United States
Environmental Protection
Agency

Office of Water/WH-556
Washington, DC 20460

March 1991

EPA

A Guide to the Office of Water Accountability System and Regional Evaluations

Fiscal Year 1992

A GUIDE TO THE OFFICE OF WATER ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM AND REGIONAL EVALUATIONS

FY 1992

OFFICE OF WATER
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

In FY 1992, the Office of Water will continue to conduct evaluations of Regional water programs. The purpose of these reviews is to assess Regional success at achieving National program objectives for the year, and to help ensure National consistency in implementation of Federal laws and regulations.

This guide contains the accountability measures that the Office of Water will use to monitor Regional performance in FY 1992. The guide should be used in conjunction with the Agency's FY 1992 Operating Guidance, which sets forth the National objectives for water programs.

II. THE OFFICE OF WATER ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

The Office of Water Accountability System (OWAS) consists of a set of qualitative and quantitative measures that provide the basis for evaluating Regional Office performance against National program objectives. The measures in the system include all measures included in the Agency's Strategic Targeted Activities for Results System (STARS) as well as additional qualitative and quantitative measures which are needed to evaluate fully performance against the Office of Water's FY 1992 National program objectives. In general, the measures from the STARS relate to selected areas of the Agency's Priority List and are among the highest priority program activities. They are not intended to provide a comprehensive picture of every program area and are supplemented by the additional measures contained in this guide.

The following is a brief description of the accountability system, which is presented fully in Appendices A and B.

A. Appendix A: The Measures

Appendix A presents the measures which comprise the OWAS. The Appendix is organized by major program theme. For FY 1992, an introductory narrative has been added at the beginning of each program theme to highlight the major points. The charts contain the following categories of information:

Program Areas: Within each theme these are the high priority areas for which performance measures are proposed. The Office of Water does not expect the Regions to address every area. Rather, each Region should identify its key program areas, and should focus on those activities that are relevant to its particular circumstances. At the time of the Regional evaluations, however, the Region will be asked to identify the activity areas that are not considered to be priorities and to explain how the Region arrived at its decision.

Reporting Measures: The reporting measures are designed to generate the key data and information that the Office of Water needs to evaluate Regional progress towards achieving National program objectives. There are two kinds of reporting measures:

II. THE OFFICE OF WATER ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

- Qualitative measures are the specific questions that Regions are expected to address during the Office of Water Regional evaluations. The measures relate primarily to program accomplishments and effectiveness, and generally do not involve pre-negotiated commitments.

- Quantitative measures provide the kinds of information that the Office of Water needs for program management and reporting purposes and for responding to Congressional inquiries. These measures include all measures included in the STARS, as well as some that are unique to the OWAS. A number of these measures involve pre-negotiated commitments with the Regions (see Section below).

In STARS/Commitments: This column refers to the quantitative measures only. It designates (1) those measures that appear in the FY 1992 STARS and (2) those measures involving a pre-negotiated commitment between the Office of Water and the Regions. "Yes" as the first entry in this column indicates that the measure also appears in STARS; if not, the word "No" appears. A pre-negotiated commitment may exist for measures which appear either in the Agency's STARS or in the OWAS only. "STARS" as the second entry in this column indicates a pre-negotiated commitment under STARS; "OWAS" indicates a pre-negotiated commitment under OW's accountability system; "No" indicates that no commitment is involved, and the measure is solely for reporting purposes.

Reporting Frequency/Sunset Date: This column indicates the planned reporting schedule and sunset date for quantitative measures.

The measures in the accountability system will provide the Office of Water with much of the information necessary to monitor Regional performance in water programs. The accountability system is not intended to provide all information that the Office of Water needs during the year, nor to limit the kinds of information that Regions may need for oversight of State water programs. As part of its oversight function, the Region is expected to gather the basic information to prepare its Regional self evaluation and to participate effectively in the Office of Water Regional

evaluations. However, Regions may seek additional information from States through program audits or other activities, and may choose to evaluate State management of water program activities that are not covered in the Agency Operating Guidance or the OWAS.

B. Appendix B: The Definitions

Appendix B contains detailed, technical information that more clearly defines some of the quantitative measures contained in Appendix A. These definitions explain the manner in which the Region is expected to report the required information to the Office of Water. For some measures, they also establish a specific target level of performance that each Region is expected to achieve during the quarter/fiscal year, and explain how the Office of Water plans to evaluate performance in these areas.

