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Introduction

Critics of health, safety, and environment regulation have sought to buttress the case against regulation by citing a 2010 report by economists Nicole Crain and Mark Crain called The Impact of Regulatory Costs on Small Firms1 (“the Crain and Crain report”). The Crain and Crain report is the fourth in a series of reports that have been produced under contract for the Small Business Administration’s (SBA) Office of Advocacy since 1995, each of which has attempted to calculate the total “burden” of federal regulations, and to demonstrate that small businesses in all economic sectors bear a disproportionate share of that burden.2

Among the Crain and Crain report’s findings is one that has become a centerpiece of regulatory opponents’ rhetoric: the “annual cost of federal regulations in the United States increased to more than $1.75 trillion in 2008.”3 This figure is several orders of magnitude larger than the estimate generated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)—the official estimate of the aggregate costs and benefits of federal regulations prepared annually for Congress. The 2009 OMB report found that in 2008 annual regulatory costs ranged from $62 billion to $73 billion.4 The authors of the Crain and Crain report attribute this massive difference to the fact that their report considers many more rules than do the annual OMB reports, including rules with estimated costs less than $100 million, rules that were put on the books more than 10 years ago, and rules issued by independent regulatory agencies.5 As this report demonstrates, however, much more is at work than that. In areas where the OMB and Crain and Crain calculations overlap, Crain and Crain use the same cost data as OMB, but, unlike OMB, which presents regulatory costs as a range, Crain and Crain always adopt the upper end of the range for inclusion in their calculations, a departure that is not justified as we explain in this report. Further, Crain and Crain’s calculations for the regulations not covered by OMB’s report appear to be based largely on a decidedly unusual data source for economists—public opinion polling, the results of which Crain and Crain massage into a massive, but unsupported estimate of the costs of “economic” regulations. Because Crain and Crain have refused to make their underlying data or calculations public—apparently even withholding them from the SBA office that contracted for the study—it is difficult to know precisely how they arrived at the result that economic regulation has a cost of $1.2 trillion dollars, comprising more than 70 percent of the total costs in their report. Nevertheless, even based on what Crain and Crain reveal, their calculation of the cost of economic regulations is deeply flawed, as we also explain.

In addition, the OMB report accounts for an equally relevant figure that the Crain and Crain’s $1.75 trillion figure simply omits: the economic benefits of regulation. OMB’s 2009 recent report found that in 2008 annual benefits of regulation ranged from $153 billion to $806 billion.6 And, as a series of CPR reports have explained, the OMB reports likely overestimate regulatory costs and underestimate regulatory benefits, including omitting from its calculations altogether significant benefits that happen to defy monetization.7 In contrast, the Crain and Crain report makes no effort to account for regulatory benefits. If, for example, a regulation imposes $100 in
costs on a business, but provides twice that in benefits, the Crain and Crain report would still tally that as $100 cost to society, even though it provides substantial net benefits.

It’s easy to see why the anti-regulatory critics have seized on the Crain and Crain report and its findings. The $1.75 trillion figure is a gaudy number that was sure to catch the ear of the media and the general public. Upon examination, however, it turns out that the $1.75 trillion estimate is the result of transparently unreliable methodology and is presented in a fashion calculated to mislead.

This report points out the severe flaws with the effort by Crain and Crain to estimate total regulatory costs. These flaws include:

- **Omitted benefits of regulation.** A discussion of regulation is inherently incomplete—and distorted—if it focuses on costs without also considering benefits. Simply put, OMB’s calculations demonstrate that regulation has a positive net effect on the economy, and not by a little. The Crain and Crain report simply ignores the benefits of regulation, focusing solely on one half of the equation. But, claiming to present a compilation of regulatory costs, without also presenting a compilation of regulatory benefits, is fundamentally misleading. Indeed, using Crain and Crain’s methodology, practically any economic transaction—from the purchase of a loaf of bread to the construction of a manufacturing plant—would be counted as a drain on the economy, because they only include the costs not the benefits. The Crain and Crain report’s failure to include an accounting of regulatory benefits is particularly puzzling, since virtually every source the authors rely on for estimates of costs also provide estimates of benefits as well.

