Justice/OLC Opinion dtd 2/13/81
- B - Executive Order No. 12291
- C - Executive Order No. 12498
- D - OIRA Procedures #3

Attachment A



United States Department of Justice
Washington, D. C. 20530

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL

1 9 73 1971

MEMORANDUM

Re: Proposed Executive Order entitled "Federal Regulation"

The attached proposed Executive Order was prepared by the Office of Management and Budget in consultation with this Office, and has been forwarded for the consideration of this Department as to form and legality by the Office of Management and Budget with the approval of the Director. The proposed Order is designed to reduce regulatory burdens, to provide for presidential oversight of the administrative process, and to ensure well reasoned regulations. The Order sets forth a number of requirements that Executive Branch agencies must adhere to in exercising their statutory rulemaking authority. We conclude that the Order is acceptable as to form and legality.

The Order has the following major provisions. Agencies must take action only if the potential benefits outweigh the social costs; attempt to maximize social benefits; choose the least costly alternative in selecting among regulatory objectives; and set priorities with the aim of maximizing net benefits. All of these requirements must be followed "to the extent permitted by law." The Order would require agencies to prepare for each "major rule" a Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) setting forth a description of the potential costs and benefits of the proposed rule, a determination of its potential net benefits, and a description of alternative approaches that might substantially achieve regulatory goals at a lower cost. Agencies would be required to determine that any proposed regulation is within statutory authority and that the factual conclusions upon which the rule is based are substantially supported by the record viewed as a whole. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Presidential Task Force on Regulatory Relief would be given authority, inter alia, to designate proposed or existing rules as major rules, to prepare uniform standards for measuring costs and benefits, to consult with the agencies concerning preparation of RIA's, to state approval or disapproval of RIA's and rules on the administrative record, to require agencies to respond to these views (and to defer rulemaking while so consulting), and to establish schedules for review and possible revision of existing major rules. The Order

would require agencies to defer rules that are pending on the date of its issuance, including rules that have been issued as final rules but are not yet legally effective, and to reconsider them under the Order. By its terms, the Order would create no substantive or procedural rights enforceable by a party against the United States or its representatives, although the RIA would become part of the administrative record for judicial review of final rules.

I. Legal Authority: In general

The President's authority to issue the proposed Executive Order derives from his constitutional power to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed." U.S. Const., Art. II, § 3. It is well established that this provision authorizes the President, as head of the Executive Branch, to "supervise and guide" Executive officers in "their construction of the statutes under which they act in order to secure that unitary and uniform execution of the laws which Article II of the Constitution evidently contemplated in vesting general executive power in the President alone." Myers v. United States, 272 U.S. 52, 135 (1926).^{1/}

The supervisory authority recognized in Myers is based on the distinctive constitutional role of the President. The "take Care" clause charges the President with the function of coordinating the execution of many statutes simultaneously: "Unlike an administrative commission confined to the enforcement of the statute under which it was created . . . the President is a constitutional officer charged with taking care that a 'mass of legislation' be executed," Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 343 U.S. 579, 702 (1952) (Vinson, C.J., dissenting).

^{1/} In Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 140-41 (1976), the Supreme Court held that any "significant governmental duty exercised pursuant to a public law" must be performed by an "Officer of the United States," appointed by the President or the Head of a Department pursuant to Art. II, § 2, cl. 2. We believe that this holding recognizes the importance of preserving the President's supervisory powers over those exercising statutory duties, subject of course to the power of Congress to confine presidential supervision by appropriate legislation. See also n.7, infra.

Moreover, because the President is the only elected official who has a national constituency, he is uniquely situated to design and execute a uniform method for undertaking regulatory initiatives that responds to the will of the public as a whole.^{2/} In fulfillment of the President's constitutional responsibility, the proposed Order promotes a coordinated system of regulation, ensuring a measure of uniformity in the interpretation and execution of a number of diverse statutes. If no such guidance were permitted, confusion and inconsistency could result as agencies interpreted open-ended statutes in differing ways.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the President's exercise of supervisory powers must conform to legislation enacted by Congress.^{3/} In issuing directives to govern the Executive Branch, the President may not, as a general proposition, require or permit agencies to transgress boundaries set by Congress. Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 343 U.S. 579 (1952). It is with these basic precepts in mind that the proposed Order must be approached.

We believe that an inquiry into congressional intent in enacting statutes delegating rulemaking authority will usually support the legality of presidential supervision of rulemaking by Executive Branch agencies. When Congress delegates legislative power to Executive agencies, it is aware that those agencies perform their functions subject to presidential supervision on matters of both substance and procedure. This is not to say that Congress never intends in a specific case to restrict presidential supervision of an Executive agency; but it should not be presumed to have done so whenever it delegates rulemaking power directly to a subordinate Executive official rather than the President. Indeed, after Myers it is unclear to what extent Congress may insulate Executive agencies from presidential supervision. Congress is also aware of the

^{2/} See Bruff, Presidential Power and Administrative Rulemaking, 88 Yale L.J. 451, 461-62 (1978).

^{3/} In certain circumstances, statutes could invade or intrude impermissibly upon the President's "inherent" powers, but that issue does not arise here.

comparative insulation given to the independent regulatory agencies, and it has delegated rulemaking authority to such agencies when it has sought to minimize presidential interference. By contrast, the heads of non-independent agencies hold their positions at the pleasure of the President, who may remove them from office for any reason. It would be anomalous to attribute to Congress an intention to immunize from presidential supervision those who are, by force of Art. II, subject to removal when their performance in exercising their statutory duties displeases the President.

Of course, the fact that the President has both constitutional and implied statutory authority to supervise decisionmaking by Executive Branch agencies does not delimit the extent of permissible supervision. It does suggest, however, that supervision is more readily justified when it does not purport wholly to displace, but only to guide and limit, discretion which Congress has allocated to a particular subordinate official. A wholesale displacement might be held inconsistent with the statute vesting authority in the relevant official. See Myers v. United States, supra, at 135: "Of course there may be duties so peculiarly and specifically committed to the discretion of a particular officer as to raise a question whether the President may overrule or revise the officer's interpretation of his statutory duty in a particular instance." This suggestion is based on the view that Congress may constitutionally conclude that some statutory responsibilities should be carried out by particular officers without the President's revision, because such officers head agencies having the technical expertise and institutional competence that Congress intended the ultimate decisionmaker to possess.^{4/} Under this analysis, of course, lesser incursions on administrative discretion are easier to support than greater ones. This Office has often taken the position that the President may consult with those having statutory decisionmaking responsibilities, and may require them to consider statutorily relevant

^{4/} Cf. H. Friendly, The Federal Administrative Agencies (1962) (discussing concept of "agency expertise" as reason for delegation of power to particular agencies). The Myers Court reaffirmed, however, that even such officers may be dismissed at the pleasure of the President. 272 U.S. at 135.

matters that he deems appropriate, as long as the President does not divest the officer of ultimate statutory authority.^{5/} Of course, the President has the authority to inform an appointee that he will be discharged if he fails to base his decisions on policies the President seeks to implement.^{6/}

A. The Order would impose requirements that are both procedural and substantive in nature. Procedurally, it would direct agencies to prepare an RIA assessing the costs and benefits of major rules. We discern no plausible legal objection to this requirement, which like most procedural requisites is at most an indirect constraint on the exercise of statutory discretion. At least as a general rule, the President's authority of "supervis[ion] in his administrative control," Myers v. United States, supra, at 135, permits him to require the agencies to follow procedures that are designed both to promote "unitary and uniform execution of the laws" and to aid the President in carrying out his constitutional duty to propose legislation. See U.S. Const., Art. II, § 3. We believe that a requirement that the agencies perform cost-benefit analysis meets these criteria. Further, the President's constitutional right to consult with officials in the Executive Branch permits him to require them to inform him of the costs and benefits of proposed action.^{7/} In our view, a requirement that rulemaking authorities prepare an RIA is the least that Myers must mean with respect to the President's authority to "supervise and guide" Executive officials.

