# Panel 18: Congressional Interest in Benefit-Cost Analysis

- Congressional Interest in Benefit-Cost Analysis
  - Heidi R. King, Chief Economist, Energy and Commerce Committee, U.S. House of Representatives
- BCA in Financial Regulation: An Idea That's Not Too Big to Fail
  - Raymond Squitieri, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency,
     U.S. Treasury Department
- Alternative Ways to Organize an Effective Congressional Regulatory Review and Analysis Function
  - Richard B. Belzer, President, Regulatory Checkbook and Managing Editor, Neutral Source
- Is there a Role for the Judiciary to Improve Regulatory Analysis?
  - Patrick J. McCormick III, Republican Special Counsel, Energy and Commerce Committee, U.S. Senate





Richard B. Belzer
Regulatory Checkbook
Mount Vernon, VA
Belzer@RegulatoryCheckbook.Org



#### **Problem Definition**

- Process
  - Opacity
  - Excess agency deference
  - OMB 'ineffectiveness'
- Analysis
  - Absence of BCA
  - Doubts about trustworthiness
  - OMB 'ineffectiveness'
- Outcomes
  - High net social costs
  - Straying from statutory intent
  - OMB 'ineffectiveness'

#### **Presumptive Solution**

- Process
  - Transparency, reproducibility
  - Broader judicial review
  - Codify EO procedures
- Analysis
  - Codify positive BCA mandate
  - Better validation
  - Establish Congressional review
- Outcomes
  - Codify normative BCA mandate
  - Clearer statutory justification
  - Require congressional approval

### **Problems? Solutions!**

# Congressional Office of Regulatory Analysis ('CORA') as Archetype

- Alternative intensities
  - Enhanced GAO model
  - Enhanced CRS model
  - CBO models
- Margins of interest
  - What?
  - When?
  - Quality standards?
  - Then what?
- Unaddressed limitations



### What Would Be Produced?

Enhanced GAO	Enhanced CRS	CBO 1	CBO 2					
Report agency estir	nates plus alternativ	e estimates included	I in IQA petitions					
Review selected BCAs								
		<u>Prepare</u> alternative BCAs for <u>some</u> major rules						
			Prepare alternative BCAs for many major rules					
			Prepare BCAs for some proposed legislation					



### What Value Would It Have?

Enhanced GAO	Enhanced CRS	CBO 1	CBO 2					
Better inform Congressional Review Act debates								
Provide QA/QC of some BCAs								
		Compete with some agency BCAs						
			Compete with many agency BCAs					
			Provide sole BCA for some legislation					



# Quality/Analytic Standards?

Enhanced GAO	Enhanced CRS	CBO 1	CBO 2				
<u>Must rely on</u> Information Quality Act principles (transparency, reproducibility, objectivity, integrity, utility)							
	Must rely on external BCA authorities (e.g., SBCA); or						
	Risk conflicts with OMB Circular A-4 and/or agency BCA guidelines						
		Significant depender BCA authorities (e.g.					
		Risk significant conflicts with OMB Circular A-4 and/or agency BCA guidelines					
			Requires new methods (SBCA?)				



# What Happens Then?

Enhanced GAO	Enhanced CRS	CBO 1	CBO 2					
<ul> <li>Improves existing CRA only marginally</li> <li>May improve REINS-enhanced CRA significantly</li> <li>Reinvigorates IQA</li> </ul>								
	Problematic utility; reviews are likely to be untimely							
	Competes with agencies for political authority							
			<ul> <li>De facto         political         authority for         regulatory         budgeting</li> <li>CB0 = best         case scenario</li> </ul>					



### Plausible Costs?

	Enhanced GAO	Enhanced CRS	СВО 1	CBO 2
FTEs	~ 3	~ 10	~ 30	100 +
\$	~ \$1 m	~ \$ 3 m	~ 10 m	~ \$30 m +
New Institutions needed	No	No	Yes	Yes
Early access to agency information required	No	Helpful	Essential	Essential



# Predictable Implementation Problems

Enhanced GAO	Enhanced CRS	CBO 1	CBO 2					
Minor; additional GAO training required								
Severe; review would be untimely								
		<ul> <li>Subject to political interference with respect to BCA methods</li> <li>Highlights value of external authorities (e.g., SBCA)</li> </ul>						
			Subject to extreme political interference with respect to BCA methods					



