

Index

- accountability 7, 22, 34, 144, 152
- Administrative Procedure Act (1946)
 - 22, 134
- analysis, generally
 - analysis of analysis 14–16, 37–8, 65–66, 88–90
 - analyst types 13
 - back-of-the-envelope analysis 154–5
 - challenges 3–4, 8, 129–31, 158–9
 - complexity implications 5, 36, 129–30, 133, 153–5
 - criticism 3–5, 14–16, 34–6, 64–5, 85, 159
 - deadlines 69, 72, 75, 77, 124, 131, 152, 161–2
 - delays 35, 64–5, 89–90, 96, 130–31, 144–6, 161–2
 - democratic tensions, and 6–8, 64, 136
 - expertise role 6–8
 - historical development 8–10, 20, 26–9, 121
 - ignoring results 48–51, 91, 96–7, 131, 145, 149
 - improvement proposals 146–56.
 - independence 12–13, 42–3, 45, 75, 79, 138–9, 149–50, 161
 - legal structure 13, 43, 139–41, 151–3
 - limitations 4–5, 16–17, 44, 141–2, 153–6, 159–60
 - process and product, interaction between 150–51
 - public participation 5, 12, 23, 64–5, 71, 73–4, 86, 91, 94–6, 98, 100, 102, 103, 113, 118, 124–5, 129, 133–5, 146–8, 161
 - satisficing 4, 149, 160
 - timing 40–41, 44, 123–4, 138–9, 148, 150, 154–5
- Arbuckle, Donald 110
- Army Corps 12, 33, 83, 88, 127
- aviation sector
 - cost-benefit analysis case study 45–7, 123, 134, 152
- back-of-the-envelope analysis 154–5
- Bird, Robert 108
- branch method 3–5, 159, 162–3
- Brown, Elizabeth 108
- bureaucratic influences 122
 - analysis, generally 12–13, 149
 - bureaucratic embedding of analysts 138
 - cost-benefit analysis 43–4, 124
 - environmental impact assessments 12, 92–3
 - ignoring analysis results 48–51, 91, 96–7, 131, 145, 149
 - Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) 75
 - risk assessment 57, 70–72, 75, 79, 124, 138–9
- Caldwell, Lynton 85
- Carrigan, Christopher 36, 154
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
 - infectious disease control guidelines 113–15
- Clean Air Act (1963) 59
 - lifetime risk assessment criteria 59–60
- Coglianese, Cary 63–4
- comprehensive-rational analysis 3–5, 6
 - 16–17, 24, 26, 156–7, 159–63.
 - analysis of analysis 14–15
 - background and development 8–10, 26–9
 - benefits 7–8, 16–17, 120–21, 126–9