B. Substantively, the Order would require agencies to exercise their discretion, within statutory limits, in accordance with the principles of cost-benefit analysis. More

^{5/} See generally, 1 Ops. Office of Legal Counsel Nos. 77-21, 77-56 (1977).

^{6/} See note 4 supra.

^{7/} See U.S. Const., Art. II., § 2 (President may "require the Opinion, in writing, of the principal Officer in each of the executive Departments, upon any Subject relating to the Duties of their respective Offices").

complex legal questions are raised by this requirement. Some statutes may prohibit agencies from basing a regulatory decision on an assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposed action. See, e.g., EPA v. National Crushed Stone Ass'n, 101 S. Ct. 295 (1980). The Order, however, expressly recognizes this possibility by requiring agency adherence to principles of cost-benefit analysis only "to the extent permitted by law." The issue is thus whether, when cost-benefit analysis is a statutorily authorized basis for decision, the President may require Executive agencies to be guided by principles of cost-benefit analysis even when an agency, acting without presidential guidance, might choose not to do so. We believe that such a requirement is permissible. First, there can be little doubt that, when a statute does not expressly or implicitly preclude it, an agency may take into account the costs and benefits of proposed action. Such a calculus would simply represent a logical method of assessing whether regulatory action authorized by statute would be desirable and, if so, what form that action should take. In our view, federal courts reviewing such actions would be unlikely to conclude that an assessment of costs and benefits was an impermissible basis for regulatory decisions.

Second, the requirement would not exceed the President's powers of "supervision." It leaves a considerable amount of decisionmaking discretion to the agency. Under the proposed Order, the agency head, and not the President, would be required to calculate potential costs and benefits and to determine whether the benefits justify the costs. The agency would thus retain considerable latitude in determining whether regulatory action is justified and what form such action should take. The limited requirements of the proposed Order should not be regarded as inconsistent with a legislative decision to place the basic authority to implement a statute in a particular agency. Any other conclusion would create a possible collision with constitutional principles, recognized in Myers, with respect to the President's authority as head of the Executive Branch.

C. We believe that the President would not exceed any limitations on his authority by authorizing the Task Force and the Director to supervise agency rulemaking as the Order would provide. The Order does not empower the Director

or the Task Force to displace the relevant agencies in discharging their statutory functions or in assessing and weighing the costs and benefits of proposed actions.^{8/} The function of the Task Force and the Director would be supervisory in nature. It would include such tasks as the supplementation of factual data, the development and implementation of uniform systems of methodology, the identification of incorrect statements of fact, and the placement in the administrative record of a statement disapproving agency conclusions that do not appear to conform to the principles expressed in the President's Order. Procedurally, the Director and the Task Force would be authorized to require an agency to defer rulemaking while it responded to their views concerning proposed agency action. This power of consultation would not, however, include authority to reject an agency's ultimate judgment, delegated to it by law, that potential benefits outweigh costs, that priorities under the statute compel a particular course of action, or that adequate information is available to justify regulation. As to these matters, the role of the Director and the Task Force is advisory and consultative. The limited power of supervision embodied in the proposed Order is, therefore, consistent with the President's recognized powers to supervise the Executive Branch without displacing functions placed by law in particular agencies.

^{8/} The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 96-511, 94 Stat. 2812, provides some implied statutory support for the Order by giving OMB a direct role in coordinating agency regulations that impose paperwork burdens on the public. With respect to non-independent agencies the Act gives the Director authority to disapprove "unreasonable" agency collection of information requests. § 3504(h)(5)(C). The Act does not authorize him, however, to disapprove the accompanying rule itself insofar as the two are separable. See § 3518(e); S. Rep. No. 930, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 56 (1980).

II. Suspension of proposed and final regulations.

The Order requires Executive Branch agencies (1) to suspend the effective date of rules that have been issued as final rules, but have not become legally effective; and (2) to reconsider rules that are proposed but have not yet been made final. After suspension of final rules, agencies must reconsider all such rules in accordance with the Order. These requirements are imposed only "to the extent permitted by law" and are thus inapplicable when a judicial or statutory deadline requires prompt action. Moreover, agencies must, in complying with these directives, adhere to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 551 et seq., and all other laws.

For rules that have not yet been made final, the APA imposes no special procedural requirements. Agencies need not follow the notice and comment procedures of 5 U.S.C. § 553, for nothing in that provision requires an agency to allow a period for comment on a decision to delay final adoption of a proposed rule. The agency's decision may, however, be subject to judicial review, and the agency may have to furnish a reasoned explanation for that decision. See ASG Indust. v. CPSC, 593 F.2d 1323, 1335 (D.C. Cir. 1979); Action for Children's Television v. FCC, 564 F.2d 458, 478-79 (D.C. Cir. 1977). The explanation here -- that the agency needs time to prepare an RIA required by Executive Order -- is, we believe, sufficient.

The second category of regulations covered by the Executive Order raises somewhat different legal issues. Under 5 U.S.C. § 553(b), notice and comment procedures must be followed for "rulemaking" unless "the agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefor in the rules issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest." Under 5 U.S.C. § 551(5), the term "rulemaking" is defined as "agency process for formulating, amending, or repealing a rule." The initial question, then, is whether an agency's decision to "suspend" a final but not effective rule is "rulemaking" which triggers the procedural safeguards of § 553.

In a recent memorandum, this Office concluded that a 60-day suspension of the effective date of a final rule should not, in general, be regarded as rulemaking within the meaning of the APA.^{9/} We based our conclusion on "the clear congressional intent to give agencies discretion to extend the effective date provision beyond 30 days" and the absence of statutory language or history suggesting "that a delay in effective date is the sort of agency action that Congress intended to include within the procedural requirements of § 553(b)." Nevertheless, we believe that a short-term suspension of the effectiveness of a final rule is not the equivalent of an indefinite suspension coupled with a process designed to review the basis for the rule, with a view to establishing a new rule. Although the former seems fairly characterized as a mere extension of an effective date under § 553(d), the latter should probably be characterized as "agency process for formulating, amending, or repealing a rule" for purposes of § 553(b).

The difference between these two measures for purposes of § 553 becomes clear upon examination of the sequence of events that is expected to take place under each of them. Under the President's Memorandum of January 29, 1981, agencies are to defer the effective dates of final rules for sixty days in order to review them. The completion of that review will point to either of two dispositions. The rule might be allowed to take effect as published in final form, or it might be withdrawn for some proposed change. The first disposition would require no new procedures. The second disposition would surely contemplate an amendment or repeal of the earlier rule subject to § 553's public procedures, but the earlier deferral of the rule's effective date would remain just that.^{10/}

Under the proposed Order, the situation is analogous to the second possible disposition under the President's Memorandum. The Order, by requiring careful cost-benefit analysis of rules through the RIA process, would contemplate notices of proposed rulemaking on the preliminary RIA and a

^{9/} Memorandum of January 28, 1981, for Honorable David Stockman, Director, Office of Management and Budget, from Larry L. Sinms, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel.

reexamination of the rule at the appropriate time. The issue to be decided at the time the rule is suspended indefinitely for the Order's process to take place is whether the rule, which has already been promulgated in final form, should be allowed to have interim effect while it is under review by the agency. We believe that this decision is one of "formulating, amending, or repealing a rule" that requires either notice and comment procedures or good cause for dispensing with them under § 553(b). Admittedly, the difference between a short deferral of the effectiveness of a rule and an indefinite suspension for reexamination is in part one of degree. But there is also a difference in kind: once a decision to begin the process of amending a rule is made, there is no longer a plausible argument that a rule that was to take effect is merely to be delayed for a brief period.

Notice and comment procedures on the issue of the interim effectiveness of a rule that is due to undergo reexamination under the Order should take the following form. The agency should defer the rule's effective date for a period sufficient to allow a short time for notice and comment, an opportunity for the agency to consider the comments and decide the issue of interim effectiveness, and an interval before the rule takes effect sufficient to meet the purposes of § 553(d).