- **Questionable assumptions and flimsy data.** The report’s estimate of “economic regulatory” costs—financial regulations, for example—which account for 70 percent of the total regulatory costs, is not based on actual cost estimates. Instead, this estimate is based on the results of public opinion polling concerning the business climate of countries that has been collected in a World Bank report. The authors of the World Bank report warn that its results should not be used for exactly the type of extrapolations made by Crain and Crain, because their underlying data are too crude. Crain and Crain nevertheless enter the World Bank data into a formula, which they appear to have created out of whole cloth, that purports to describe a relationship between a country’s regulatory stringency and its Gross Domestic Product (GDP). OMB has repeatedly warned against

---

* While comparing costs and benefits is beyond the scope of this paper, it is notable that the 2009 OMB report found that total regulatory benefits are far larger than total regulatory costs. See infra endnote 4 and supra accompanying text. This finding refers to total aggregate net benefits, which means that some individual regulations may not have benefits that exceed costs. But, this result usually arises from the difficulty of monetizing regulatory benefits, rather than the lack of actual benefits. See comments cited infra endnote 7; see also Rena Steinzor et al., *A Return to Common Sense: Protecting Health, Safety, and the Environment Through “Pragmatic Regulatory Impact Analysis”* (Ctr. for Progressive Reform, White Paper 909, 2009), available at http://www.progressivereform.org/articles/PRIA_909.pdf; John Applegate et al., *Reinvigorating Protection of Health, Safety, and the Environment: The Choices Facing Cass Sunstein* (Ctr. for Progressive Reform, White Paper 901, 2009), available at http://www.progressivereform.org/articles/SunsteinOIRA901.pdf; Frank Ackerman et al., *Applying Cost Benefit Analysis to Past Decisions: Was Protecting the Environment Ever a Good Idea?* (Ctr. for Progressive Reform, White Paper 401, 2004), available at http://www.progressivereform.org/articles/Wrong_401.pdf.
trying to reduce the complex relationship between these two concepts to such simplistic
terms, yet this is precisely what Crain and Crain do.

- **Opaque calculations.** Contrary to academic and government norms, Crain and Crain do
not reveal their data or show the calculations they used to arrive at their cost estimates.
Neither is the information available from the SBA Office of Advocacy. Moreover, Crain
and Crain declined to furnish their data to CPR despite several requests. As a result, it is
impossible to replicate their results, a flaw so significant it would prevent the publication
of their paper in any respectable academic journal.

- **Slanted methodology.** The Crain and Crain report suffers from several methodological
problems, all of which tilt the results towards an overstatement of regulatory costs. These
problems are itemized and explained further below.

- **Overstated costs.** To estimate the cost of non-economic regulation, Crain and Crain
almost always used the agency estimates of such costs that were submitted to OMB.
Although OMB presents these costs as a range, Crain and Crain always used the upper
bound estimate, effectively eliminating the agencies’ careful efforts to draw attention to
the uncertainties in these calculations. Moreover, cost estimates are typically based on
industry data, and regulated entities have a strong incentive to overstate costs in this
circumstance. As discussed below, empirical studies have shown that such estimates are
usually too high.

- **Peer review rendered meaningless.** The peer review process used by the SBA Office of
Advocacy does not support the reliability of the report. Only two people examined the
document. The authors ignored a significant criticism raised by one of the two reviewers
concerning their estimate of economic regulatory costs. As for the second person, the
entire review consisted of the following comments: “I looked it over and it's terrific,
nothing to add. Congrats[.]”

For the reasons that follow, we conclude that the Crain and Crain report is sufficiently flawed
that it does not come close to justifying regulatory reform efforts, such as the REINS Act,†
which seek to limit protection of people and the environment. If Crain and Crain had used a more
straightforward and generally accepted methodology, they likely would have reached a figure
that was several orders of magnitude smaller. And, if Crain and Crain had properly considered
regulatory benefits, they likely would have found that regulation is a net economic plus for
society. Such findings, however, would not comport with the political agenda of the SBA’s
Office of Advocacy or of the opponents of regulation in general.

---

† Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act, H.R. 10, 112th Cong. (2011). Under this bill,
no new “economically significant” regulations would take effect unless Congress affirmatively approved the
regulation within 90 days of receiving it, by means of a joint congressional resolution of approval, signed by the
President. For more information on the REINS Act, see Sidney Shapiro, The REINS Act: The Conservative Push to
Undercut Regulatory Protections for Health, Safety, and the Environment (Ctr. for Progressive Reform,
Backgrounder, 2011), available at
The Crain and Crain Report’s Methodology

The Crain and Crain report purports to provide a complete accounting of all regulatory costs. It divides the regulatory universe into four categories: economic regulations; environmental regulations; tax compliance regulations; and occupational health and safety and homeland security regulations. Notably, the report never provides a clear definition of the term “regulation,” nor does it provide clear definitions of each of the four regulatory categories. Next, the authors employ different methodologies to calculate the total costs of regulation in each category. Finally, they add up the costs of regulation for each category to derive a total cost of federal regulations.

