

Regulation & Governance / Volume 11, Issue 2 / pp. 203-212

Original Article

What's wrong with the back of the envelope? A call for simple (and timely) benefit-cost analysis

Christopher Carrigan X, Stuart Shapiro

First published: 26 April 2016

https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12120

Abstract

Observers across the ideological spectrum have criticized benefit-cost analysis for as long as it has been part of the rulemaking process. Still, proponents and detractors agree that analysis has morphed into a mechanism often used by agencies to justify regulatory decisions already made. We argue that a simpler analysis of more alternatives conducted earlier in the regulatory process can resuscitate it as a tool to inform policy. Recognizing that requiring a procedure does not ensure that regulators will follow it, we offer possible remedies, including strengthening or relaxing subsequent review of proposed rules, which raise the cost of circumventing the reform or lower the cost of following it.

References

Ackerman F, Heinzerling L (2004) *Priceless: On Knowing the Price of Everything and the Value of Nothing.* The New Press, New York.

Google Scholar ☑

Arbuckle DR (2012) Regulation's Impact on Jobs. RegBlog, University of Pennsylvania Law School, 26 November. [Last accessed 28 Jan 2016.] Available from URL: http://www.regblog.org/2012/11/26-arbuckle-jobs.html

Google Scholar 🗹

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. Privacy Policy

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

Google Scholar 🖸 Dunlop CA, Maggetti M, Radaelli CM, Russel D (2012) The Many Uses of Regulatory Impact Assessment: A Meta-Analysis of EU and UK cases. Regulation & Governance 6, 23-45. Web of Science® ☑ Google Scholar ☑ Ellig J, McLaughlin PA, Morrall JF III (2012) Continuity, Change, and Priorities: The Quality and Use of Regulatory Analysis across US Administrations. Regulation & Governance 7, 153–173. Web of Science® ☑ Google Scholar ☑ EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) (2009) Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Mercury and Air Toxics Standards. EPA-452/R-11-011. [Last accessed 28 Jan 2016.] Available from URL: http://www.regulations.gov/#! documentDetail;D=EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0234-20131 Google Scholar 🖸 Golden MM (1998) Interest Groups in the Rule-making Process: Who Participates? Whose Voices Get Heard? Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 8, 245–270. Google Scholar 🗹 Hahn RW, Sunstein CR (2001) A New Executive Order for Improving Federal Regulation? Deeper and Wider Cost-benefit Analysis. University of Pennsylvania Law Review 150, 1489-1552. Web of Science® ☑ Google Scholar ☑ Hahn RW, Tetlock PC (2008) Has Economic Analysis Improved Regulatory Decisions? Journal of Economic Perspectives 22, 67-84. Web of Science® Google Scholar

Holman KW (2012) Statement of the US Chamber of Commerce on "Regulatory Flexibility Act Compliance: Is

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. <u>Privacy Policy</u>

X

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

McGarity T (1987) Regulatory Analysis and Regulatory Reform. Texas Law Review 65, 1243-1334. Web of Science® ☑ Google Scholar ☑ Nichols AL (1997) Lead in Gasoline. In: RD Morgenstern (ed) Economic Analyses at EPA: Assessing Regulatory Impact, pp. 49–86. Resources for the Future Press, New York. Google Scholar ☑ Olson ED (1984) The Quiet Shift of Power: Office of Management and Budget Supervision of Environmental Protection Agency Rulemaking under Executive Order 12,291. Virginia Journal of Natural Resource Law 4, 1-80. Google Scholar 🗹 OSHA (Occupational Health and Safety Administration) (2012) Hazard Communication. Federal Register 77, 17574-17896. Google Scholar 🗵 Parson E,, Coglianese C, Zeckhauser R (2004) Seeking Truth for Power: Informational Strategy and Regulatory Policymaking. Minnesota Law Review 89, 277-341. Web of Science® ☑ Google Scholar ☑ Posner RA (2013) Reflections on Judging. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. Google Scholar 🗵 Shapiro S, Morrall JF III (2012) The Triumph of Regulatory Politics: Benefit-cost Analysis and Political Salience. Regulation & Governance 6, 189–206. Web of Science® ☑ Google Scholar ☑ X This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. Privacy Policy **Manage Preferences Accept All Reject Non-Essential**

PC Stern, HV Fineberg (eds) (1996) Understanding Risk: Informing Decisions in a Democratic Society. National Academies Press, Washington, DC. Google Scholar 🗹 Sunstein CR (2013) Simpler: The Future of Government. Simon and Schuster, New York. Google Scholar 🖸 Torriti J, Löfstedt R (2012) The First Five Years of the EU Impact Assessment System: A Risk Economics Perspective on Gaps between Rationale and Practice. Journal of Risk Research 15, 169–186. Web of Science® ☑ Google Scholar ☑ Wagner WE (2009) The CAIR RIA: Advocacy Dressed Up as Policy Analysis. In: W Harrington, L Heinzerling, RD Morgenstern (eds) Reforming Regulatory Impact Analysis, pp. 56-81. Resources for the Future Press, Washington, DC. Google Scholar 🗵 West WF (2004) Formal Procedures, Informal Processes, Accountability, and Responsiveness in Bureaucratic Policy Making: An Institutional Policy Analysis. Public Administration Review 64, 66-80. Web of Science® ☑ Google Scholar ☑ West WF (2009) Inside the Black Box: The Development of Proposed Rules and the Limits of Procedural Controls. Administration and Society 41, 576-599. Web of Science® ☑ Google Scholar ☑ West WF, Raso C (2013) Who Shapes the Rulemaking Agenda? Implications for Bureaucratic Responsiveness and Bureaucratic Control. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 23, 495-519. Web of Science® ☑ Google Scholar ☑ X This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. Privacy Policy **Manage Preferences Accept All Reject Non-Essential**



Citing Literature

Download PDF

X

ABOUT WILEY ONLINE LIBRARY

Privacy Policy
Terms of Use

This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. <u>Privacy Policy</u>

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential

Sitemap

OPPORTUNITIES

Subscription Agents
Advertisers & Corporate Partners

CONNECT WITH WILEY

The Wiley Network
Wiley Press Room

Copyright © 1999-2025 John Wiley & Sons, Inc or related companies. All rights reserved, including rights for text and data mining and training of artificial intelligence technologies or similar technologies.



This website utilizes technologies such as cookies to enable essential site functionality, as well as for analytics, personalization, and targeted advertising. You may change your settings at any time or accept the default settings. You may close this banner to continue with only essential cookies. Privacy Policy

Manage Preferences

Accept All

Reject Non-Essential