In deciding on the interim effectiveness of final rules subject to the Order's procedures, the final question is whether and under what circumstances agencies will have good cause to dispense with notice and comment procedures. Public procedures on interim effectiveness might be "unnecessary, impracticable, or contrary to the public interest," where

10/ Admittedly, one of the purposes of the 30-day effective date provision is to allow agencies to correct errors or oversights in final regulations. See Final Report, Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure 114-15 (1941); Sannon v. United States, 460 F. Supp. 458, 467 (S.D. Fla. 1978). This purpose, however, does not suggest that agencies may make corrections, let alone withdraw rules, during the period between a rule's publication and its effective date without offering public procedures or showing good cause for dispensing with them. Proposed corrections -- or even repeals -- would of course be amendments for purposes of § 553(b).

the question whether there should be any rule at all was fully ventilated in the rule's comment process, or where it is clear that interim effect could impose substantial but short-term compliance costs. On the other hand, notice and comment might be needed where the rule's proponents had advanced substantial arguments for its early effectiveness, and where compliance costs are not likely to be wasted.

Such arguments must, of course, be assessed on a case-by-case basis. If the available record indicates that the costs of the rule at issue are not substantial and that the failure to allow the rule to become effective may itself be controversial, the likelihood that a court will require notice and public comment increases. The procedural requirements of the APA will, therefore, vary with the size and immediacy of the burdens imposed by the rule and the need for public comment on a decision to withdraw a final but not effective rule.

III. Regulatory Review by Agency Heads.

Section 4 of the proposed Order would require agency heads to make express determinations that regulations they issue are authorized by law and are supported by the materials in the rulemaking record. These requirements are meant to assure agency compliance with existing legal principles that rules must be authorized by law, and that they should be adequately supported by a factual basis. Accordingly, we find no legal difficulty with them. In particular, they do not purport to change generally applicable statutory standards for judicial review of agency action, see 5 U.S.C. § 706, and could not have such an effect. They also do not purport to alter any specially applicable standards, such as those concerning the evidentiary standard that must be met to uphold a given rule, appearing in statutes governing a particular agency.

On the other hand, the section would add the significantly new procedural requirements that agency heads expressly determine that the legal and factual requisites for a rule have been met. The first requirement reflects the principle, central to administrative law, that agency action must be guided by the "supremacy of law." St. Joseph Stock Yards Co. v. United States, 298 U.S. 38, 84 (1936) (Brandeis, J.). This principle protects against excess of power and abusive

exercise of power by administrators. See Report of the U.S. Attorney General's Comm. on Administrative Procedure, Administrative Procedure in Government Agencies, S. Doc. No. 8, 77th Cong., 1st Sess. 76 (1941). The requirement that agency heads determine that a rule has "substantial support" in the materials before the agency means that a rule's necessary factual basis must be found to exist. This second requirement should not be confused with a "substantial evidence" standard of judicial review, which could be imposed only by statute. It embodies Recommendation 74-4 (subpart 3) of the Administrative Conference of the United States, 1 CFR § 305.74.4, which urges that for a rule to be considered rational, it should be adequately grounded in a factual basis. This requirement is consistent with the approach of courts that have carefully reviewed agency action under the "arbitrary and capricious" standard of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706 (2)(A). See, e.g., Ethyl Corp. v. EPA, 541 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir.) (en banc), cert. denied, 426 U.S. 941 (1976).

IV. Judicial Review.


The Order states that it is not intended to create any rights or benefits enforceable by a party to litigation against the United States, its agencies, or any other person. At the same time, it provides that determinations of costs and benefits, and the RIA itself, are meant to form part of the agency record for purposes of judicial review. The effect of this provision is to preclude direct judicial review of an agency's compliance with the Order. The provision makes clear the President's intention not to create private rights, an intention that should be controlling here. See Independent Meat Packers Ass'n v. Butz, 526 F.2d 228 (8th Cir. 1975), cert. denied, 424 U.S. 966 (1976) (no judicial enforcement of Executive Order requiring consideration of inflationary impact of regulations, in part because such Order had not been issued pursuant to delegation from Congress); Legal Aid Soc. of Alameda County v. Brennan, 608 F.2d 1319 (9th Cir. 1979) (judicial review available of compliance with an Executive Order that had been ratified by Congress). Even without the provision, compliance with the Order would probably be immunized from review because the Order has not been promulgated pursuant to a specific grant of authority from Congress to the President and thus lacks the "force and effect of law" concerning private parties. See Independent

Meat Packers Ass'n v. Butz, supra; National Renderers Ass'n v. EPA, 541 F.2d 1281, 1291-1292 (8th Cir. 1976); Hiatt Grain Feed, Inc. v. Bergland, 446 F. Supp. 457, 501-502 (D. Kan. 1978). The bar on judicial review of agency compliance with the Order does not, of course, prohibit a court from hearing a constitutional or statutory attack on the legality of the Order itself or of agency action taken pursuant to its requirements.

Because the regulatory impact analysis that will be required by the Order will become part of the agency record for judicial review, courts may consider the RIA in determining whether an agency's action under review is consistent with the governing statutes. This, of course, is true of all matters appearing in the rulemaking record.

V. Conclusion

The proposed Executive Order is acceptable as to form and legality.



Larry L. Simms
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legal Counsel

federal register

**Thursday
February 19, 1981**

Part III

The President

**Executive Order 12291—
Federal Regulation**

Federal Register

Vol. 46, No. 33

Thursday, February 19, 1981

Presidential Documents

Title 3—

Executive Order 12291 of February 17, 1981

The President

Federal Regulation

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, and in order to reduce the burdens of existing and future regulations, increase agency accountability for regulatory actions, provide for presidential oversight of the regulatory process, minimize duplication and conflict of regulations, and insure well-reasoned regulations, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Definitions.* For the purposes of this Order:

(a) "Regulation" or "rule" means an agency statement of general applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the procedure or practice requirements of an agency, but does not include:

(1) Administrative actions governed by the provisions of Sections 556 and 557 of Title 5 of the United States Code;

(2) Regulations issued with respect to a military or foreign affairs function of the United States; or

(3) Regulations related to agency organization, management, or personnel.

(b) "Major rule" means any regulation that is likely to result in:

(1) An annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more;

(2) A major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

(3) Significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

(c) "Director" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(d) "Agency" means any authority of the United States that is an "agency" under 44 U.S.C. 3502(1), excluding those agencies specified in 44 U.S.C. 3502(10).

(e) "Task Force" means the Presidential Task Force on Regulatory Relief.

Sec. 2. *General Requirements.* In promulgating new regulations, reviewing existing regulations, and developing legislative proposals concerning regulation, all agencies, to the extent permitted by law, shall adhere to the following requirements:

(a) Administrative decisions shall be based on adequate information concerning the need for and consequences of proposed government action;

(b) Regulatory action shall not be undertaken unless the potential benefits to society for the regulation outweigh the potential costs to society;

(c) Regulatory objectives shall be chosen to maximize the net benefits to society;

(d) Among alternative approaches to any given regulatory objective, the alternative involving the least net cost to society shall be chosen; and

(e) Agencies shall set regulatory priorities with the aim of maximizing the aggregate net benefits to society, taking into account the condition of the

particular industries affected by regulations, the condition of the national economy, and other regulatory actions contemplated for the future.

Sec. 3. Regulatory Impact Analysis and Review.

(a) In order to implement Section 2 of this Order, each agency shall, in connection with every major rule, prepare, and to the extent permitted by law consider, a Regulatory Impact Analysis. Such Analyses may be combined with any Regulatory Flexibility Analyses performed under 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604.

(b) Each agency shall initially determine whether a rule it intends to propose or to issue is a major rule, *provided that*, the Director, subject to the direction of the Task Force, shall have authority, in accordance with Sections 1(b) and 2 of this Order, to prescribe criteria for making such determinations, to order a rule to be treated as a major rule, and to require any set of related rules to be considered together as a major rule.