The report provides only a part of the data, equations, assumptions, extrapolations, and calculations that would be necessary for replicating the report’s results. The authors of this white paper made several attempts to obtain the missing additional materials from the authors of the Crain and Crain report, as well as from the SBA Office of Advocacy, which funded the report, so that we could fully understand and verify the methodologies, data, and assumptions that were employed. The authors of the Crain and Crain report provided us with only very general responses and have given no indication that they would furnish us with the missing information.

Remarkably, a staff member at the SBA Office of Advocacy explained that his office did not have access to any of the additional materials, since it had only contracted to receive the final report from the authors. Thus, the SBA Office of Advocacy entered into an agreement with Crain and Crain to spend taxpayer money on a report whose findings it could not then have verified in any significant way—not even checking the arithmetic.

Because this underlying information is unavailable, the Crain and Crain report is a political document, rather than an academic study. No academic author would submit such a study for publication without revealing the data and calculations on which the scholar relied. No academic publication would accept such a study unless such information was released. Academic reports also acknowledge and discuss potential weaknesses in their calculations, a modesty that is absent from the Crain and Crain report.

Methodological Problems

Economic Regulation Costs

To calculate the total cost of economic regulations, Crain and Crain employ a regression analysis that purports to establish a correlation between a country’s score on the World Bank’s “Regulatory Quality Index” (RQI) and the size of the country’s economic activity, as measured by GDP per capita. According to the World Bank report, the RQI seeks to measure public “perceptions of the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations that permit and promote private sector development.”

‡ If the SBA Office of Advocacy contracts to have similar reports performed in the future, we strongly urge it to obtain all the data, equations, assumptions, extrapolations, and calculations as part of the contract, and to make these materials readily available in a useable format on its website.
interpreted the RQI as measuring how friendly a country is to business interests. The World Bank researchers did not intend for the RQI to be used as a proxy measure for regulatory burden or as a tool for critiquing a particular country’s regulatory stringency. Nevertheless, Crain and Crain use the RQI in precisely this fashion.

As the World Bank report explains, the RQI is based on public opinion polling, not quantitative data. It is derived from a composite of 35 opinion surveys that asked questions about the regulatory climate of approximately 200 countries. Given its subjective origins, the World Bank researchers responsible for the RQI designed it with a few limited applications in mind—namely, to make meaningful cross-country comparisons as well as to monitor a single country’s progress over time. At the same time, these researchers strongly caution against using the RQI for developing specific policy prescriptions in particular countries.

Crain and Crain provide no justification defending their use of the RQI to estimate regulatory costs, nor do they ever acknowledge the myriad theoretical or empirical problems with calculating such costs based on public opinion polling. Significantly, one of the peer reviewers of the Crain and Crain report raised this objection, stating “I am concerned that the index may not measure what the authors say it measures, and even if it does, it may overstate the costs of regulation when used in conjunction with the other measures.” The authors do not appear to have revised the report in response to this comment.

As noted above, the Crain and Crain report uses the RQI, which the authors have converted into a proxy measure for a country’s regulatory stringency, as the main variable in their formula for calculating the cost of a country’s economic regulations—that is, the supposed reduction in that country’s GDP caused by the regulations. The authors do not explain how they devised this formula, nor do they provide any of the underlying data, calculations, and assumptions that they used to devise it. Consequently, no one can verify whether or not the formula provides a reasonable model of reality, nor can anyone verify their calculations.

Using this formula, Crain and Crain calculate the loss in GDP the United States suffers because of economic regulation. It is unclear whether Crain and Crain calculate the loss in GDP as compared to the country with the highest RQI score or whether they calculate the loss in GDP attributed to all regulation. The latter baseline would reflect the GDP in a hypothetical United States that had no economic regulations. Whichever baseline they use, Crain and Crain thus conclude that the cost of economic regulations in the United States in 2008 was $1.236 trillion, “as reflected in lost GDP.”