The following is a brief description of the ways in which the Office of Water plans to collect information and to evaluate Regional performance.

A. Pre-negotiated Commitments and Quarterly Reporting

Many quantitative measures in the accountability system require pre-negotiated commitments. The commitment setting process will be carried out in conjunction with that of the STARS and will follow the same schedule. In July and August of 1991, the Office of Water programs negotiate with the Regions to set specific target levels of activity for the quantitative measures in the accountability system. The Regions and the Office of Water use the following process to reach agreement on all pre-negotiated commitments.

- Program offices will negotiate commitments based on the quantitative measures in the FY 1992 accountability system; the Assistant Administrator must personally approve any requests for pre-negotiated commitments beyond those included in the final FY 1992 system.

- Program Office Directors will initiate the original data requests which will be addressed to the Regional Water Management Division Directors.

II. THE OFFICE OF WATER ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

- Program office data requests will identify significant program assumptions, reporting frequency, and reporting mode; each data requests should cross-reference the pertinent measure in the FY 1992 OWAS.

- Program offices will negotiate commitments based on specific target levels of performance that take workload and output projections into account. Negotiations will start from zero based, with Regions developing the initial commitment levels; the program offices will analyze the Regions' output estimates to assure that they are consistent with performance expectations, and will accept the Region's estimates unless there is practical evidence or other valid reason to suggest that an alternative output estimate is more appropriate. Several measures include commitments from States. In these instances, Regions will negotiate commitments with their States to support national priorities and performance expectations and submit State commitments to the program offices.

- Once staff level negotiations are complete, the Assistant Administrator will certify agreed upon commitments for those measures included in the STARS to the Office of Strategic Planning and Management Systems Division (SPMD). Regional Administrators will also be asked to certify the STARS commitments to SPMD. The Assistant Administrator will send the commitments for those measures included only in the OWAS to the Water Management Division Director for verification and request that the Region confirm the commitments to the Assistant Administrator through the Regional Administrator.

SPMD will provide specific instructions on the schedule to be followed in submitting STARS commitments. Briefly, both the Regional Administrators and the Office of Water will be required to submit STARS commitments, and any disagreements between the Regions and the Office of Water are to be discussed personally between the Assistant Administrator and the Regional Administrator. Then any differences that remain unresolved are to be mediated by SPMD or OECM and, if necessary, ultimately resolved by the Deputy Administrator.

STARS quarterly reports are completed by the Office of Water on the fifteenth day after the quarter's end. Copies of these reports are available to the Regions through the computerized system maintained by SPMD. To meet the reporting deadline, each

program office works with the Regions to obtain the requisite information, generally within 10 days after the quarter's end. The program office will establish pull dates for the information which will form the basis of the report. These pull dates are sent to the Water Management Division Directors and 404 Coordinators (Regions III, VI, and VII) on an annual basis prior to the end of the first quarter, and any changes are provided prior to the end of the quarter in which they are effective.

III. THE OFFICE OF WATER EVALUATION SYSTEM

B. Regional Initiatives

Each Region may propose to the Office of Water for discussion environmental initiatives which the Region would like to carry out in FY 1992. These initiatives should offer specific solutions or approaches for achieving the environmental goals and results outlined in the Office of Water Strategic Plan.

For each initiative that anticipates an adjustment, by mutual agreement, to the commitment for a STARS measure, the Region should describe how such adjustment is expected to improve water quality, and indicate that it lacks the flexibility to pursue the initiative within its operating plan resource levels. We plan to accommodate this new flexibility in our FY 1992 STARS commitment negotiation process.

C. Regional Evaluations

In FY 1989 and FY 1990, in conjunction with the Regions, the Office of Water piloted new approaches to Regional evaluations. Based on those experiences, a revised process will be developed that meets the needs enumerated during the pilot process. Guidance for 1992 Regional evaluations will be issued separately.

D. Other Office of Water Information Collection Activities

While the accountability system and the Regional evaluations will provide the Office of Water with much of the critical information necessary to oversee Regional water programs, these reviews are not intended to provide all the data that program offices need to monitor ongoing activities in the Regions and States and to respond to special requests from the Congress, the Administrator or the Assistant Administrator. Consequently, there will be a need for program offices to collect data and information from the Regions outside the formal accountability system. The Office of Water remains committed to keeping these information requests to a minimum, and to coordinate activities between the program offices to the extent possible.

