

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION COPY
001a. draft	re: Regulatory Review Reform (5 pages)	03/26/1993	P5
001b. list	re: Principles of Regulatory Review (1 page)	n.d.	P5
002. memo	R. James Woolsey to Thomas McLarty; re: Executive Directives to Reduce Government Waste and Perks (3 pages)	03/13/1993	P1/b(1)
003. memo	Jack Quinn to Mack McLarty; re: Reform of the Regulatory Review Process (2 pages)	n.d.	P5 6086
004a. memo	VPOTUS to POTUS; re: Regulatory Review (2 pages)	03/17/1993	P5
004b. report	re: Regulatory Review Reform (5 pages)	03/17/1993	P5
005a. memo	VPOTUS to POTUS; re: Regulatory Review (2 pages)	03/17/1993	P5
005b. report	re: Regulatory Review Reform (5 pages)	03/17/1993	P5
006a. draft	re: Regulatory Review Reform (5 pages)	03/26/1993	P5
006b. list	re: Principles of Regulatory Review (1 page)	03/26/1993	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Chief of Staff
Bill Burton
OA/Box Number: 2780

FOLDER TITLE:

Reinventing Government [2]

Jimmie Purvis
2009-0628-F
jp2888

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

For the 11:30am Meeting

Memorandum to Mack McLarty

60810
COPY

From: Jack Quinn
Counsel to the Vice President

RE: Reform of the Regulatory Review Process

1. When President Clinton abolished the much-criticized Competitiveness Council, he asked Vice President Gore to prepare a proposal for a new process of regulatory review. Greg Simon and I are assisting the Vice President in that project and, in so doing, coordinating with OMB Director Panetta and Deputy Director Rivlin.
2. The Competitiveness Council was generally popular in the business community -- because it served as a bottleneck through which many significant regulatory initiatives were unable to pass.
3. The current review process is highly controversial, costly, and poorly managed. Over 2,500 rules go through the OMB process approximately five times each before they are implemented. Substantial agency resources must be devoted to submitting regulatory justifications materials to OMB during the minimum of two years it now takes to issue a rule. At bottom, rather than pushing agencies to fulfill their statutory obligations in a timely manner, OMB and Competitiveness Council used their authority to inhibit the activities of the regulatory agencies.
4. The delays characteristic of the current system not only impede government functions, but afflict the private sector as well. Businesses are faced with the uncertainty caused by a lengthy and complex process that makes planning for new regulation difficult.

COPY

5. The current process also focuses too narrowly on the costs of regulation without adequately considering such benefits as enhancing the quality of life, making more efficient and healthy use of our natural resources and otherwise accomplishing the statutory goals that underlie specific regulatory initiatives.

COPY

6. All this said, there remains an appropriate and, indeed, vital role for a strong regulatory review process. That process should --

a. ensure that the Administration's priorities are accurately reflected in the regulatory process;

b. coordinate the regulatory initiatives and perspectives of different agencies so they are neither inconsistent or unnecessarily redundant;

c. guarantee that, particularly as to regulatory initiatives that are truly major or that are highly controversial, the proper balance is struck between health, safety, environmental and other quality of life goals, on the other hand, costs and other appropriate considerations, on the other; and

d. streamline the regulatory process, discourage unnecessary litigation, ease the burden on state and local government with the efficient functioning of markets and the economy generally.

These are the goals of we shall pursue in our reform of the process.

Jack P.

COPY