Crain and Crain do not clearly define the category of “economic regulations,” other than to note it is broadly inclusive. The lack of a clear definition opens up the possibility that the category of “economic regulations” also includes the other categories of regulations identified by Crain and Crain. If, for example, this category includes some environmental regulation costs, those costs are also the subject of a separate calculation in the report. This would mean that some of

---

§ The report indicates that the category of economic regulations is broad enough to include “a wide range of restrictions and incentives that affect the way businesses operate—what products and services they produce, how and where they produce them, and how products and services are priced and marketed to consumers.” Crain & Crain, infra endnote 1, at 17.
these regulation costs would be counted twice (once as an economic regulation and once as an environmental regulation), leading to an exaggeration of total regulation costs. Some of the polling data used by the authors of the World Bank study in the calculation of the RQI asks questions of environmental and safety regulations, although the majority of the questions are about tax and price control regulations, trade barriers, access to capital, and regulatory barriers to starting a new business.**

One other significant problem in this category of costs is that the regression analysis used in the report assumes an overly simplistic relationship between regulatory stringency and GDP. As noted above, the Crain and Crain report’s formula implies that increases in regulatory stringency cause a reduction in a country’s economic activity, which are reflected in a decreased GDP. The actual relationship between regulatory stringency and a country’s economic activity is not so clear-cut, however, because measurements of GDP do not include regulatory benefits. On this subject, the 2009 OMB report to Congress notes:

> The relationship between regulation and indicators of economic activity raises a number of complex questions, conceptual, empirical, and normative. A key issue involves identification of the appropriate measures. For example, is GDP the appropriate measure? As we have seen, many regulations have favorable net benefits, and by hypothesis, such regulations are desirable on standard economic grounds. Of course it would be useful to understand the effects on GDP of particular regulations and of classes of regulations. But while important, GDP is hardly a complete measure of relevant values, and some of the benefits of regulation, such as environmental protection, are not adequately captured by changes in GDP.  

Finally, the report’s use of the RQI is misleading because it gives the false impression that the U.S. regulatory burden is especially high. In fact, the United States has one of the highest RQI scores, ranking eleventh out of more than 200 countries. The United States ranks higher than many of its competitive trading partners, including China, Germany, Japan, Mexico, South Korea, and Taiwan, and its RQI score has remained fairly constant since 1996, when these scores were first developed. But Crain and Crain’s use of the RQI, and the SBA’s use of the Crain and Crain report, imply that the U.S. is inferior to these other countries as an excellent place to do business.

**Environmental Regulation Costs**

To calculate the costs of environmental regulations, the Crain and Crain report adds up the estimated costs of environmental regulations found in each of OMB’s annual reports to Congress on cost-benefit analysis since 2001. These estimates in turn are based on aggregation of the

---

**The World Bank study relied on 35 different sources of global or regional surveys, produced by 33 different organizations. Only 16 of the sources had any measure of regulation at all. Only one specifically mentioned environmental regulations (the World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness Survey). Only 2 of the 35 sources mentioned labor market policy: the African Development Bank (not relevant to the US) and the Institute for Management Development World Competitiveness Yearbook. Neither of these two said which labor market issues they measured, and there was no mention of safety and health by them. See Kaufmann et al., infra endnote 11, at 29 (Table 1), 39-71 (App. A).**
cost-benefit analyses that EPA produced when developing the regulations. Based on this data, Crain and Crain find that the total cost of environmental regulations in 2008 was $281 billion, which is 16 percent of the total regulatory costs according to their estimate of total costs.

To generate cost estimates for its cost-benefit analyses, EPA primarily relies on surveys of representative companies that the regulation will likely affect. Because companies know the purpose of the surveys, they have a strong incentive to overstate costs in order to skew the final cost-benefit analysis toward weaker regulatory standards. Agencies must also fill in any data gaps they encounter by making various assumptions. Due to fear of litigation over the regulation, they tend to adopt conservative assumptions about regulatory costs, such that the cost assessment ends up reflecting the maximum possible cost, rather than the mean.

Industry cost estimates—and therefore the cost estimates that EPA develops—do not account for technological innovations that reduce the cost of compliance and produce non-regulatory co-benefits, such as increased productivity. When companies are asked to predict which technology they will employ to comply with a particular environmental regulation, they often will point to the most expensive existing “off-the-shelf” technology available. Once the regulation actually goes into effect, however, companies have a strong incentive to invent or purchase less costly technologies to come into regulatory compliance. As a result, compliance costs tend to be less, and often much less, than the predicted costs. Moreover, the technological innovations tend to produce co-benefits unrelated to the regulation—such as increased productivity and efficiency—that the company strives to achieve in any event. Given these co-benefits, only a portion of the innovative technology’s costs can fairly be counted as compliance costs.

