### FAX TRANSMITTAL SHEET



OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL LITIGATION DIVISION
445 12th STREET, S.W., 8th Floor WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

TO: John Morrall
PHONE NUMBER:
FAX NUMBER: (202) 395-6974
PHONE NUMBER: 202-418-1720
FAX NUMBER: 202-418-7540
IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE THE AMOUNT MENTIONED BELOW, PLEASE CALL ON 202-418-1740.  THIS IS PAGE 1 OF
-

1 EB. 11. 1999 - C. EBITI - 19. 1901 - 19. 1901 - 1901 - 1901 - 1901 - 1901 - 1901 - 1901 - 1901 - 1901 - 1901



# Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

May 28,2002

Mr. John Morrall
Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs
Office of Management and Budget
NEOB, Room 10235
725 - 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20503

Dear Mr. Morrall:

The Federal Communications Commission appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Office of Management and Budget's *Draft Report to Congress on the Costs and Benefits of Federal Regulation*, As explained more fully in the comments attached, the FCC recommends that the Draft Report's discussion of FCC proceedings be clarified in several significant respects.

Most importantly, the Report should modify its statement that the FCC did not prepare cost-benefit analyses in its proceedings. As recognized in the Report, independent agencies are not subject to Executive Order 12866. On relevant forms provided to GAO, the FCC therefore noted that the Executive Order's requirement to prepare a formal cost-benefit analysis is "not applicable" to the FCC. Where appropriate, however, the FCC's decisions do take into account the costs and benefits of proposed regulations in order reduce unnecessary government regulation. The specific FCC proceedings mentioned are, in fact, excellent examples of deregulatory rulemaking actions in which the FCC has used cost-benefit analysis in its decision making.

The Report should also expressly recognize that the FCC's use of cost-benefit analyses properly may be affected by statutory requirements. For example, in the two proceedings concerning regulatory fees mentioned in the Report, the FCC's rules and the resulting costs are mandated by Congress. Because the FCC has no discretion to alter the amount of these fees, it would have been neither relevant nor appropriate to conduct a cost-benefit analysis. There are other instances in which Congress has set out specific statutory factors that are necessary to justify deregulatory actions under the Telecommunications Act of 1996. In these contexts, the FCC's deregulatory rulensking actions properly focus on the specific factors that Congress has identified, and which may be designed to achieve the same deregulatory objectives as cost-benefit analyses.

The Report should furthernote that its conclusions regarding the FCC are based on less than one-third of the potentially relevant FCC proceedings, During the period in question, the FCC conducted many potentially economically significant rulemaking

proceedings implementing the Telecommunications Act of 1996 that arc not considered in the Draft Report.

Thank you very much for taking these comments into consideration. We very much look forward to seeing the final Report.

Sincerely,

Susan H.Steiman

Associate General Counsel.

#### **ATTACHMENT**

## COMMENTS OF THR FCC ON DRAFT REPORT TO CONGRESS ON COSTS AND BENEFITS OF FEDERAL REGULATION

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC), through its staff, submits the following comments on the *Draft Report to Congress on Costs and Benefits of Federal Regulation*. As explained below, the FCC recommends that the Draft Report's discussion of FCC proceedings be clarified and modified in several respects to better ensure the accuracy of the information that is provided to Congress.

### I. FCC Use of Cost-Benefit Analyses

At the outset, the **Deft** Report should correct any implication that the **FCC** does not consider costs and benefits in its rulemaking proceedings. The **FCC** frequently uses qualitative analyses of costs and benefits to determine whether regulations should be imposed.

Because the FCC is not subject to Executive Order 12866, it does not prepare a formal cost-benefit analysis in accordance with Executive Branch guidance. The FCC's submissions to GAO on eight major rules thus correctly indicated on the appropriate forms that preparation of an analysis of costs and benefits was "not applicable to" the FCC. Apparently based on this information, the Draft Report states that the Federal Communications Commission "did not prepare benefit-cost analyses," in contrast to some other independent agencies that "consistently considered benefits and costs in their rulemaking processes." This statement does not accurately describe the FCC's proceedings and its use of cost-benefit analyses.