- challenges 3–5, 8, 129–32, 162
- characteristics 16
- complexity implications 129–30, 133, 154–5
- cost-benefit analysis, compared 32–5, 42, 53
- criticism of 3–5, 14, 16, 34–5, 120–21, 153, 162
- environmental impact assessments, compared 82–3, 86–7, 88, 90, 98
- factors affecting 10–13
- impact analysis, compared 105–106, 117–18
- judicial review 132–3
- political influences 26–9
- public participation 133–5, 161
- risk assessment, compared 57, 78
- systems analysis 8–10
- cooling water standards
 - cost-benefit analysis case study 51–3
- cost-benefit analysis
 - Army Corps flood control projects 33
 - back-of-the-envelope analysis 155
 - background and development 32–3
 - bureaucratic influences 43–4, 124
 - case studies
 - aviation security 45–7, 134, 152
 - cooling water intake 51–3
 - dietary supplements 48–51, 130
 - comprehensive-rational analysis, compared 32–5, 42, 53
 - criticism 34–6
 - delays 35, 130–31
 - economic efficiency 35, 54
 - economists' views 41–5
 - environmental impact assessment, differences from 87
 - ethical concerns 34
 - judicial review 36, 129, 132–3
 - length and complexity trends 129, 155
 - not working well 43–4
 - political influences 27, 35, 79
 - public participation 41, 123, 134
 - reform proposals 35–7
 - regulation role 40–41, 122
 - criticism 34–6
 - historical development 26–7, 33
 - risk assessment, compared 57–8, 64–5, 71, 78, 123
 - study method 38–9
 - transparency 54
 - trends 39–40
 - working well 34, 41–2, 53–4, 126
- deadlines 69, 75, 77, 141, 151–3, 161–2
- delays 161–2
 - cost-benefit analysis 35, 130–31
 - environmental impact assessments 89–90, 96, 144–6
 - risk assessment 64–5, 130–31
- DeMuth, Christopher 34
- dietary supplements
 - cost-benefit analysis case study 48–51, 131
- Dror, Yehezkel 8
- environmental impact assessments
 - application, scope 82
 - background and development 82–90, 127–8
 - bureaucratic influences 12, 92–3
 - case studies
 - Beluga whales import prohibition 101–2, 125
 - Mexican truck entry restrictions 99–101, 124–5, 131–2, 135, 137
 - comprehensive-rational analysis, compared 82–3, 86–7, 88, 90, 98
 - contracting out 93
 - criticisms 84–5, 89–90, 133
 - delays 89–90, 96, 144–6
 - judicial review 12, 87–8, 92–3, 96–8, 125, 127–8, 132–3, 152–3
 - length and complexity 96, 129, 133, 155
 - litigation 84–5, 87, 97–8, 100, 125
 - mitigated FONSI approach 85, 88, 93–4, 127, 135, 155–6
 - political influences 86, 88–9, 137, 145
 - public participation 84, 86, 94–6, 98, 101–3, 124–5, 134–5, 146–7
 - working poorly 96–7
 - working well 12, 93–6, 102–3

- Environmental Protection Agency
 cost-benefit analysis
 cooling water intake case study
 51–3
 impact assessments
 alleged savings resulting from
 110–11
 risk assessment 27
 duty and powers 58–9
 formaldehyde risk assessments
 64–5
 Integrated Risk Information
 System (IRIS) case study
 73–6
 pesticide registration case study
 76–8
 reform proposals 60–61
 risk management, links between
 60–62
 science charade 63–4
 equity impact analysis 107
 executive branch agencies
 criticism 21–2, 25
 discretionary powers 24–5
 historical development 21–2
 notice and comment process 22–3
 restrictions 21–3
 standards-setting powers 24–5
 Executive Order 12291 (1981) 26–7,
 33, 134
 Executive Order 12866 (1993) 27–9,
 102
 Executive Order 13563 (2011) 28
 Federal Motor Carrier Safety
 Administration
 Mexican truck entry restrictions EIS
 case study 99–101, 124–5
 Flood Control Act (1936) 33
 Food and Drug Administration 27, 62
 dietary supplements cost-benefit
 analysis case study 48–51, 120,
 122, 131
 Forester, John 4–5, 16
 formaldehyde risk assessment 64–5
 Ginsburg, Douglas 34
 Glucker, Anne 146–7
 Government Accountability Office
 environmental impact assessments
 89–90
 Regulatory Flexibility Analysis
 108–9
 risk assessment policies of EPA
 60–61, 73
 UMRA, analysis 109–10
 Graham, John 15, 28, 65–6, 69, 76
 Greenberg, Michael 88–9
 Greenwood, Ted 64
 Hahn, Robert 35–6
 Harrington, Winston 36
 health impact assessments 106–7, 118
 Homeland Security
 regulations, and cost-benefit analysis
 43, 64, 134, 140, 148, 149
 impact analysis *see also* environmental
 impact assessments
 adoption trends 105–7
 background and development 105–10
 decision-making influences 105,
 110–12, 117, 126
 differences from other analysis
 methods 117–18
 executive orders 110, 117–18
 judicial review 112, 132
 limitations 106–10, 117
 Regulatory Flexibility Analysis 25,
 27, 106–11, 121, 132, 154
 savings resulting from 110–12
 small business (SBREFA) panels 27,
 108–9, 112–17, 120, 125–6,
 128–9, 135, 137, 140, 145–8
 benefits 117–18
 infectious disease exposure case
 study 113–17
 incremental decision-making 3–5,
 159–61
 infectious disease control
 impact analysis 113–17
 Medical Removal Protection
 provisions 114–15
 Workplace Infection Control Plan
 114–17
 inflationary impact statements 26