As the following chart indicates, retrospective studies of regulatory costs find that the initial cost estimates are often too high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Subject of Cost Estimates</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHB, 1980</td>
<td>Sector level capital expenditures for pollution controls</td>
<td>EPA overestimated capital costs more than it underestimated them, with forecasts ranging 26 to 126% above reported expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTA, 1995</td>
<td>Total, annual, or capital expenditures for occupational safety &amp; health regulations</td>
<td>OSHA overestimated costs for 4 of 5 health regulations, with forecasts ranging from $5.4 million to $722 million above reported expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodstein &amp; Hedges, 1997</td>
<td>Various measures of cost for pollution prevention</td>
<td>Agency and industry overestimated costs for 24 of 24 OSHA &amp; EPA regulations, by at least 30% and generally by more than 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for the Future, 1999</td>
<td>Various measures of cost for environmental regulations</td>
<td>Agency overestimated costs for 12 of 25 rules, and underestimated costs for 2 rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, unlike the OMB reports, which present regulatory costs as a range, Crain and Crain always adopt the upper end of the range for inclusion in their calculations. The authors justify this move by claiming that agencies allegedly have a strong incentive to underestimate regulatory costs, although they provide no empirical evidence to support this claim. In fact, as just explained, it is likely that regulatory costs are overstated. In any case, the choice by Crain and Crain to always take the higher bound estimate, rather than presenting their results as a range of costs, as OMB does, is a misleading use of the OMB data.

Agencies were not required by Executive Order to provide OMB with estimates of regulatory costs and benefits prior to 1988. For this reason, OMB had to rely on non-government estimates in order to estimate regulatory benefits and costs prior to 2000. For environmental regulations issued before 1988, the 2001 OMB report relied on a 1991 study of regulatory costs undertaken by economists Robert Hahn and John Hird. Hahn and Hird performed no new calculations of regulatory costs, but instead they generated an estimate by synthesizing a set of earlier studies of regulatory costs conducted by a small circle of conservative economists. These estimates are subject to the same limitations as agency-produced cost analyses, including relying on industry-estimates of compliance costs and failing to account for innovation. An additional problem is that the Hahn and Hird study is nearly 20 years old, and many of the earlier studies and data it relies upon are more than 30 years old. The data and assumptions reflected in the Hahn and Hird study cannot be reasonably extrapolated to modern social and economic reality.

Occupational Safety and Health and Homeland Security Regulation Costs

The Crain and Crain report concludes that the total cost of occupational safety and health and homeland security regulations in 2008 was $75 billion, which is four percent of their total costs. Occupational safety and health regulations accounted for $65 billion of the total.

Occupational Safety and Health Regulation Costs

To calculate the occupational safety and health regulations, the Crain and Crain report relies on two sources. The first source, a 2005 study by Joseph Johnson, provides the total costs of all occupational safety and health regulations issued before 2001. The second source, the 2009

†† In addition, many of these earlier studies assume a regulatory baseline of zero for their comparisons of regulatory costs. In other words, these studies assume that in the absence of the regulations under examination, companies would have taken no environmentally protective actions. This assumption has no basis in a reality where other existing regulations (federal, state, and local), fear of tort liability, and simple market forces induce companies to take some minimal level of environmentally protective action all the time. This minimal level of actions represents the proper baseline against which regulatory costs should be measured. To the extent that these earlier studies assume a zero baseline, they grossly overestimate regulatory costs. McGarity & Ruttenberg, infra endnote 24, at 2047.

‡‡ In the intervening years, the U.S. economy and society have drastically changed. For example, scientific knowledge regarding the harmful public health and environmental effects of pollution has greatly improved, the U.S. has shifted from an industrial sector-based economy to a service sector-based one, and even industry has become characterized by more automation and less human labor. See Ian D. Wyatt & Daniel E. Hecker, Occupational Changes During the 20th Century, MONTHLY LABOR REV., March 2006.
OMB report to Congress, provides the total cost of all occupational safety and health regulation issued since 2001.

