May 30, 1985

MR. A. JAMES BARNES
Deputy Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency

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 believe 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 perons 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.[11] 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.

[11] As 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.

- 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.
- 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.
- It is contrary to the "legislative model" of informal rulemaking[12] adopted by the Congress.
- It would divert attention from whether the agency's decision is a good one—the substantive issue—to how the agency made the decision.
- 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.
- 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 not principled answers to these questions.
- 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 meeting, 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.

ROBERT P. BEDELL
Deputy Administrator
Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs

Enclosures

[12] Where 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.