The following are the main, ongoing information collection activities that the Office of Water anticipates during FY 1992.

- Budget: The Office of Water will ask the Regions to provide the information necessary to prepare the annual budget request. Regions will also participate in the

workload analysis that serves as the basis for distributing resources among the Regions. Regions may also periodically be asked to provide incidental information related to the budget process.

- Data Retrieval: The Office of Water will retrieve quantitative data from existing management information systems, such as the Permits Compliance System (PCS), the Grants Information Control System (GICS), and the Federal Reporting Data System (FRDS).

- Quarterly Reporting: Regions will submit quarterly, semiannual or annual reports to the Office of Water program offices to monitor pre-negotiated commitments and measures without commitments where such data cannot be tracked through National data retrieval systems (see above). The Office of Water will supply the appropriate information for the STARS to SPMD.

- Annual Work Programs/Strategies: The Office of Water will review Regional documents that are submitted on a routine basis, such as the section 106/205(j) work programs, the State section 305(b) reports, and the annual plans and evaluation results from section 205(g) delegation agreements. The Office of Water will also review any Regional and State strategies called for in the FY 1992 OWAS.

- Program Audits: The Office of Water will continue to conduct selected program audits and case studies on an as needed basis to track critical activities. Examples include staff level audits of the construction grants and permits and compliance programs. The program offices will plan and negotiate these essential activities with the Regions, and will conduct these activities jointly to the extent possible.

- Self Evaluation Reports: Regions will submit Regional self evaluations that summarize their progress-to-date as it relates to the Office of Water's National program objectives.

- State Mid-Year Evaluation Reports: Upon request, Regions will submit a copy of the mid-year evaluation report for each State. This report will include findings, follow-up activities, and State comments on the report's findings.

- Regional Initiatives: Regional progress on the initiatives and constraints will be reviewed annually.

The information produced by these activities will be used for ongoing program management purposes, and may also be used to help identify issues and concerns that will be discussed during the Regional evaluations.

APPENDIX A

QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE MEASURES

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

Over the past two decades water quality has improved dramatically, but our success has also brought forth new challenges and unmet needs. In FY 92, the water program will move forward to strengthen our base program, and address new complex issues we face. EPA will continue to ensure that statutory mandates are fulfilled and that national programs maintain an effective enforcement presence to deter violators of environmental protection requirements. EPA will work with States to ensure a high national level of technical expertise and consistent application of national policies.

The major program highlights in this section are:

- Maintaining strong NPDES permitting, enforcement, and pretreatment programs as cornerstones of our regulatory framework.

- Focusing Agency resources on activities which will result in the maximum environmental benefit, including CSO and Storm water permitting, toxic pollutant controls and aggressively enforcing program requirements.

- Continuing a strong regulatory presence in the 404 program as an essential element of wetlands protection activities.

- Continuing the Near Coastal Waters Program focus on enhancing EPA base programs to address the problems being experienced by the Nation's coasts, thus providing the context under which coastal regulatory programs such as 301(h), 403(c), and ocean dumping are integrated.

- Addressing the Underground Injection Control (UIC) program priorities of: ensuring the mechanical integrity of injection wells as a strong measure of pollution prevention, evaluating deep injection wells that dispose of hazardous waste for compliance with RCRA land ban requirements, eliminating the disposal of waste that exceeds maximum contaminant levels into shallow injection wells where the injectated may enter an underground source of drinking water (USDW) and ensuring a timely and appropriate enforcement response to significant noncompliance.

- Reducing risks to public health through the continued implementation and enforcement of new drinking water regulations. The Regions will work with all the States to meet all primacy requirements and effectively implement the new regulations. Where necessary, the Regions will implement the new requirements in the absence of an acceptable State Program.

- Reducing the risks to public health posed by water systems with violations of the NPDWRs by strategically targeting enforcement actions against the most serious violators. States and Regions will focus attention on significant noncompliers, those systems serving the largest populations, and those systems which have been criminally negligent -- such as falsification of monitoring reports.

The following quantitative and qualitative performance measures are designed to be used as the basis to measure our progress in these areas.