The deregulatory policies underpinning many provisions of the FCC's governing statute require that the Commission aggressively pursue efforts to promote competitive environments for telecommunication service providers by examining whether market conditions currently make regulation unnecessary, whether there are alternatives that avoid unnecessary regulation, and, when appropriate under statutory mandates, that the costs imposed justify the benefits of proposed regulations. Many of the FCC rulemaking orders mentioned in the Draft Report are, in fact, excellent examples of the Commission's steps to reduce unnecessary regulation and encourage market place solutions.

The proceedings at *issue*, among other things used alternatives such as economic incentives (bidding credits) to encourage telecommunications carriers to serve tribal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Executive Order 12866, <u>Regulatory Planning and Review</u>, 58 Fed. Reg. 51735,51737 (1993) (Executive Order 12866) (Section 2(b) specifically excludes independent regulatory agencies).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Pursuant to the Congressional Review Acr (CRA), 5 U.S.C.§ 801(a)(1)(B)(i), agencies must submit to the Comptroller General and each House of Congress a report that includes "a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Draft Report to Congress on the Costs and Benefits of Federal Regulations, 67 Fed. Reg. 13104, 15029 (Mar. 28,2002) (Draft Report).

FEB.17.1995 6:22H

lands, eliminated service restrictions on narrow band PCS service providers, and afforded greater service flexibility to 24 GHz band licensees. Examination of these decisions, which were supported by the affected industries, also demonstrates that, in appropriate circumstances, the FCC considers and weighs the costs of regulation before determining that regulation should be imposed.

The **FCC** determined, for example, that market conditions **justified imposing** certain restrictions on exclusive contracts with service providers in multi-tenant buildings only **after** considering evidence whether such contracts might have efficiency enhancing or pro-competitive effects. It **also** concluded that these requirements should not be imposed on existing contracts due to the costs reflected in possible **effects** on investment interests, In other instances, it concluded that regulation is unnecessary or that there **is** insufficient information to justify regulation; for **example**, it declined to **mandate** a **uniform** demarcation **point** for inside **wire** after considering the costs **and** benefits both to proponents **and** opponents of the requirement, concluding that there **was** no convincing evidence that the benefits to one group of competitors outweighed the harms to **the** other.

As these examples show, the FCC's rulemaking decisions, do utilize cost-benefit analysis as an important tool in its decision making. Like the other independent agencies mentioned in the draft Report, the FCC relies primarily on qualitative rather than quantitative analysis of costs and benefits. As Executive Order 12866 notes, however, some costs and benefits are difficult to quantify; but agencies nevertheless may make a reasoned determination whether regulations are justified by their qualitative benefits and costs.<sup>4</sup>

### II. Statutory Constraints on Independent Agencies

The Report should correct any implication that it would have been appropriate for the FCC to conduct a cost-benefit analysis in all of the proceedings considered in the Report. The Report should acknowledge, for example, that a cost-benefit analysis may not have been relevant to some FCC decisions in which statutory requirements afforded it no discretion. Also, as a general matter the PCC's governing statute may set out specific statutory criteria for deregulatory actions that emphasize factors other than cost-benefit analyses. It is entirely proper for independent agencies like the FCC to render their decisions by focusing primarily on the statutory criteria that Congress has identified. The Report should acknowledge this when discussing independent agencies.

By way of comparison, the Draft Report explains that agencies subject to Executive Order 12866 must prepare a cost-benefit analysis "regardless of whether the underlying statute governing agency action requires, authorizes or prohibits cost-benefit analysis as an input to decision making" and "regardless of whether it plays a central role in decision making under the agency's statute." The Draft Report correctly recognizes, however, that independent agencies are not subject to Executive Order 12866 or this OMB policy. 6

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Executive Order 12866, 58 Fed. Reg. at 51735 (Section 1(a)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Draft Report, 67 Fed. Reg. PI 15019.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Id., 67 Fed. Reg. at 15024.

Hence, independent agencies are not subject to a blanket requirement that they prepare a cost-benefit analysis irrespective of statutory guidance. The Report should thus explain that statutory factors properly may influence the extent to which independent agencies use cost-benefit analyses.