(c) Except as provided in Section 8 of this Order, agencies shall prepare Regulatory Impact Analyses of major rules and transmit them, along with all notices of proposed rulemaking and all final rules, to the Director as follows:

(1) If no notice of proposed rulemaking is to be published for a proposed major rule that is not an emergency rule, the agency shall prepare only a final Regulatory Impact Analysis, which shall be transmitted, along with the proposed rule, to the Director at least 60 days prior to the publication of the major rule as a final rule;

(2) With respect to all other major rules, the agency shall prepare a preliminary Regulatory Impact Analysis, which shall be transmitted, along with a notice of proposed rulemaking, to the Director at least 60 days prior to the publication of a notice of proposed rulemaking, and a final Regulatory Impact Analysis, which shall be transmitted along with the final rule at least 30 days prior to the publication of the major rule as a final rule;

(3) For all rules other than major rules, agencies shall submit to the Director, at least 10 days prior to publication, every notice of proposed rulemaking and final rule.

(d) To permit each proposed major rule to be analyzed in light of the requirements stated in Section 2 of this Order, each preliminary and final Regulatory Impact Analysis shall contain the following information:

(1) A description of the potential benefits of the rule, including any beneficial effects that cannot be quantified in monetary terms, and the identification of those likely to receive the benefits;

(2) A description of the potential costs of the rule, including any adverse effects that cannot be quantified in monetary terms, and the identification of those likely to bear the costs;

(3) A determination of the potential net benefits of the rule, including an evaluation of effects that cannot be quantified in monetary terms;

(4) A description of alternative approaches that could substantially achieve the same regulatory goal at lower cost, together with an analysis of this potential benefit and costs and a brief explanation of the legal reasons why such alternatives, if proposed, could not be adopted; and

(5) Unless covered by the description required under paragraph (4) of this subsection, an explanation of any legal reasons why the rule cannot be based on the requirements set forth in Section 2 of this Order.

(e) (1) The Director, subject to the direction of the Task Force, which shall resolve any issues raised under this Order or ensure that they are presented to the President, is authorized to review any preliminary or final Regulatory Impact Analysis, notice of proposed rulemaking, or final rule based on the requirements of this Order.

(2) The Director shall be deemed to have concluded review unless the Director advises an agency to the contrary under subsection (f) of this Section:

(A) Within 60 days of a submission under subsection (c)(1) or a submission of a preliminary Regulatory Impact Analysis or notice of proposed rulemaking under subsection (c)(2);

(B) Within 30 days of the submission of a final Regulatory Impact Analysis and a final rule under subsection (c)(2); and

(C) Within 10 days of the submission of a notice of proposed rulemaking or final rule under subsection (c)(3).

(f) (1) Upon the request of the Director, an agency shall consult with the Director concerning the review of a preliminary Regulatory Impact Analysis or notice of proposed rulemaking under this Order, and shall, subject to Section 8(a)(2) of this Order, refrain from publishing its preliminary Regulatory Impact Analysis or notice of proposed rulemaking until such review is concluded.

(2) Upon receiving notice that the Director intends to submit views with respect to any final Regulatory Impact Analysis or final rule, the agency shall, subject to Section 8(a)(2) of this Order, refrain from publishing its final Regulatory Impact Analysis or final rule until the agency has responded to the Director's views, and incorporated those views and the agency's response in the rulemaking file.

(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as displacing the agencies' responsibilities delegated by law.

(g) For every rule for which an agency publishes a notice of proposed rulemaking, the agency shall include in its notice:

(1) A brief statement setting forth the agency's initial determination whether the proposed rule is a major rule, together with the reasons underlying that determination; and

(2) For each proposed major rule, a brief summary of the agency's preliminary Regulatory Impact Analysis.

(h) Agencies shall make their preliminary and final Regulatory Impact Analyses available to the public.

(i) Agencies shall initiate reviews of currently effective rules in accordance with the purposes of this Order, and perform Regulatory Impact Analyses of currently effective major rules. The Director, subject to the direction of the Task Force, may designate currently effective rules for review in accordance with this Order, and establish schedules for reviews and Analyses under this Order.

Sec. 4. Regulatory Review. Before approving any final major rule, each agency shall:

(a) Make a determination that the regulation is clearly within the authority delegated by law and consistent with congressional intent, and include in the **Federal Register** at the time of promulgation a memorandum of law supporting that determination.

(b) Make a determination that the factual conclusions upon which the rule is based have substantial support in the agency record, viewed as a whole, with full attention to public comments in general and the comments of persons directly affected by the rule in particular.

Sec. 5. Regulatory Agendas.

(a) Each agency shall publish, in October and April of each year, an agenda of proposed regulations that the agency has issued or expects to issue, and currently effective rules that are under agency review pursuant to this Order. These agendas may be incorporated with the agendas published under 5 U.S.C. 602, and must contain at the minimum:

(1) A summary of the nature of each major rule being considered, the objectives and legal basis for the issuance of the rule, and an approximate

schedule for completing action on any major rule for which the agency has issued a notice of proposed rulemaking;

(2) The name and telephone number of a knowledgeable agency official for each item on the agenda; and

(3) A list of existing regulations to be reviewed under the terms of this Order, and a brief discussion of each such regulation.

(b) The Director, subject to the direction of the Task Force, may, to the extent permitted by law:

(1) Require agencies to provide additional information in an agenda; and

(2) Require publication of the agenda in any form.

Sec. 6. *The Task Force and Office of Management and Budget.*

(a) To the extent permitted by law, the Director shall have authority, subject to the direction of the Task Force, to:

(1) Designate any proposed or existing rule as a major rule in accordance with Section 1(b) of this Order;

(2) Prepare and promulgate uniform standards for the identification of major rules and the development of Regulatory Impact Analyses;

(3) Require an agency to obtain and evaluate, in connection with a regulation, any additional relevant data from any appropriate source;

(4) Waive the requirements of Sections 3, 4, or 7 of this Order with respect to any proposed or existing major rule;

(5) Identify duplicative, overlapping and conflicting rules, existing or proposed, and existing or proposed rules that are inconsistent with the policies underlying statutes governing agencies other than the issuing agency or with the purposes of this Order, and, in each such case, require appropriate interagency consultation to minimize or eliminate such duplication, overlap, or conflict;

(6) Develop procedures for estimating the annual benefits and costs of agency regulations, on both an aggregate and economic or industrial sector basis, for purposes of compiling a regulatory budget;

(7) In consultation with interested agencies, prepare for consideration by the President recommendations for changes in the agencies' statutes; and

(8) Monitor agency compliance with the requirements of this Order and advise the President with respect to such compliance.

(b) The Director, subject to the direction of the Task Force, is authorized to establish procedures for the performance of all functions vested in the Director by this Order. The Director shall take appropriate steps to coordinate the implementation of the analysis, transmittal, review, and clearance provisions of this Order with the authorities and requirements provided for or imposed upon the Director and agencies under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*, and the Paperwork Reduction Plan Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

Sec. 7. *Pending Regulations.*

(a) To the extent necessary to permit reconsideration in accordance with this Order, agencies shall, except as provided in Section 8 of this Order, suspend or postpone the effective dates of all major rules that they have promulgated in final form as of the date of this Order, but that have not yet become effective, excluding:

(1) Major rules that cannot legally be postponed or suspended;

(2) Major rules that, for good cause, ought to become effective as final rules without reconsideration. Agencies shall prepare, in accordance with Section 3 of this Order, a final Regulatory Impact Analysis for each major rule that they suspend or postpone.

(b) Agencies shall report to the Director no later than 15 days prior to the effective date of any rule that the agency has promulgated in final form as of the date of this Order, and that has not yet become effective, and that will not be reconsidered under subsection (a) of this Section:

(1) That the rule is excepted from reconsideration under subsection (a), including a brief statement of the legal or other reasons for that determination; or

(2) That the rule is not a major rule.

(c) The Director, subject to the direction of the Task Force, is authorized, to the extent permitted by law, to:

(1) Require reconsideration, in accordance with this Order, of any major rule that an agency has issued in final form as of the date of this Order and that has not become effective; and

(2) Designate a rule that an agency has issued in final form as of the date of this Order and that has not yet become effective as a major rule in accordance with Section 1(b) of this Order.