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
1. NPDES Permits	(A) Have Region/State expired major permit backlogs increased significantly over the last two years? Has the Region assessed the reasons? How will the Region/States address the problem?	(a) Track, against targets, the number of permits reissued to major facilities during FY 92. (Report NPDES States and non-NPDES States separately.)	Yes/STARS WQ-12	Quarterly FY 93
	(B) Are there major common issues being raised in permit appeals? What are they?	(b) Identify the number of final permits reissued and the number modified during FY 92 that include water quality-based limits for toxics. (Report NPDES and non-NPDES States; majors and minors separately.)	Yes/No WQ-13	Quarterly FY 93

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(C) Which parameters are required to be monitored for sludge? Do monitoring requirements follow recommendations in the Interim Strategy?	(c) List the permits identified in (b) which include water quality based WET limits.	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 93
	(D) Discuss the Region's strategy for achieving authorization of State sludge permitting programs. (E) What action has the Region taken to make sure State delegation agreements are current and accurate?	(d) Track the number of municipal permits reissued/modified to include comprehensive pretreatment implementation requirements, including DSS and PIRT. (NPDES States; non-NPDES States)	No/No	Quarterly FY 93

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		(e) Track number of general permits issued/reissued: --# OCS (NPDES States) --# other than OCS (non-NPDES States)	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 93
		(f) Identify, by Region, the number of pending evidentiary hearing requests and track, by the Region, progress against quarterly targets for evidentiary hearing requests for major permits pending at the beginning of FY 92 resolved by EPA and for the number resolved by NPDES States.	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 93

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		(g) Identify by Region, the number of permits for which EPA has objected to, for which final resolution is pending as of 10/1/91. Report in second and fourth quarters: - number of permits objected to; - number of permits transferred to EPA; - number of permits issued by EPA.	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 93
		(h) Track, against targets, total number of permits issued to priority sludge facilities containing sludge conditions necessary to meet the requirements of CWA Section 405.	Yes/STARS WQ-15	Quarterly FY 93

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		(i) Track total number of permits (NPDES and non-NPDES; major and minor separately) issued containing standard sludge conditions including monitoring.	No/No	Quarterly FY 93
		(j) Track, the number of State program approvals in accordance with established schedules: --full/partial NPDES programs; --pretreatment program; --Federal facility; --general permit authority; --sludge program.	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 93

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		(k) How many assessments of State programs have been preformed? Indicate the program elements evaluated.	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 93
		(l) Track, by Region and NPDES State, the number of baseline general permits issued for industrial stormwater activity.	Yes/No WQ-16	Quarterly FY 93
		(m) Track, by Region and State, the number of Part One stormwater applications submitted for large and medium cities and counties (population greater than 100,000).	Yes/No WQ-17	Quarterly FY 93

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
2. Pretreatment	(A) What is the Region's strategy for targeting additional POTWs for local pretreatment program development? (B) How are Regional/ State oversight activities of POTW programs timed and completed with regard to reissuance of NPDES permit?	(a) Identify the local pretreatment programs requiring approval but not yet approved at the beginning of the fiscal year and distinguish between those newly identified in FY 92 and those previously required. (List separately: non-pretreatment States, approved pretreatment States).	No/No	10/31/91 FY 92
	C) What is the Region/ State strategy for assuring POTWs develop/ implement technically based local limits?	(b) Report the number of EPA and State pretreatment inspections of IUs where EPA or the State is the control authority (Report separately: EPA, State)	No/No	Quarterly FY 92

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		(c) Report, by Region, the number of State pretreatment civil and criminal referrals sent to State Attorneys General and the number of State civil and criminal cases filed.	Yes/STARS WQ/E-10	Quarterly FY 92
		(d) Track, by Region, against quarterly targets, for approved local pretreatment programs: 1) the number audited by EPA and by approved pretreatment States; and 2) the number inspected by EPA and by approved pretreatment States.	Yes/STARS WQ-14	Quarterly FY 92
		(e) Identify the number of POTWs that need to conduct local limits headworks analysis. (unapproved States; approved States)	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 92

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		(f) Identify the number of categorical IUs (CIUs) in nonpretreatment cities (report non-pretreatment States and pretreatment States separately.)	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 92
		(g) Report the percent of significant noncompliance by categorical IUs in non-pretreatment cities where EPA is the control authority and where the State is the control authority.	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 92

