

1. a. Yes on both counts.
b. As current policy makes it cheaper to buy a smartphone than access some of the regulations in question, most libraries offer internet access to members, and the number of people without any kind of internet access is very small to begin with, the point seems moot, but for the person who both wants this information and doesn't have access to the easiest way to get information there's no requirement to stop offering paper laws.
2. Yes, the class of persons affected should be anyone who wants to know, with no further restrictions. If a college student decides to write a paper on safety standards, they are affected by those laws. If dolphins figure out how to ask what building codes Sea World is subject to, their trainers should be able to look up that information. Besides, determining which people are worth allowing in is much more complicated than just letting everyone see it.
3. Making an account on Blogger isn't particularly expensive, nor is putting something on the relevant wiki. Those kinds of things can be done by an intern during his or her lunch break. There are plenty of services dedicated to making it easy to put walls of text on the internet; the agencies in question shouldn't need to host the content themselves, as long as it's publically accessible. There might be costs involved if an old law hasn't yet been digitized, and those costs should be shouldered by the agencies, because internal inefficiency is their own fault.
4. They'd no longer be able to require payment to view the laws they've drafted, and they'd need to either have an internet connection or have an intern to send to Starbucks whenever a new law was finalized.
5. Putting text online isn't a huge imposition. I'm doing it now. There's no reason that having to do so will significantly lengthen the approval process or negatively affect the regulations in question.
6. Of course. There's no reason to require that something be made available online if it can still be approved without being available online.
7. Given what some seem to consider innovative or transparent, I'm not confident that anything other than outright regulation is likely to get those laws online any time soon.
8. Reasonable availability is if I can Google something and find it. If you feel that the Office of Management and Budget is better suited to the task of using a search engine, I wouldn't object to their inclusion in the process.
9. The review period would be extended by the amount of time it takes them to send you a link, and you to click on it and see if the link contains the proposed rule. Any additional time spent on the process of verifying that something is on the internet is wasted. [This link](#) demonstrates all the necessary steps of the process.