#### **Supply Side**

- Agency as monopolist
  - Supply depends on agenda
  - Low output, high prices
  - Politicized quality
  - Insuperable barriers to entry
- CORA as competitor
  - Supply depends on agenda
  - Low output, high prices
  - Politicized quality
  - Insuperable barriers to entry

#### **Demand Side**

- Agency as monopsonist
  - Demand depends on agenda
  - Agency chooses price & quality
  - Controlled peer review
  - Total information control
- Congress as competitor
  - Demand depends on agenda
  - Low output, high prices
  - Politicized quality
  - Total information control

## Monopoly/Monopsony as Alternative Problem Definition

# What Will Go Wrong?

Enhanced GAO	Enhanced CRS	CBO 1	CBO 2					
Not much; additional GAO training is required								
Failure virtually certain; reviews would be untimely								
		<ul> <li>Subject to political interference with respect to BCA methods</li> <li>Highlights need of external authorities (e.g., SBCA)</li> </ul>						
			Subject to extreme political interference with respect to BCA methods					



#### A Better Path forward

- Competition in BCA demand
  - Congress as new customer
  - Enforceable quality standards
- Competition in BCA supply
  - Resist desire for single authoritative BCA
  - Unleash nongovernmental expertise
  - Separate BCA production from decisionmaking



# Current Regime Yields Substantially Incomplete BCAs

Producer of the Analysis	Cost 1	Cost 2	Cost 3	Cost 4	Cost 5	Ben 1	Ben 2	Ben 3	Ben 4	Ben 5
Agency	<b>V</b>		<b>V</b>			<b>V</b>			<b>V</b>	
# Analyses	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
All Analyses Combined	~		<b>/</b>			<b>V</b>			<b>V</b>	



## Competitive Supply Yields More Comprehensive BCAs

Producer of the Analysis	Cost 1	Cost 2	Cost 3	Cost 4	Cost 5	Ben 1	Ben 2	Ben 3	Ben 4	Ben 5
Agency	<b>V</b>		<b>V</b>			<b>V</b>			<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>
Industry A	<b>V</b>	<b>~</b>	<b>/</b>	<b>V</b>		<b>/</b>				
Industry B	<b>V</b>	<b>~</b>	<b>/</b>			<b>/</b>			<b>V</b>	
Nonprofit C	<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>		<b>/</b>	<b>~</b>	<b>V</b>		
Nonprofit D	<b>V</b>					<b>/</b>		<b>V</b>	<b>/</b>	
Professor E	<b>V</b>	<b>~</b>				<b>/</b>		<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>	
Consultant F	<b>V</b>		<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>		<b>/</b>	<b>V</b>			
Agency G					<b>V</b>					
# Analyses	6	4	5	3	1	6	2	3	4	1
All Analyses Combined	<b>V</b>	<b>✓</b>	<b>~</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>~</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>✓</b>	<b>/</b>



# Competitive Supply Yields More Accurate Overall BCA

Producer of the Analysis	Cost 1	Cost 2	Cost 3	Cost 4	Cost 5	Ben 1	Ben 2	Ben 3	Ben 4	Ben 5
Agency	<b>V</b>		<b>V</b>			<b>V</b>			<b>V</b>	V
Industry A	<b>/</b>	$\overline{\checkmark}$	<b>V</b>	<b>/</b>		<b>/</b>				
Industry B	<b>V</b>	<b>~</b>	V			<b>V</b>			<b>/</b>	
Nonprofit C	<b>~</b>	<b>~</b>	<b>~</b>	V		<b>~</b>	V	<b>~</b>		
Nonprofit D	<b>V</b>					<b>V</b>		<b>V</b>	V	
Professor E	V	<b>~</b>				<b>/</b>		V	<b>/</b>	
Consultant F	<b>V</b>		<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>		V	<b>V</b>			
Agency G					V					
# Analyses	6	4	5	3	1	6	2	3	4	1
All Analyses Combined	<b>V</b>	<b>~</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>✓</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>	<b>✓</b>	<b>/</b>

 $\square$  = 'best' analysis determined by final offer arbitration