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
3. NPDES Enforcement	(A) Have the Region/ States completed and filed enforcement cases against major POTWs? If not, what is delaying action?	(a) Report, by Region and State, the number of major permittees. Of these, track by Region and State the number and percent in SNC.	Yes/STARS WQ/E-4	Quarterly (Data lagged on quarter) FY 94
	(B) Have the Region and approved States negotiated a basis for Regional evaluation of the States penalty program including identification of sanctions which might be used in lieu of penalties and the documentation which must be maintained by	(b) Report, by Region and State, the number of approved pretreatment programs. Of these, track by Region and State the number and percent in SNC.	Yes/STARS WQ/E-5	Quarterly (Data lagged on quarter) FY 94

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	the State for review? Are States complying with provisions of the agreement on penalties? To what extent are States calculating and obtaining economic benefit? Are States seeking penalties in the majority of cases? Are States getting the penalty amounts they are seeking?			
	(D) Have the Region/ States considered use of pollution prevention offsets in settlement agreements? If so, how has this worked? (E) Does each approved State have written EMS procedures? If not, what is being done to get these procedures in place?	(c) Report, by Region, the total number of (a) EPA Administrative Compliance Orders and total number of State equivalent actions issued; of these report the number issued to POTWs for not implementing	Yes/No WQ/E-8	Quarterly FY 94

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		pretreatment; (b) Class I and Class II proposed administrative penalty orders issued by EPA for: --NPDES violations; --pretreatment violations; and (c) Administrative penalty orders issued by States for NPDES violations and pretreatment violations.		
		(d) REFERRALS (1) Report, by Region, the active State civil case docket, the number of civil referrals sent to the State Attorneys General, the number of civil cases filed, the number of civil cases concluded, and the number of criminal referrals filed in State courts.	Yes/No WQ/E-9	Quarterly FY 94

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		(2) Provide the number of 309 referrals generated: --civil referrals sent to HQ/DOJ; --civil referrals filed;	No/No	Quarterly FY 94
		(3) Track by permit name and NPDES number State judicial cases with penalties assessed.	No/No	Quarterly FY 94
		(e) Track, by Region, against targets, the number of major permittees inspected at least once (combine EPA and State inspections and report as one number).	Yes/STARS WQ/E-11	Quarterly FY 94

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		(f) EXCEPTION LIST	Yes/No	Quarterly
		UNIVERSE		
		(1) Identify, by Region and State, the number of major permittees in significant noncompliance on two or more consecutive QNCRs without returning to compliance or being addressed by a formal enforcement action (persistent violators). Identify how many quarters they have been in SNC.	WQ/E-6	(Data lagged one quarter) FY 94
		(2) Identify by name and NPDES number major permittees appearing on two or more consecutive QNCRs as being in significant	No/No	Quarterly (Data lagged one quarter) FY 94

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		SNC) without being returned to compliance or addressed with a formal enforcement action.		
		(g) EXCEPTION LIST	Yes/No	Quarterly
		TRACKING (1) Report, by State and Region, the number of major permittees (including those for pretreatment SNC) that are on the previous exception list which have returned to compliance during the quarter, the number not yet in compliance but	WQ/E-7	(Data lagged one quarter) FY 94

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		addressed by a formal enforcement action by the QNCR completion date, and the number that were unresolved (not returned to compliance during the quarter or addressed by a formal enforcement action by the QNCR completion date).		
		(2) Identify by name major permittees listed on the Exception List universe for the previous quarter for which the following has occurred: --# returned to compliance; --# not yet in compliance but addressed with a formal enforcement action;	No/No	Quarterly (Data lagged one quarter) FY 94

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		--# that are unresolved as the end of the quarter; and the number consecutive quarters each facility has appeared on the QNCR.		
4. Wetlands Permitting	A. Describe the Region's most significant activities under §404	(a) Number of §404 permit application public notice reviews initiated during the quarter	No/No	Quarterly FY 93
	B. Address effectiveness of §404 working relationships with each Corps district, FWS Region and Field Office, and NMFS Region	(b) Number of §404 resolutions during the quarter	No/No	Quarterly FY 93

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
5. Wetlands Enforcement	A. Describe the Region's §404 enforcement program	(a) Number of administrative compliance orders issued this quarter (STARS)	Yes/No	Quarterly FY 93
		(b) Number of administrative penalty complaints issued this quarter (STARS)	Yes/No	Quarterly FY 93
		(c) Number of civil cases referred to DOJ this quarter (STARS)	Yes/No	Quarterly FY 93
		(d) Number of criminal cases referred to DOJ this quarter(STARS)	Yes/No	Quarterly FY 93
		(e)Total number of enforcement cases resolved this quarter (STARS)	Yes/No	Quarterly FY 93
		(e1) Number of compliance orders where the violator has complied with order	Yes/No	Quarterly FY 93