To illustrate, two of the eight FCC rules cited by the Draft Report concerned the FCC's collection of regulatory fees for the years 2000 and 2001. The FCC is required by law to set and collect regulatory fees in specific amounts established by yearly appropriations acts. The cost to the public of these fee regulations is expressly determined by Congress: the FCC has no discretion to modify the amounts collected or refrain from their collection. In these circumstances, absent a congressional command that a costbenefit analysis be conducted, an FCC analysis of the costs and benefits of this statutory fee requirement in its proceedings would not have been relevant or even appropriate. Indeed, Executive Order 12866 itself provides that agency regulations should be based on cost-benefit analyses "only to the extent permitted by law and where applicable," and OMB has recognized that a less intensive analysis of regulatory options is needed "when regulatory options are limited by statute."10

Similarly, independent agency action — even when deregulatory in nature — may be constrained by explicit statutory policies and requirements. The FCC conducts many proceedings designed to promote deregulatory, procompetitive policies for telecommunications that are central objectives of statutory provisions in the Communications Act as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. These statutory objectives are consistent with and, in fact, very similar to the objectives of Executive Order 12866, which likewise is designed to reduce "unacceptable or unreasonable [regulatory] costs on society."11

Many of the statutory provisions governing the FCC, however, contain specific statutory standards for deregulatory actions: Congress has tailored its requirements to the specific market environment surrounding telecommunications services, As a consequence, the FCC may be called upon to consider factors other than the cost-benefit analysis required by Executive Order 12866, but the statutory criteria that guide it may be very similar and serve equally important and beneficial purposes.

Under the Telecommunication Act of 1996, for example, the FCC is required to "forbear" **from** applying any existing rule or law to telecommunications services if the requirement is not necessary to prevent unreasonable rates, unjust discrimination and protection of consumers, and where forbearance otherwise serves the public interest, especially when it promotes competition among providers of telecommunications services. <sup>12</sup> Similarly, another provision requires the FCC biennially to review all rule that apply to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> <u>Id.</u>, 67 Fed. Reg. at 15039,

See 47 U.S.C.§ 159.

Executive Order 12866, 58 Fed. Reg, at 51735 (Section 1(b)). <sup>10</sup> OMB, Economic Analysis of Federal Regulations Under Executive Order 12666 ("Best Practices Guidance") (January 11, 1996), at 4.

<sup>11</sup> Executive Order 12866, 58 Fed, Reg. at 51735.

<sup>12 47</sup> U.S.C.\$ 160.

110.100 1.17

telecommunications service provides to determine whether any such regulation is no longer necessary in *the* public interest as the result of meaningful competition between providers of such service. <sup>13</sup> In these and other contexts, the FCC's&regulatory rulemaking actions properly focus and rely on the specific factors that Congress has decided should "play a central role" in deregulatory decision making under the governing statute.

The FCC's primary obligation is to **follow**the statutory commands in its enabling legislation and base its decisions on the statutory criteria set out by Congress. The Report **should** therefore make clear that it is proper for independent agencies to **make** decisions that **are** grounded on the specific statutory requirements **and** criteria that apply to them. It should also **recognize** that, in many instances, statutory provisions guiding agencies may be designed to achieve the same beneficial deregulatory objectives as the cost-benefit **analyses** required by **Executive** Order 12866.

### III. GAO Data

Finally, the Draft Report should recognize that any conclusions it reaches about the FCC's use of cost-benefit analyses have examined less than one-third of the potentially relevant FCC proceedings, The eight FCC major rules mentioned in the Draft Report do not provide a comprehensive basis for evaluating the extent to which the FCC used cost-benefit or similar analyses during the period covered by the Report

In discussing major rules **issued** by independent regulatory agencies, the Draft Report considered **only** the "major rules" these agencies submitted to GAO under the Congressional Review Act (CRA). The CRA provides, however, that FCC rulemaking proceedings implementing provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 will be deemed non-major rules under the CRA regardless of their impact on the economy. During the 18 month period in question, the FCC, in accordance with the CRA, submitted information to GAO on an additional 21 rulemakings that were deemed non-major rules because they implemented the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Some or all of these proceedings may otherwise have satisfied the criteria for major rules under the CRA. Therefore, the Report should note that the universe of potentially relevant FCC proceedings is far larger than the eight proceedings mentioned in the Report.

\* \* \*

The FCC recommends that OMB's firal Report incorporate the clarifications discussed in these comments. These changes, we believe, will improve the accuracy of the Report and improve its usefulness to Congress. Should you have any further questions about these comments, please contact the FCC'sOffice of General Counsel.

<sup>13 47</sup> U.S.C. § 161.

<sup>14 5</sup> U.S.C§ 804(2) (The term 'major rule' ... does nor include any rule promulgated under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the amendments made by the Act.").