(d) Agencies may, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable statutes, permit major rules that they have issued in final form as of the date of this Order, and that have not yet become effective, to take effect as interim rules while they are being reconsidered in accordance with this Order, *provided that*, agencies shall report to the Director, no later than 15 days before any such rule is proposed to take effect as an interim rule, that the rule should appropriately take effect as an interim rule while the rule is under reconsideration.

(e) Except as provided in Section 8 of this Order, agencies shall, to the extent permitted by law, refrain from promulgating as a final rule any proposed major rule that has been published or issued as of the date of this Order until a final Regulatory Impact Analysis, in accordance with Section 3 of this Order, has been prepared for the proposed major rule.

(f) Agencies shall report to the Director, no later than 30 days prior to promulgating as a final rule any proposed rule that the agency has published or issued as of the date of this Order and that has not been considered under the terms of this Order:

(1) That the rule cannot legally be considered in accordance with this Order, together with a brief explanation of the legal reasons barring such consideration; or

(2) That the rule is not a major rule, in which case the agency shall submit to the Director a copy of the proposed rule.

(g) The Director, subject to the direction of the Task Force, is authorized, to the extent permitted by law, to:

(1) Require consideration, in accordance with this Order, of any proposed major rule that the agency has published or issued as of the date of this Order; and

(2) Designate a proposed rule that an agency has published or issued as of the date of this Order, as a major rule in accordance with Section 1(b) of this Order.

(h) The Director shall be deemed to have determined that an agency's report to the Director under subsections (b), (d), or (f) of this Section is consistent with the purposes of this Order, unless the Director advises the agency to the contrary:

(1) Within 15 days of its report, in the case of any report under subsections (b) or (d); or

(2) Within 30 days of its report, in the case of any report under subsection (f).

(i) This Section does not supersede the President's Memorandum of January 29, 1981, entitled "Postponement of Pending Regulations", which shall remain in effect until March 30, 1981.

(j) In complying with this Section, agencies shall comply with all applicable provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, and with any other procedural requirements made applicable to the agencies by other statutes.

Sec. 8. Exemptions.

(a) The procedures prescribed by this Order shall not apply to:


(1) Any regulation that responds to an emergency situation, *provided that*, any such regulation shall be reported to the Director as soon as is practicable, the agency shall publish in the **Federal Register** a statement of the reasons why it is impracticable for the agency to follow the procedures of this Order with respect to such a rule, and the agency shall prepare and transmit as soon as is practicable a Regulatory Impact Analysis of any such major rule; and

(2) Any regulation for which consideration or reconsideration under the terms of this Order would conflict with deadlines imposed by statute or by judicial order, *provided that*, any such regulation shall be reported to the Director together with a brief explanation of the conflict, the agency shall publish in the **Federal Register** a statement of the reasons why it is impracticable for the agency to follow the procedures of this Order with respect to such a rule, and the agency, in consultation with the Director, shall adhere to the requirements of this Order to the extent permitted by statutory or judicial deadlines.

(b) The Director, subject to the direction of the Task Force, may, in accordance with the purposes of this Order, exempt any class or category of regulations from any or all requirements of this Order.

Sec. 9. Judicial Review. This Order is intended only to improve the internal management of the Federal government, and is not intended to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers or any person. The determinations made by agencies under Section 4 of this Order, and any Regulatory Impact Analyses for any rule, shall be made part of the whole record of agency action in connection with the rule.

Sec. 10. Revocations. Executive Orders No. 12044, as amended, and No. 12174 are revoked.



THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 17, 1981.

[FR Doc. 81-5790
Filed 2-17-81; 3:19 pm]
Billing code: 3195-01-M

Federal Register

**Tuesday
January 8, 1985**

Part III

The President

**Executive Order 12498—Regulatory
Planning Process**

1036

Federal Register

Vol. 50, No. 5

Tuesday, January 8, 1985

Presidential Documents

Title 3—

Executive Order 12498 of January 4, 1985

The President

Regulatory Planning Process

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, and in order to create a coordinated process for developing on an annual basis the Administration's Regulatory Program, establish Administration regulatory priorities, increase the accountability of agency heads for the regulatory actions of their agencies, provide for Presidential oversight of the regulatory process, reduce the burdens of existing and future regulations, minimize duplication and conflict of regulations, and enhance public and Congressional understanding of the Administration's regulatory objectives, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. General Requirements. (a) There is hereby established a regulatory planning process by which the Administration will develop and publish a Regulatory Program for each year. To implement this process, each Executive agency subject to Executive Order No. 12291 shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) each year, starting in 1985, a statement of its regulatory policies, goals, and objectives for the coming year and information concerning all significant regulatory actions underway or planned; however, the Director may exempt from this Order such agencies or activities as the Director may deem appropriate in order to achieve the effective implementation of this Order.

(b) The head of each Executive agency subject to this Order shall ensure that all regulatory actions are consistent with the goals of the agency and of the Administration, and will be appropriately implemented.

(c) This program is intended to complement the existing regulatory planning and review procedures of agencies and the Executive branch, including the procedures established by Executive Order No. 12291.

(d) To assure consistency with the goals of the Administration, the head of each agency subject to this Order shall adhere to the regulatory principles stated in Section 2 of Executive Order No. 12291, including those elaborated by the regulatory policy guidelines set forth in the August 11, 1983, Report of the Presidential Task Force on Regulatory Relief, "Reagan Administration Regulatory Achievements."

Sec. 2. Agency Submission of Draft Regulatory Program. (a) The head of each agency shall submit to the Director an overview of the agency's regulatory policies, goals, and objectives for the program year and such information concerning all significant regulatory actions of the agency, planned or underway, including actions taken to consider whether to initiate rulemaking; requests for public comment; and the development of documents that may influence, anticipate, or could lead to the commencement of rulemaking proceedings at a later date, as the Director deems necessary to develop the Administration's Regulatory Program. This submission shall constitute the agency's draft regulatory program. The draft regulatory program shall be submitted to the Director each year, on a date to be specified by the Director, and shall cover the period from April 1 through March 31 of the following year

(b) The overview portion of the agency's submission should discuss the agency's broad regulatory purposes, explain how they are consistent with the Administration's regulatory principles, and include a discussion of the significant regulatory actions, as defined by the Director, that it will take. The overview should specifically discuss the significant regulatory actions of the agency to revise or rescind existing rules.

(c) Each agency head shall categorize and describe the regulatory actions described in subsection (a) in such format as the Director shall specify and provide such additional information as the Director may request; however, the Director shall, by Bulletin or Circular, exempt from the requirements of this Order any class or category of regulatory action that the Director determines is not necessary to review in order to achieve the effective implementation of the program.

Sec. 3. Review, Compilation, and Publication of the Administration's Regulatory Program. (a) In reviewing each agency's draft regulatory program, the Director shall (i) consider the consistency of the draft regulatory program with the Administration's policies and priorities and the draft regulatory programs submitted by other agencies; and (ii) identify such further regulatory or deregulatory actions as may, in his view, be necessary in order to achieve such consistency. In the event of disagreement over the content of the agency's draft regulatory program, the agency head or the Director may raise issues for further review by the President or by such appropriate Cabinet Council or other forum as the President may designate.

(b) Following the conclusion of the review process established by subsection (a), each agency head shall submit to the Director, by a date to be specified by the Director, the agency's final regulatory plan for compilation and publication as the Administration's Regulatory Program for that year. The Director shall circulate a draft of the Administration's Regulatory Program for agency comment, review, and interagency consideration, if necessary, before publication.

(c) After development of the Administration's Regulatory Program for the year, if the agency head proposes to take a regulatory action subject to the provisions of Section 2 and not previously submitted for review under this process, or if the agency head proposes to take a regulatory action that is materially different from the action described in the agency's final Regulatory Program, the agency head shall immediately advise the Director and submit the action to the Director for review in such format as the Director may specify. Except in the case of emergency situations, as defined by the Director, or statutory or judicial deadlines, the agency head shall refrain from taking the proposed regulatory action until the review of this submission by the Director is completed. As to those regulatory actions not also subject to Executive Order No. 12291, the Director shall be deemed to have concluded that the proposal is consistent with the purposes of this Order, unless he notifies the agency head to the contrary within 10 days of its submission. As to those regulatory actions subject to Executive Order No. 12291, the Director's review shall be governed by the provisions of Section 3(e) of that Order.


