

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 12/5/17 10:21 AM Received: November 30, 2017 Status: Posted Posted: December 04, 2017 Tracking No. 1k1-903b-h11s Comments Due: January 09, 2018 Submission Type: Web
--

Docket: MSHA-2014-0031
Exposure of Underground Miners to Diesel Exhaust

Comment On: MSHA-2014-0031-0076
Exposure of Underground Miners to Diesel Exhaust: Request for Information; Reopening of Rulemaking Record; Extension of Comment Period

Document: MSHA-2014-0031-0125
Comment from f f, NA

Submitter Information

Name: f f
Organization: NA

General Comment

From fiscal year 2004 through 2013, Federal agencies published 37,022 final rules in the Federal Register.

Excessive and unnecessary regulations can place undue burdens on companies, consumers, and workers, and may cause growth and overall productivity to slow. Evidence suggests that past administrations domestic environmental regulation has led some U.S.-based multinationals to invest in other nations especially in manufacturing, , such regulation had a adverse effect on domestic growth. There is widespread belief that new or more stringent environmental regulations raise production costs thereby reducing production which in turn must lead to lower employment ("output effect").

During the last Administration, significant and escalating regulatory burden was apparent , costs of regulation and realms subject to regulation have grown, while benefits remain ambiguous; entire sectors of society experience regulation from independent agencies that get little scrutiny; Federal Register page counts occupy record heights; economically significant and major rules reviewed annually have increased notably over the past decade; regulatory dark matter outside the normal notice and comment procedure lacks adequate scrutiny.

The Regulatory Right-to-Know Act calls for an analysis of the effects of regulations on small business. In the findings section of SBREFA, Congress states that "small businesses bear a disproportionate share of regulatory costs and burdens."

Primary task is to double GDP, rather than to double spending or regulatory burdens .
Overreach by bureaucracy and the administrative state may not only impede economic

AB86-COMM-68

efficiency but also undermine health, safety, and environmental progress. Healthy government requires recognizing downsides to coercive intervention; it requires vigilant legislative and executive institutions and mindsets that seek reasons not to add yet another rule or decree to the existing tens of thousands. Public has a right to know the ways federal agencies have harmed and harm that which they oversee, and how those negatives may propagate beyond the agency throughout the economy and society.

Past Rules with the highest estimated costs, come from the EPA, and in particular its Office of Air and Radiation. EPA rules account for 46 to 56 percent of the monetized costs. The annualized estimated cost is \$9.6 billion (\$2007, using discount rates of 3% and 7%). 2016 was much greater. . EPA's 2006 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for PM, with estimated costs of \$3 billion per year using 2001 dollars. Far greater today. The Utility MACT rule, which is estimated to be the costliest of the EPA rules, has annualized costs of about \$8.2 billion using 2001 dollars. Far greater today. Department of Labor rules taken together could range from about \$2.2 billion to \$19.1 billion per year (in 2001\$)

An important source of uncertainty in the case of health and safety regulations is how to value the regulations' expected reduction in risks to life. Agencies vary in how they estimate the value of a statistical life (VSL), which is best understood not as the "valuation of life," but as the valuation of statistical mortality risks. Differential toxicity among of PM, EPA, and concluded that the scientific evidence is not yet sufficient to allow differentiation of benefits estimates by particle type, if any. Uncertainty in the PM benefits estimates because a significant portion of the benefits associated with Obama admin. rules are from projected exposure reductions. Two of the particulate matter science experts in 2005 specifically highlighted the uncertainty associated with the fine PM. Source of uncertainty is the assumptions used in projecting the health impact of reducing PM. These projections are based on series of models that take into account emissions changes, resulting distributions of changes in ambient air quality, the estimated reductions in health effects from changes in exposure, and the composition of the population that will benefit from reduced exposure. Component includes assumptions, each with significant level of uncertainty. Although discussed qualitatively in EPA's regulatory impact analyses, assumption carries uncertainty that is not accounted for in the analysis presented in EPA's benefits estimates. Uncertainty differ across individual rules, aggregating high and low-end estimates can result in totals that may be misleading.

Past Admin regulation process did not provide accuracy of prospective analyses in a way that can be brought to bear on such analyses when they are originally written. In short, retrospective analysis should inform prospective analysis. Consistent with the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act. The need to offset the march of bureaucracy and regulation and proposed ideas there should be bipartisan momentum for economic and regulatory reform. Some animated new constituency for limited government.