- Information Quality Act (2000) 28
- Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) 73–6, 121, 123–4, 139, 148, 151, 160
- criticisms 73–4, 76, 124, 130–31
- legal and bureaucratic influences 75
- political influences 74–5, 136–7
- risk assessment case study 73–6
- Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) 21
- Jackson, Henry ‘Scoop’ 82
- Jasanoff, Sheila 6, 80 (n)
- Jay, Stephen 85
- Jenkins-Smith, Hank 9, 12, 106
- judicial review 140, 141, 152–3
- back-of-the-envelope analysis 155
- cost-benefit analysis 36, 129, 132–3
- environmental impact assessments 12, 87–8, 92–3, 96–8, 125, 127–8, 132–3, 152–3
- limitations 132–3
- Kagan, Robert 140
- Karkkanien, Bradley 85,
- Kelman, Steven 34
- Landy, Marc 21, 37–8
- Lavertu, Stéphane 152
- legal influences 14, 122, 139–41, 160
- see also* judicial review; public participation
- adversarial system 138–9
- Congress, role and powers 43, 151–2
- deadlines 69, 75, 77, 141, 151–3, 161–2
- risk assessment 57, 70–72, 75, 79
- Leman, Christopher 154
- Lindblom, Charles 3–4, 7, 9, 10, 13–17, 20–21, 31, 32, 34, 35, 83, 88, 130, 136, 149, 153–5, 159–61, 162–3
- Lindstrom, Matthew 85, 87
- Livermore, Michael 36
- Lynn, Laurence 9
- McNamara, Robert 8–9
- Marchant, Gary 63
- Marine Mammals Protection Act (1972) 101
- Mayhew, David 145
- Meltsner, Arnold 3–4, 7, 13, 15, 42, 138
- mitigated FONSI approach 85, 88, 93–4, 127, 135, 155–6
- Morgenstern, Richard 15, 36–8,
- Morrall, John 35
- National Academy of Sciences
- OIRA risk assessment guidelines, criticism 61
- risk assessment studies and reports 58–63, 73–4, 76, 134
- National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) 63–4
- National Environment Policy Act (1970) 24, 82–3, 89, 124
- experts, employment trends 140
- judicial review 132–3
- Nelson, Robert 154
- New Deal 21–3
- notice and comment process 22–3
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration 24, 39, 65, 109
- infectious disease impact analysis 113–17, 145
- Office of Advocacy of Small Business Administration (SBA) 110–11
- Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs 25–6, 28, 34
- independence 42, 149–50
- political influences 43
- risk assessment guidelines 61
- role and purpose 42, 69, 149–50
- Office of Management and Budget 26, 34, 61
- Olson, Erik 34
- Paperwork Reduction Act (1980) 25, 106
- Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (2003) 77
- pesticides
- EPA registration risk assessment case study 76–8, 126–7, 152

- Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS) 8–9, 11, 29, 32, 121, 136, 138
- Plato 6
- political influences
- analysis, generally 9–12, 128–9, 136–7, 144–6, 160
 - cost-benefit analysis 33, 34, 43, 51
 - environmental impact assessments 86, 88–9, 137, 145
 - regulation 20–21
 - risk assessment 58–60, 70, 72, 74–5, 79, 136–7
 - SBREFA panels 145–6
- Porter, Theodore 33
- progressivism 18, 21, 162.
- public participation
- analysis, relationship between 23, 133–5, 146–8, 161
 - benefits and limitations of 22–3
 - cost-benefit analysis 41, 47, 54, 123, 134
 - environmental impact assessments 84, 86, 94–6, 98, 101–3, 124–5, 134–5, 146–7
 - risk assessment 71, 124, 134–5
 - SBREFA panels 135, 146–7
 - timing, relevance of 148
- “Quality of Life” reviews 26
- Radin, Beryl 15, 138
- Rayner, Steve 5,
- Regulation 20
- cost-benefit analysis 26–7, 34–8, 40–45, 53–5, 122–3
 - criticism 34–6
 - historical development 33
 - criticism 1–2, 24–5
 - historical development 21–5, 121
 - impact analysis 107–110, 125–6
 - increasing role 1–2, 20
 - resistance 21–2
 - retrospective review 28
 - risk assessment 27–8, 58–66, 67–72, 78–9, 123–4
- Regulatory Analysis Review Group 26
- regulatory experimentation 155–6
- Regulatory Flexibility Act (1981) 25, 27, 106–8, 132–3
- Regulatory Impact Analysis
- background and introduction 26–7
 - cost-benefit analysis 32–3
 - criticism 26–7
 - reform proposals 36
- Renn, Ortwin 6–7, 63
- Revesz, Richard 36,
- risk assessment
- agenda-setting 123
 - assumptions 70, 72
 - background and development 27, 58–66
 - bureaucratic influences 57, 70–72, 75, 79, 124, 138–9
 - case studies
 - EPA pesticide registration 76–8, 126–7, 152
 - Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) 73–6
 - challenges and concerns 63–4, 70–71, 76
 - comprehensive-rational analysis, compared 57, 78
 - cost-benefit analysis, compared 57–8, 64–5, 71, 78, 123
 - criticisms 57–8, 60, 69, 78
 - deadlines 69, 75, 77
 - definition 58
 - delays 64–5, 130–31
 - environmental impact assessment, differences from 87
 - ethical concerns 57
 - NRC studies and reports 58–63, 73–4, 76, 134
 - OIRA guidelines 61
 - political influences 58–60, 70, 72, 79
 - public participation 71, 124, 134–5
 - reform proposals 61–2
 - risk, concept understanding 58, 63
 - risk management, links between 58, 60–62, 67, 139
 - science and policy, links between 58–60, 63–4, 71, 123, 128
 - stages 58
 - study method 66–7
 - timing 123–4, 138–9, 150, 154–5

- transparency 124
- uncertainty 123
- working poorly 70–71
- working well 68–70, 78, 124, 126–7
- Robert, Christopher 13,
- root-method analysis *see*
 - comprehensive-rational analysis
- satisficing 4, 149, 160
- SBREFA *see* Small Business
 - Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (1996)
- science
 - analysis benefits 7–8
 - analysis limitations 6–7
 - expertise and democracy 6–8
 - risk assessment, policy links 58–60, 63–4, 71, 123
 - science charades 7, 63–4, 128
- Shaipro, Stuart, 35
- Shapiro, Sidney A. 5
- Simon, Herbert 3–5, 160
- Sinden, Amy 52, 54, 150,
- Small Business Regulatory
 - Enforcement Fairness Act (1996) 27, 106, 108–9
- regulation review panels 108–9
 - impacts 113, 118, 127–9
 - infectious disease impact analysis case study 113–17
 - politics and policy interactions 145–6
 - procedures 112–13
 - public participation 135, 146–7
 - role and powers 125–6
- small businesses
 - impact statements 110–112
 - regulatory burdens 25
 - regulatory reforms 27, 108–9
- Sullivan, William 85
- Sunstein, Cass 28, 35–6,
- Taylor, Serge 12, 15, 84, 87–88–139, 150,
- Tetlock, Paul 35
- Toxic Substances Control Act (1976) 69
- Transportation Security Administration
 - cost-benefit analysis case study 45–7
- Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (1995) 27, 109–10
- Wagner, Wendy 7, 28, 63–4, 76, 110, 141
- Walter-Logan Bill 21–2
- Weidenbaum, Murray 34
- West, William 22
- Western Watersheds Project v. Kraayenbrink (2015)* 87
- whale imports prohibition
 - EIS case study 101–2, 125
- Wildavsky, Aaron 8–9, 13
- Williams, Richard 38
- Williams, Walter 9,
- Yackee, Susan 23, 152
- Yost, Nicholas 87
- Zeckhauser, Richard 13,