(d) Absent unusual circumstances, such as new statutory or judicial requirements or unanticipated emergency situations, the Director may, to the extent permitted by law, return for reconsideration any rule submitted for review under Executive Order No. 12291 that would be subject to Section 2 but was not included in the agency's final Regulatory Program for that year; or any other significant regulatory action that is materially different from those described in the Administration's Regulatory Program for that year.

1038

Federal Register / Vol. 50, No. 5 / Tuesday, January 8, 1985 / Presidential Documents

Sec. 4. *Office of Management and Budget.* The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is authorized, to the extent permitted by law, to take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Order.

Sec. 5. *Judicial Review.* This Order is intended only to improve the internal management of the Federal government, and is not intended to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers or any person.



THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 4, 1985.

[FR Doc. 85-625

Filed 1-4-85; 4:06 pm]

Billing code 3198-01-M

Editorial note: The President's memorandum of Jan. 4, 1985, for the heads of executive departments and agencies on the development of the administration's regulatory program is printed in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* (vol. 21, no. 1).



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

MAY 30, 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR OIRA STAFF

FROM: Robert P. Bedell *RPB*
SUBJECT: OIRA Procedures #3

The purpose of this memorandum is to remind you of the policies of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Executive Order No. 12291, and Executive Order No. 12498, with respect to:

- o records maintenance;
- o public access to records; and
- o meetings with the public.

These policies are intended to ensure that our responsibilities are discharged as efficiently and openly as practicable, consistent with both the law and the need for confidential communications between the President and his executive officers. Because OIRA's role in implementing the Paperwork Reduction Act is very different from its role in implementing Executive Order No. 12291 and Executive Order No. 12498, different procedures are necessary for our actions under each of these three programs. The differences derive primarily from the different authorities involved. The rules for Executive Order No. 12291 reviews will be applied to the Executive Order No. 12498 process to the extent they are relevant in that context.

BACKGROUND

OIRA'S Role Under the Paperwork Reduction Act. In summary, the Paperwork Reduction Act requires OMB to review and approve or disapprove agency requests for information from the public. In this regard, the Paperwork Reduction Act essentially recodified the clearance authority that was originally assigned to OMB (actually the old Bureau of the Budget) by the Federal Reports Act of 1942.

OMB is responsible for determining whether agency information collection requirements meet the standards of the Act. Reviews under the Act determine whether the proposed information collection request is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions, including whether the information has "practical utility," whether it is too burdensome on respondents, and whether there is a need for the information. As a result, our actions may have legal, judicially reviewable consequences and must be based

upon a complete record. The Act and our implementing rule specify the procedures that OIRA must follow. The bottom line is that we are responsible for ensuring that the record is complete and constitutes a justifiable basis for our decision, and that we adhere to the required procedures in developing the record and making our decision.

OIRA'S Role under E.O. 12291 and E.O. 12498. In contrast, our review under Executive Orders No. 12291 and No. 12498 derives from the President's constitutional authority over, and responsibility for actions taken by, his executive officers in carrying out the law. He has delegated his authority to review regulations to the Director of OMB. Thus, we conduct our reviews on behalf of the Director and the President.

In conducting an Executive Order review, OMB does not make final regulatory decisions--those are assigned by law to the heads of the respective agencies and must in all cases remain the regulatory agency's responsibility. The decision is made by the regulatory agency and the agency is accountable for both the adequacy of the record of its rulemaking and for justifying the substantive validity of the decision under the applicable statutes. We review the draft regulations of departments and agencies and advise whether the draft rules and their analysis meet the President's regulatory principles, as set forth in Executive Orders No. 12291 (Section 2) and No. 12498 (Section 1). As the Executive Orders note, our review is not intended to provide any third party with any procedural or substantive right concerning the regulations.

Since some regulations contain collections of information from the public, they are subject to our review and approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act as well as under Executive Order No. 12291.

THE DECISIONMAKING RECORD

The law generally requires that agencies must compile a record of materials that justify their rulemaking actions and that will serve as a basis for judicial review. The regulatory agency is also required under the Administrative Procedure Act to provide a concise general explanation for any regulations adopted by informal rulemaking and to explain, for example, significant substantive differences between an NPRM and a final rule, including new facts or data that the agency has relied upon.

For most rulemakings the law requires only that public comments on a proposed rule and certain underlying scientific and empirical data be included with a text of the notice of proposed rulemaking and a final rule in the rulemaking record. The agency may, and usually does, include in a preamble to a rule other material in the record that is significant and relevant to the rulemaking. But the rule must be based upon and justified by the whole rulemaking record. Factual material that is not in the rulemaking record may not be used as a basis for supporting a rule.

For paperwork reviews, OIRA is the decisionmaking agency; we open and maintain that record. Our decision to approve or disapprove is based upon this record and must be justified by it. The record we compile is the material that may be reviewed as the law provides by the courts.

For reviews of regulations under Executive Orders No. 12291 and No. 12498, the agency is the decisionmaker; for judicial review, its rulemaking file, not factual material available to us, is the relevant material. In accordance with the Director's Memorandum of June 11, 1981, (attached) we make available materials we receive from the public to the regulatory agency so it may consider such material and include it in its records if it chooses to do so.

When we conduct reviews and give advice under the Executive Orders, we and the agencies treat our discussions in the same way we handle such consultation on other subjects -- they are not generally disclosed. We will, however, make available upon request to the public all written information that we receive from any member of the public that we consider in our review, our final recommendation letter (if any) to the agency under E.O. 12291, and, of course, any material we submit for inclusion in an agency rulemaking record.

The following additional policies should be used as guidance in implementing our responsibilities under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 and Executive Orders No. 12291 and No. 12498.

RECORDS MAINTENANCE

Each OIRA supervisor is responsible for ensuring that the relevant documents are placed in the proper files on matters under their supervision.

Any supervisor (including the Administrator and Deputy Administrator) who receives written comments directly from a member of the public will promptly send a copy of the comments to the appropriate Desk Officer.

Any comments that would otherwise be included in the public record but for which the commentor proposes to limit public access should not be accepted without the approval of the Deputy Administrator. Jim MacRae is responsible for periodic review and disposition of all files for the purpose of retention, storage, or destruction, in accordance with the policies set forth below. Except in unusual circumstances, all documents that are not required by law to be retained should be disposed of when the documents that are required to be retained are transferred to the Federal Records Center.

o Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980

-- Because the written materials in our dockets are the documentary basis for our paperwork decisions and also

constitute a basis for the public to review and comment to us on the proposed agency action, paperwork clearance dockets must be kept accurate, timely, and complete. To that end, Desk Officers should place in the docket, promptly after its receipt at OMB, any material that should be in the record.

-- The record should include the following material:

- Agency proposal and any revisions;
- OMB worksheet;
- All written comments from the public and other government agencies;
- Evidence of final OMB action.

-- After final action (approval or disapproval), the record should be retained in the reading room for at least 6 months. At least twice a year the Reports Management staff will review the files and send to the Federal Records Center all records for which final action has been completed for at least six months. The records will be classified as "temporary" for the Federal Records Center.

o Executive Order No. 12291

-- Because the head of the regulatory agency, not OMB, is the decisionmaker on all rulemaking issues that come to us under E.O. 12291, we will routinely make available to the appropriate regulatory agency copies of all written materials that we receive from members of the public during the rulemaking proceeding and that are relevant to a particular informal rulemaking.

-- The Desk Officer should also send to the public reading file within three days after receipt a copy of any such comments received from members of the public.

-- The Desk Officer should send a copy of the final OMB written recommendation to the agency (if any) to the public reading file within three days after transmittal to the agency.

-- The following material will not be made public, but, in addition to the final written OMB recommendations/views to the agency (if any), will be retained as part of the regulatory files:

- draft and proposed agency materials;
- OMB worksheets; and
- internal OMB and interagency documents as described by 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(5).