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		(e2) Number of final administrative penalty orders	Yes/No	Quarterly FY 93
		(e3) Number of civil judicial referrals resulting in final court order.	Yes/No	Quarterly FY 93
		(e4) Number of criminal judicial referrals resulting in final court order.	Yes/No	Quarterly FY 93
		(e5) Number of cases resolved through voluntary compliance/informal processes	Yes/No	Quarterly FY 93
6. NCW-- Develop and Implement Regional	(A) How is the Region supporting HQ in the integration of NCW initiatives into	(a) Development of NCW management strategy by Regions.	No/No	Q 4 FY 95

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
Near Coastal Waters (NCW) Management Strategies	ongoing water programs and in the recognition of NCW priorities in targeting water programs? (B) How are NCW management strategies and demonstration projects being integrated with the national demonstration effort?			
	(A) How has the Region increased its role in EIS development?	(b) #NCW demonstration projects implemented, evaluated, and transferred/applied to other parts of the coasts.	No/No	Q 4 FY 95
7. Ocean Site Designation -Increase Role in		a) Track, by Region against quarterly targets, # draft EISs.	No/OW	Q 1,2,3,4

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
Preparation of Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and Continue Preparing Rule Making Packages for Ocean Dumping Site Designation		(b) Track, by Region, against quarterly targets # final EISs.	No/OW	Q 1,2,3,4
		(c) Track, by Region, against quarterly targets # ocean dumping final actions.	Yes/STARS WQ-1	Q 1,2,3,4
8. Ocean Dispoal Permits - Issue Ocean Disposal Permits Increase Enforcement Activities, Conduct Monitoring Surveys for Site	(A) What procedures does the Region following permit issuance or review? Are all criteria evaluated and applied consistently among the permit applications?	(a) # and type of ocean disposal permit applications received and issued.	No/No	Q 1,2,3,4
		(b) # of administrative penalty complaints issued this quarter	No/OW	Q,4
	(B) How is the Region conducting compliance, monitoring, and enforcement of EPA	(c) statute, case name, and amount of penalties assessed for violations.	No/No	Q,4

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
Designation and Managment	permits or other Federal requirements?			
9. 301(h) - Review Sec. 301(h) Applica-tions, Issue Permits, and/or Reissue Permits	(A) How do permits ensure that monitoring provisions of Sec. 301(h) decisions are reflected in enforceable requirements which can be used in assessing compliance with Sec. 301(h) criteria?	(a) # final permits issued/reissued.	Yes/STARS WQ-1	Q 2,4
		(b) # secondary equivalency determinations.	No/No	Q 2,4
10. UIC -- Ensure that injection wells maintain mechanical integrity and are inspected regularly		(a) Report, by Region, progress against quarterly targets for the number of wells that have mechanical integrity tests performed by operators and verified by EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy.	Yes/Yes DW-2	Q 1,2,3,4

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
11. UIC -- Protect health and environment from hazardous waste injection	(A) How do the States and Regions identify and implement land ban requirements?	(a) Report, by Region, the number of Class I hazardous waste injection wells for which land ban petitions have been received and processed.	No/No	Annually (Mid-Year)
12. UIC -- Identify significant violations to ensure early action to correct non-compliance		(a) Report, by Region, for EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy the number of Class I, II, III, IV and V wells found in SNC.	Yes/No DW/E-6	Q 1,2,3,4

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
13. UIC -- Achieve and maintain high level of compliance	(A) List and provide the status of any federal enforcement action(s) in primacy States. Include actions taken in the last year and those planned for the near future.	(a) Report, by Region, for EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy wells that appear on the Exceptions List from the date the violation becomes an exception through the date the violation is resolved, noting the date formal enforcement action was taken, if any.	Yes/No DW/E-8	Q 1,2,3,4
	(B) List and provide the status of any civil and criminal referrals to the State Attorney General by primacy States.	(b) Report, by Region, for EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy, the number of administrative orders and equivalent actions and the total number of §1431 emergency orders issued by well class.	Yes/No DW/E-9	Q 1,2,3,4

