

DOGE
Department of Government Efficiency

DOGE

Deregulation Opportunity

July 1, 2025



THE PROBLEM

Overregulation is Costing America \$Trillions Annually

\$3.1 Trillion

Compliance cost/year
representing 12% of GDP

**NAM Crain Study of 2023*

\$1.2 Trillion

Reduced investment
regulations estimated to lower
external investment by \$650B,
and lower corp reinvestment
by \$550B

\$2.2 Trillion

Lower Sales Revenue
Estimated to be \$1.98 Trillion in
lost US Sales and \$220 Billion
in lower exports

\$175B

Higher Fed Costs
Excess Regulations - an
estimated \$100-\$250 Billion in
costs to manage and control

THE OPPORTUNITY

50% of All Federal Regulations Can Be Eliminated -
Yielding Potential \$3.3T Per Annum Value Opportunity

\$1.5 Trillion

Compliance Saving/Year

\$600 Billion

Unlocked Investment

\$1.1 Trillion

Revenue Potential

\$85 Billion

Fed Budget Reduction

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

*100,000 Regulatory Sections
of the 200,000+ can be deleted

**Source: DOGE AI Solution*

Not Statutorily
Required

50%

38%

Statutorily
Required

12%

Not Required but
Agency Needs

THE CHALLENGE

Deregulating Today Involves Significant Man Hours

Average Hours Required Per Regulatory Section



Key Finding: 3.6 million man-hours to deregulate 100,000 sections

THE SOLUTION

DOGE AI Program Saves 93% of Man Hours

How Does it Work?

- Creates a regulation/statute database, and determines which regulations are required
- Enables agencies to comment and modify to result in a final delete list

Automatically drafts all submission documents for attorneys to edit

Automatically analyzes 20 to 500,000 citizen comments for Final Rule inclusion

CASE STUDIES & VETTING

Case Studies with DOGE AI Deregulation Decision Tool

1. CFPB – 100% of Deregulations Written Using the Tool
2. HUD Policy Team Completed Decisions on **1,083 Regulatory Sections in Two Weeks**
3. Vetted and Endorsed by DOGE Lawyers: Austin Reynor, James Burnham, Jacob Altic, and Ashley Boizelle

ASK: RELAUNCH AMERICA ON JAN 20, 2026

Set Sept 1 Goal for All Agencies to Complete the DOGE AI Deregulation List

1. Every agency can do it in less than four weeks with existing staff
2. From this – DOGE will roll-up a delete list of 50% of all Federal Regulations (100k Regulatory Rules)
3. Sets in Motion the Acceleration Moving Deregulations through the Process with Automation

Appendix

Selection from the AI Results: Is the Regulation Statutorily Required

Section Content Summary	Core Statutory Provisions	Statutorily Required?	Statutorily Required Explanation	Program Group Response to 'Statutorily Required'	Program Group Statutorily Required Explanation
<p>This regulatory section establishes procedures for raising and considering price squeeze issues in wholesale electric rate proceedings before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. It outlines the elements of a prima facie case for price discrimination, data request protocols, and the burden of proof, to implement the Supreme Court's decision in <i>F.P.C. v. Conway Corp.</i></p>	<p>Federal Power Act, section 205(e), 42 U.S.C. § 7172(a)(1)(A), 16 U.S.C. § 2601 (2)</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Rulemaking is mandated because this section implements the Supreme Court's decision in <i>F.P.C. v. Conway Corp.</i>, which affirmed the Commission's authority under the Federal Power Act (FPA) to consider price squeeze allegations. The Conway decision, while affirming jurisdiction, did not prescribe specific procedures. Therefore, regulations establishing a procedural framework—including elements of a prima facie case (§ 2.17(a)), data exchange (§ 2.17(b)-(d)), and application of the burden of proof (§ 2.17(e))—are strictly implicitly necessary to operationalize the Commission's statutory duties under the FPA as interpreted by Conway, ensuring consistent and efficient resolution of complex price squeeze issues.</p>		

Selection from the AI Results: Can Part of the Statute be Eliminated

Non Compliant Subclauses	Non Compliant Text	Non Compliant Explanation (based on Loper Bright + EO14219)
§ 2.17(e), § 2.17(a)(4), § 2.17(a)(5)	<p>1. § 2.17(e) “The burden of proof (i.e. the risk of nonpersuasion) to rebut the allegations of price squeeze and to justify the proposed rates are on the utility proposing the rates under section 205(e) of the Federal Power Act.”</p> <p>2. § 2.17(a)(4) “The wholesale customer’s prospective rate for comparable retail service, i.e. the rate necessary to recover bulk power costs (at the proposed wholesale rate) and distribution costs;”</p> <p>3. § 2.17(a)(5) “An indication of the reduction in the wholesale rate necessary to eliminate the price squeeze alleged.”</p>	<p>[§ 2.17(e)] [Criterion 8] This subsection states that the burden of proof to rebut price squeeze allegations and justify proposed rates is on the utility, citing section 205(e) of the Federal Power Act as authority. Section 205(e) of the Federal Power Act (analogous to section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. §717 c(e)) generally places the burden on the utility to show that any increased rate or charge is just and reasonable. If, as is highly probable, FPA section 205(e) already clearly establishes this burden of proof on the utility in any proceeding involving its proposed rates, then § 2.17(e) merely restates this statutory mandate without adding substantive clarification, interpretation, or implementation detail specifically necessary for the price squeeze context that wouldn’t already be apparent from the statute itself. Therefore, it is redundant.</p> <p>[2.17(a)(4)] [CREATION OF LEGAL TEST/FRAMEWORK] Criterion 1, Criterion 7: This clause, requiring a wholesale customer at the prima facie stage to specify its ‘prospective rate for comparable retail service, i.e. the rate necessary to recover bulk power costs (at the proposed wholesale rate) and distribution costs,’ exceeds the reasonable scope necessary to implement the mandate from F.P.F. v. Conway Corp. to consider price squeeze allegations. It imposes a significant and complex analytical burden, akin to a mini-rate case, on the intervenor merely to have its price squeeze allegation considered. This level of detail is not reasonably necessary for an initial showing and may unduly burden smaller wholesale customers (Criterion 7) by creating a high barrier to entry for raising legitimate claims, thereby going beyond the scope of simply operationalizing the Conway mandate (Criterion 1).</p> <p>[2.17 (a)(5)] [CREATION OF LEGAL TEST/FRAMEWORK] Criterion 1, Criterion 7: This clause, requiring ‘an indication of the reduction in the wholesale rate necessary to eliminate the price squeeze alleged’ as part of a prima facie case, exceeds the reasonable scope necessary to implement the mandate from F.P.C. v. Conway Corp. It compels the intervenor to propose a specific remedy before full discovery or development of the record. Determining the precise rate reduction needed to eliminate a price squeeze is a complex task that typically follows a finding of a price squeeze, not as a prerequisite to alleging one. This requirement places a premature and potentially heavy analytical burden on intervenors, especially smaller entities (Criterion 7), and is not reasonably necessary to simply trigger Commission consideration of a price squeeze allegation (Criterion 1).</p>

CAPABILITY

The DOGE AI Solution Increases Output by 15X

De-Regulation Average Time Required Per Regulatory Section



Policy and Legal Teams Make All The Decisions - Focus on Editing

TIMELINE

50% of All Regulations Eliminated is an Audacious Goal that Requires Only the Will to Prioritize It



The 50% deregulation goal is clearly within reach with the DOGE AI Solution

- The hours required are available within the existing staff at each agency