-- After completion of the OIRA review, the regulatory files should be retained for at least six months. At least twice a year, the Reports Management staff, assisted by the other Branches, will review the files and segregate all files for which the reviews have been completed for at least six months. All files of rules that were "consistent, with no change" will be sent to the Federal Records Center. All other files will be retained within the NEOB for one year, then sent to the Federal Records Center. All files sent to the Federal Records Center will be classified as "temporary."

PUBLIC ACCESS TO OUR DOCKETS AND RECORDS

FOIA requests should be handled in accordance with OMB FOIA procedures. In addition, we have customarily made our paperwork dockets and written information from the public available for inspection.

Notwithstanding the increased Secret Service security precautions in the New Executive Office Building, we must continue to make access to our public records as simple as possible. All clearances should be arranged through Jim MacRae's office, ext. 6880.

To avoid confusion and misunderstanding, visitors should be told at the time clearance is sought that their clearance is limited to the public reading room. If the individual who has been cleared does not arrive at the reading room shortly after their scheduled clearance time, Jim MacRae should be notified. Jim will alert the Secret Service, which will take appropriate action. We cannot permit individuals who are cleared into the building for the reading room to roam through the building.

o Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980

-- Current and recent records of paperwork clearance actions will be maintained in such a way as to be readily accessible to members of the public (with exceptions as provided in 5 CFR 1320.18). These files, which are the complete and official record for clearance purposes, will be kept in NEOB 3201, the reading room. They will be accessible to the public during normal business hours--9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

o Executive Orders No. 12291 and No. 12498

-- We will maintain two type of documents in our public files relating to regulatory reviews -- all comments received from any member of the public, and all our final recommendation letters to agencies under Executive Order No. 12291. These files will also be accessible to the public in the reading room during normal business hours.

MEETINGS WITH MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (including telephone contacts)o Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980

- Any desk officer or supervisor may meet with members of the public to discuss and receive data and facts that are relevant to a paperwork clearance decision.
- Consistent with the policies of this memorandum and available time, OIRA staff must be equally accessible to all members of the public.
- In making our paperwork decision, we will consider only information that we receive in writing. The OIRA staff should make this policy clear during any conversation with members of the public, and should advise them to submit their comments in writing to both OMB and the agency concerned.
- OIRA staff may provide the public with information regarding the status of our paperwork decisionmaking process and the material and factual basis of our review, but should refrain from discussing their views of the issues or speculating on the outcome of the review.
- If an information collection requirement is contained in a proposed rule, any discussion with members of the public must be limited exclusively to the information collection request.
- Other procedures concerning paperwork reviews are set forth in 5 CFR 1320 and the Act itself.

o Executive Orders No. 12291 and No. 12498

- Inquiries from persons outside of the executive branch about regulatory matters under Executive Orders No. 12291 and No. 12498 shall be referred to the Deputy Administrator's Office or the appropriate agency.
- Consistent with the policies of this memorandum and available time the Administrator and Deputy Administrator will be accessible to all members of the public.
- No one within OIRA except the Administrator or Deputy Administrator will meet or talk with members of the public on Executive Orders No. 12291 and No. 12498 matters, unless specifically authorized by the Administrator or Deputy Administrator.
- Members of the public should be advised to submit their comments in writing to the appropriate agency if they wish to submit them to OMB, as provided in the Director's letter of June 11, 1981. They should also be advised that any materials submitted to us will be made part of the public file and made available to the appropriate agency.

Attachment



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON DC 20503
June 11, 1981

M-81-9

MEMORANDUM FOR HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

FROM: DAVID A. STOCKMAN *ADS*
DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: Certain Communications Pursuant to
Executive Order 12291, "Federal Regulation."

Regulatory relief is one of the cornerstones of President Reagan's program of economic recovery. As an important step in achieving regulatory relief, on February 17, 1981, the President issued Executive Order 12291, "Federal Regulation." This memorandum explains how the Presidential Task Force on Regulatory Relief and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) will communicate with the public and the agencies regarding proposed regulations covered by E.O. 12291. It also describes certain obligations of the public and agencies in this regard.

A major purpose of the Executive Order is to ensure that, to the extent permitted by law, regulatory decisions are based upon sound analysis of the potential consequences. Toward this end, a comprehensive factual basis is essential to assist agencies and other interested parties in assessing the economic and other ramifications of proposed regulations.

Under the Executive Order, both the Task Force and OMB will be reviewing factual materials related to regulatory proposals. Both the public and the agencies should understand that the primary forum for receiving factual communications regarding proposed rules is the agency issuing the proposal, not the Task Force or OMB. Factual materials that are sent to the Task Force or OMB regarding proposed regulations should indicate that they have also been sent to the relevant agency. Pursuant to this policy, the Task Force and OMB will regularly advise those members of the public with whom they communicate that relevant factual materials submitted to them should also be sent to the agency for inclusion in the rulemaking record. Accordingly, agencies receiving such materials from the public should take care to see that they are placed in the record.

On occasion, the Task Force staff and OMB will receive or develop factual material which they believe should be considered by an agency during a particular informal rulemaking. In accordance with advice provided by the Department of Justice, such material, when submitted to an agency for its consideration, will be identified as material appropriate for the whole record of the agency rulemaking.

Two additional matters should be noted. First, our procedures will be consistent with the holding of and policies discussed in Sierra Club v. Costle, No. 79-1565, slip op. at 212-20 (D.C. Cir. April 29, 1981). Second, these procedures apply only to informal rulemaking proceedings and are not in any sense intended to affect the more stringent ex parte rules applicable to agency adjudications and formal rulemaking. (Such proceedings are expressly intended by Congress to be more in the nature of formal judicial proceedings and involve bars against various forms of ex parte communication.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

MAY 31 1985

Mr. A. James Barnes
Deputy Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Dear Jim:

In recent discussions, you have asked us to review our present practices to ensure that factual information pertaining to EPA's rulemaking activities that is made available to us by members of the public is also made available to EPA in a timely manner.

We have reviewed our procedures and we believe that our general policies and practices under Executive Order No. 12291 are sound. However, in response to your request, we would propose certain additional procedures, beyond our existing policies and practices, which, if they are acceptable to you, we would be willing to undertake on an experimental basis.

Background

Our existing procedures implement guidance provided to us by the Attorney General in an opinion of April 24, 1981, entitled "Contacts between OMB and Executive Branch Agencies Pursuant to Executive Order 12291." It complements an earlier analysis by the Attorney General of the legal basis of the Executive Order (Memorandum re: Proposed Executive Order entitled "Federal Regulation," dated February 13, 1981). Both opinions of the Attorney General are enclosed (Tabs A and B).

The earliest of these two opinions of the Attorney General concluded that Executive Order No. 12291, which established the regulatory review process administered by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs was a lawful exercise of the President's Constitutional authority--

"to 'supervise and guide' Executive Officers in 'their construction of the statutes under which they act in order to secure that unitary and uniform execution of the laws which Article II of the Constitution evidently contemplated in vesting general executive power in the President alone' Myers v. United States, 272 U.S. 52, 135 (1926)."

The second opinion of the Attorney General of April 24, 1981, concluded, in part that:

- The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, to which the authority of the Director of OMB under Executive Order No. 12291 has been delegated, "may freely contact agencies regarding the substance of proposed regulations, and may do so by way of telephone calls, meetings, or other forms of communication unavailable to members of the public."
- "[D]isclosure obligations, if any, lie with the rulemaking agency and not with [OIRA]."
- "[OIRA] is therefore under no legal disability with respect to contact with rulemaking agencies. At most, [OIRA] could adopt procedures as a matter of policy to assist the agencies in complying with our recommendation or with rules fashioned by the agencies themselves...." (p. 4).

This opinion, written before the seminal decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in Sierra Club v. Costle, 657 F.2d 298 (1981), concluded that the judicial decisions issued until that time were "confused" as to whether an agency must include in its rulemaking record for judicial review factual information received by the agency from officials of the Executive Office of the President (EOP). The Attorney General therefore recommended that agencies include such factual information in their records in order to avoid the possibility of judicial reversal. The Attorney General did not, however, require or recommend inclusion of communications under the Executive Order that form part of the agency's deliberative process, i.e., legal and policy arguments, analyses of the facts, and factual data that cannot reasonably be segregated from deliberative material.