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
14. PWSS Implementation - Assure Federal and State implementation of the requirements established through existing, and new, EPA drinking water regulations and conduct regulations and conduct oversight of State programs.	(A) Did you conduct evaluations of each State's PWSS program within the last 12 months? What were your major findings? (B) PHASE I & PN -- Are there any States that have not yet adopted Phase I or PN regulations? If yes, which States, and what is the Region doing about, a) the State's primacy, and b) implementation of the Federal regulations? Has VOC monitoring been completed for all systems?	(a) Report by State those which have adopted new regulations, States which have received EPA approval of a primacy revision application, and States which have received approvals for an extension.	Yes/No DW/E-5	Q 1,2,3,4

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(C) SWTR & TCR -- Are the States which have adopted SWT and/or TC regulations fully implementing those regulations? If not, what is not being implemented? What is the Region's strategy for dealing with these shortcomings? Which States are currently operating under extensions for the SWT and TC regulations? Are States meeting the agreements of the extensions? Is the Region implementing its portion of the agreements? Are SWT and TC violations being reported to FRDS? Are			

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	the violations, particularly the SNCs being enforced? What is the status of unfiltered water systems -- total number, number which must install filtration, the status of these (on a schedule), number of system where State still needs to make a decision?			
	(D) LEAD & COPPER -- What is the status of State adoption of the Lead & Copper regulations? How many States will require extensions? What is the Region's strategy for implementation of the regulations during any extension?			

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(E) PHASE II -- What is the status of State adoption of the Phase II regulations? How many States will require extensions? What is the Region's strategy for implementation of the regulations during any extension? How are the States implementing the Standardized Monitoring Framework?			
	(F) Does the Region have a formal strategy for evaluating each State's ability to maintain Primacy, for escalating concerns about State program weaknesses, and for considering and initiating Primacy withdrawal? Has the Region made its			

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	position known to each State? How?			
15. PWSS-- Enforce the Safe Drinking Water Act and the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations.	(A) Describe how each State is enforcing the lead ban? What basis did the Region use for determining that each State is adequately enforcing the lead ban? (B) Describe the Region's progress in implementing current enforcement initiatives -- such as data falsification.	(a) Negotiate, with each State, annual targets for the number of SNCs and the number of exceptions that will be appropriately addressed or returned to compliance by June 1, 1992, and reported to ODW by June 22, 1992 for each of the two categories listed below. The target numbers will be based on the number of SNCs occurring as of the compliance period	Yes/Yes DW/E-1	Q 3

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(C) Describe the Region's strategy for upgrading the enforcement component of each of the State's programs.	ending March 31, 1991, and the number of exceptions existing as of June 1, 1991. (both will be contained on the July 1991 SNC/Exception report).		
	(D) How well is the Region meeting its targets established under the enforcement workload model? Will the targets be met at end of the year?	1) micro/turbidity/TTHM SNCs and exceptions 2) chem/rad SNCs and exceptions (Note: data are lagged one quarter.)		
	(E) Has the Region reviewed its State's enforcement authorities and processes for	(b) Report, using the SNC/Exception Report format, against all SNCs, those systems	Yes/No DW/E-2	Q 1,2,3,4

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	issuing AOs and referring civil cases? What is the average time for issuing AOs, for filing a case once it has been referred, and for concluding a case? What is the Region's opinion on the effectiveness of the State authorities?	that: returned to compliance; had an appropriate enforcement action taken against them; remained unresolved; or became exceptions this quarter. Report separately for each of the following two groups: (Note: Date are lagged one quarter.)		
	(F) Are all formal enforcement actions being reported to FRDS?	1) micro/turbidity/TTHM SNCs 2) chem/rad SNCs		
		(c) Report using the SNC/Exception Report format those systems identified as exceptions through the prior quarter which have since returned to compliance, had an appropriate enforcement	Yes/No DW/E-3	Q 1,2,3,4

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		action taken against them, or remained exceptions as of this quarter. Report separately for each of the following two groups: 1) micro/turbidity/TTHM exceptions 2) chem/rad exceptions (Note: data are lagged one quarter)		
		(d) Report, State by State: (1) the total number of EPA NOVs, proposed administrative orders, final administrative orders, complaints for penalty, civil referrals, criminal filings, and §1431 emergency orders issued, and the amount of each administratively	Yes/No DW/E-4	Q 1,2,3,4

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		assessed/collected penalty, during the quarter. (2) the number of State administrative orders; bilateral compliance agreements; civil cases referred to State Attorneys General (AGs), filed, and concluded; and the number of criminal cases filed by the AGs and concluded. (OECM will report the same data for EPA referrals.) Note: State data are lagged 1 quarter)		

REDUCING RISK THROUGH IMPROVED SCIENCE

In FY 1992 EPA will emphasize improving our scientific knowledge and tools to effectively address today's water quality problems and develop the national primary drinking water regulations. We will also reflect priorities in the Science Advisory Board's (SAB) Report, "Reducing Risk: Setting Priorities and Strategies for Environmental Protection" with emphasis on reduction of ecological risk in critical surface waterbodies and protection of public health through improved drinking water quality.