The cost estimate from the 2009 OMB report to Congress is based on a simple aggregation of the cost-benefit analyses that OSHA produced when developing these regulations. As discussed above, the cost assessments generated as part of these cost-benefit analyses greatly overstate the costs of regulations, since the agencies that produce them rely on industry for estimates of compliance costs, adopt conservative assumptions to fill in data gaps, and fail to account for innovation.

The Johnson study likewise suffers from several flaws, leading it to overestimate these regulatory costs. The study begins by aggregating the agency-produced cost-benefit analyses for all of OSHA rules issued before 2001. As just noted, these costs estimates are overstated. Nevertheless, the Johnson study then inflates OSHA’s cost estimates by multiplying the total of all of the estimates by 5.5. According to Johnson, using the multiplier is necessary to account for the costs of all of OSHA’s non-major regulations—since OSHA does not perform cost-benefit analyses for these regulations—and for fines levied for violations of any OSHA standards. In other words, the Johnson study assumes that for every dollar industry spends on compliance with OSHA’s major rules, it spends $5.50 on compliance with non-major regulations and on fines for violations of existing OSHA standards.

We see no justification for counting the fines that companies pay for violating regulatory standards as regulatory costs. Instead, these are the costs of choosing to break the law. That is, the fines would never have occurred if the firms had not chosen to disobey the law. Under this logic, mass lawbreaking raises regulatory costs, enabling regulatory opponents to argue that we need to reduce regulation because of these high regulatory costs.

The Johnson study took the multiplier of 5.5 from a 1996 study by Harvey James. The James study uses an unpublished and otherwise unavailable 1974 estimate prepared by the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) of the per-firm cost of compliance with OSHA regulations. Because the report is unavailable, it cannot be checked for accuracy. As we related earlier, industry estimates of regulatory costs are suspect because of the political incentive to inflate such costs. Nevertheless, the Crain and Crain report incorporate the Johnson study without any discussion of this significant limitation in the data.

**Homeland Security Regulation Costs**

To calculate the cost of all homeland security regulations, the Crain and Crain report again relies on the 2009 OMB report to Congress, which is based on the cost-benefit analyses that the Department of Homeland Security produced when developing its regulations. The cost assessments provided in these cost-benefit analyses are overstated for all the reasons stated above: industry-supplied estimates of compliance estimates; conservative assumptions to fill in data gaps; and failure to account for innovation.
Tax Compliance Regulation Costs

To calculate the cost of tax compliance regulations, the Crain and Crain report starts with estimates of the time that businesses, non-profit organizations, and individuals spend each year completing tax-related forms and filings, and multiplies it by an estimate of the hourly cost of filling out the forms. Using this methodology, the Crain and Crain report concludes that the total cost of tax compliance regulations in 2008 was $160 billion, which is about nine percent of their total costs.

The report says it derives its estimates of the time it takes to fill out tax forms from the Internal Revenue Service and the Tax Foundation, a conservative-leaning non-profit organization. However, they do not explain which data they use or how those data contribute to their estimate. To the extent that data from the Tax Foundation are used, the report’s estimate of the amount of time spent on tax compliance should be viewed with caution since the Tax Foundation tends to be “anti-tax” in orientation.

The authors calculate tax compliance costs for businesses separately from individuals and non-profit organizations, using the reasonable assumption that businesses spend more money per hour complying with tax regulations. Crain and Crain assume that all businesses rely on “Human Resources professionals” to prepare their taxes, but they provide no evidence to justify this assumption. They nevertheless multiply estimates of the amount of time it takes to fill out the tax forms by $49.77 per hour (“the hourly compensation rate for Human Resources professionals”) on tax compliance. The report then appears to assume that all individuals and non-profit organizations have their taxes prepared by accountants or auditors, and it estimates that these entities spend $31.53 per hour (“the average hourly wage rate for accountant and auditors”) on tax compliance. With respect to individuals, this assumption seems particularly unfounded given that millions of American households prepare their own taxes.

Conclusion

The Crain and Crain study is rife with flawed methodologies and questionable data and assumptions. Of even greater importance, each of the problems with the Crain and Crain report’s methodologies, data, and assumptions lead to an overstatement of regulatory costs. Because of these problems with the Crain and Crain report’s reliability, we believe policymakers should disregard its misleading conclusions as they consider matters of regulatory policy.
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41 CRAIN & CRAIN, supra endnote 1, at 31.
43 CRAIN & CRAIN, supra endnote 1, at 29 (2009 dollars).
44 Id. at 28.
45 Id. at 29.
46 Id. at 29.
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