To implement the recommendations of the Attorney General, OMB Director David A. Stockman issued a Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies on June 11, 1981, entitled "Certain Communications Pursuant to Executive Order No. 12291, 'Federal Regulation.'" (Tab C). That Memorandum emphasized "that the primary forum for receiving factual communications regarding proposed rules is the agency issuing the proposal, not the Task Force or OMB."

This emphasis on the agency as the forum for receiving factual communications merely reflects, of course, the fact that the Executive Order does not divest an agency head of authority provided by law or the legal requirement that agency rules must be based upon the rulemaking record.

Since these procedures were implemented, the court's decision in Sierra Club has clearly established the propriety of contacts between EOP officials and agencies concerning rulemaking-- indeed, it has demonstrated their importance for proper policy

guidance of this critical aspect of government activity--and demonstrated that the procedures recommended by the Attorney General and implemented by the Director's Memorandum go well beyond what is required by law.

Written Materials from Persons Outside the Executive Branch

The Director's Memorandum provided that:

- Factual materials that are sent to the Presidential Task Force on Regulatory Relief or OIRA regarding proposed regulations should indicate that they have also been sent to the relevant agency. Pursuant to this policy, the Memorandum noted that the Task Force and OIRA would regularly advise those members of the public with whom they communicated that relevant factual materials submitted to them should also be sent to the agency for inclusion in the rulemaking record.
- Accordingly, agencies receiving such materials from the public should take care to see that they are placed in the record.
- On occasion, the Task Force staff and OIRA would receive or develop factual material that they believed should be considered by an agency during a particular informal rulemaking. The Memorandum provided that, in accordance with advice provided by the Department of Justice, such material, when submitted to an agency for its consideration, would be identified as material appropriate for inclusion in the record of the agency rulemaking.

To further implement the recommendations of the Attorney General, OIRA established additional procedures, as a matter of policy, beyond the requirements of law and the recommendations of the Attorney General. Thus, we have uniformly and consistently made available to Members of Congress, the agencies, and the public copies of documents concerning an agency rulemaking that we have received from persons who are not officials or employees of the executive branch. We also strive to maintain copies of all such documents in our materials that are available for public review.

In addition to such materials being lodged in our public files and copies being made available upon request, you have asked whether copies of such documents that pertain to EPA rules could be routinely sent to EPA to help ensure that such materials are included, if appropriate, in EPA rulemaking dockets. In order to accommodate you, we will send to the General Counsel of EPA copies of all such documents that we receive from persons outside the executive branch. We will seek to provide these copies within five working days of their receipt in OIRA.

Non-written Communications with Persons Outside the Executive Branch

As you know, our practice with regard to non-written communications with persons outside the Federal Government, e.g., telephone calls and meetings, is to constrain communications that pertain to proposed agency rules. Only the Administrator and I (or OIRA employees specifically authorized by us in unusual circumstances) are authorized to communicate with persons outside the Federal Government on the substance (as opposed to the status) of rules that are subject to review under Executive Order No. 12291. These restrictions also apply to our review of rulemaking activities pursuant to Executive Order No. 12498. These restrictions do not apply to the other functions and activities of OIRA, such as our review of information collection requests under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, even if an information collection request is contained in a proposed rule. In this latter circumstance, different procedures apply. See 5 CFR Part 1320 (Tab D) and OIRA Procedures Memorandum #3 (Tab E). The limitations noted above do, however, apply to the parts of a rule that do not contain an information collection request.

Obviously, senior officials in OIRA must be able to communicate freely with members of the public and persons within the Federal Government, just as the senior officials in EPA do.¹ We have, however, limited such communications essentially to the Administrator and Deputy Administrator. Furthermore, even Doug and I usually do not communicate with persons outside the Federal Government on proposed agency rules while they are under review pursuant to Executive Order No. 12291.

Notwithstanding these procedures applicable to all rules subject to the Order, you have asked whether specific additional procedures could be fashioned to apprise EPA of factual information that becomes available to us as a result of non-written communications with persons outside the Federal Government and that pertain to proposed EPA rules. Before describing what we believe is appropriate, it is useful first to deal with an approach we have rejected and the reasons why.

¹As the court stated in Sierra Club v. Costle, "Under our system of government, the very legitimacy of general policymaking performed by unelected administrators depends in no small part upon the openness, accessibility, and amenability of these officials to the needs and ideas of the public from whom their ultimate authority derives, and upon whom their commands must fall....Furthermore, the importance to effective regulation of continuing contact with a regulated industry, other affected groups, and the public cannot be underestimated. Informal contacts may enable the agency to win needed support for its program, reduce future enforcement requirements by helping those regulated to anticipate and shape their plans for the future, and spur the provision of information which the agency needs." 657 F.2d 298,400-1 (1981)

"Logging"

Although you have not suggested it, we believe that a general "logging" program or some variant thereof, particularly between and within executive agencies and entities, would not be an acceptable solution and would, as a general matter, be bad policy. The Attorney General's opinion of April 24, 1981, confirms this at pages 7-9 (Tab A). This view is also reflected in Sierra Club v. Costle, 657 F.2d 298, 404-408 (1981); prior congressional consideration of the issue (see pp 3-4, Tab A); and, EPA's own stated position on the matter (Tab F).

In a nutshell, here is why we think a general "logging" system is a bad idea.

- o It is unnecessary. There would be no adverse legal consequence even if we were to have information that is not in the agency record. An agency rule must be based on material in the record. Since EPA cannot rely on information it does not have to support a rule, see 657 F.2d 401, factual information that might be available to us from persons outside the Federal Government, that is not also made available to EPA, is not pertinent. Furthermore, an agency has no use for who-talked-to-whom entries.
- o Imposition of a logging requirement would improperly interfere with the communication of policy views within the executive branch and the deliberative process itself. The court in Sierra Club rejected this approach. This was also a basis for Congress' rejection of the proposal to apply "ex parte" requirements to informal rulemaking. See pages 3 and 4 of Tab A, particularly footnotes 5-8.
- o It is contrary to the "legislative model" of informal rulemaking² adopted by the Congress.
- o It would divert attention from whether the agency's decision is a good one--the substantive issue--to how the agency made the decision.

²Where agency action resembles judicial action, where it involves formal rulemaking, adjudication, or quasi-adjudication among "conflicting private claims to a valuable privilege," the insulation of the decisionmaker from ex parte contacts is justified by basic notions of due process. But where agency action involves informal rulemaking of a policymaking sort, the concept of ex parte contacts is of more questionable utility.

- o It would establish a paperwork blizzard if all participants in all discussions were required to "log" all communications on the thousands of rules considered every year. This would be nothing short of a bureaucratic nightmare to administer.
- o A "logging requirement" would be impossible to "define." When would it begin? Who would it cover? When would it end? What would it consist of? There are neither practical nor principled answers to these questions.
- o Such a procedure would logically require the agency to log all of its internal deliberative discussions also--a practical impossibility.

Additional Procedures

Nonetheless, in order to increase the amount of factual information that is available to EPA for its rulemaking decisions, and to respond to your request, we propose the following procedure which, if acceptable to you, we would try for a period of time and then reassess with you.

Whenever the Administrator or I have a meeting or a telephone call with a person outside of the executive branch concerning a proposed EPA rule subject to Executive Order No. 12291, and that meeting or telephone call provides factual information that we are not confident has also been provided to EPA, either the Administrator or I will call the General Counsel of EPA and advise him of the communication and of the relevant factual information. EPA can then do whatever it deems appropriate with regard to the information reported to the General Counsel. Furthermore, with respect to scheduled meetings, if any, we will try for a period of time and for a few rulemakings to provide an opportunity for senior officials of EPA to attend and participate, if they choose to do so. After some experience, we will reassess this procedure, as well.

Please let me know if you believe that we should initiate these procedures.

Sincerely,



Robert P. Bedell
Deputy Administrator
Office of Information and
Regulatory Affairs

Enclosures