The major program highlights in this section are:

- Completing the FY 1991 - 1993 triennium, which requires States to adopt: (1) narrative biological criteria, (2) salt water criteria, as appropriate, (3) antidegradation policies and implementation methods, (4) water quality standards for wetlands and (5) water quality standards for coastal/estuarine waters. These requirements are designed to enhance the ability of States and qualified Indian tribes to adopt water quality standards that will serve as the foundation for programs to reduce the ecological risks facing our critical aquatic resources from the expanded universe of permittees, including combined sewer overflows and stormwater runoff dischargers.

- Continuing implementation of Section 303(c)(2)(B) of the CWA, as amended, which requires that whenever a State reviews water quality standards in accordance with Section 303(c)(1), the State must adopt numeric criteria into water quality standards for section 307(a) priority pollutants that could be reasonably expected to interfere with designated uses. Where the Regions disapproved water quality standards or portions of those standards because the Section 303(c)(2)(B) requirements were not met, the Agency initiated action to propose Federal standards. If a State adopts sufficient criteria to fully comply with Section 303(c)(2)(B), EPA will not promulgate Federal standards for that State.

- Implementing effluent guidelines regulations to serve as performance standards in identifying industrial wastewater treatment technologies that may be used to achieve the mandated levels of pollutant removal from effluents. The regulations reduce risk to human health and the environment by providing the basis for NPDES permits and pretreatment agreements. Increasingly, the thrust of the technology assessments is to determine these new technologies and changes to existing technologies that minimize or eliminate pollutant generation in the first place.

- Ensuring that States have the capability to accurately assess and reduce risks from toxic effluent through the NPDES permitting program.

- Completing the remaining drinking water standards identified for regulation in the 1986 SDWA amendments, with emphasis on balancing the reduced acute risks to the public from microbial contamination of ground and surface water with the chronic risks from disinfection by-products. The final regulations for radionuclides will also be completed by the end of FY 1992.

The following quantitative and qualitative performance measures are designed to be used as the basis to measure our progress in these areas.

REDUCING RISK THROUGH IMPROVED SCIENCE

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
1. WQS - Triennial Reviews	(A)Describe in detail: (1) the barriers that exist as States develop and adopt the elements included in the quantitative measure; and (2) the actions that the RO is taking to assist States/Tribes overcome the barriers, including workshops or other types of meetings the RO sponsors.	(a)Identify, against targets, the States/ Tribes completing a Section 303(c)(1) triennial review that includes, biological criteria and salt water criteria, where appropriate, antidegradation policies and implementation methods and water quality standards for wetlands and coastal/estuarine waters; and for which EPA takes formal action (approval, or disapproval and request for promulgation).	Yes/Yes WQ-3	Q 2,4 FY 93

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
2. WQS - Standards for Toxic Pollutants		(a) Identify, against targets, the States for which Regions approve the numeric criteria adopted by the States that are necessary to bring the States into full compliance with Section 303(c)(2)(B).	Yes/Yes WQ-4	Q 2,4 FY 93
3. WQS - Whole Effluent Toxicity.		(a) Report the number of States that adopt numeric procedures to implement standards for whole effluent toxicity.	No/No	Q 4 FY 93
4. Effluent Guidelines - Publish Two Regulations		(a) Publish two regulations in the Federal Register: final amendments for the Organic Chemicals, Plastics and Synthetic Fibers Industry Categories; and final rule for the Offshore Oil and Gas extraction Subcategory.	Yes/No WQ-11	Q 4 FY 93

REDUCING RISK THROUGH IMPROVED SCIENCE

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
5. NPDES Permits	(A) Discuss the Region's approach to controlling bioaccumulative and persistent toxicants, especially toxicants contaminating fish tissues and sediments. (B) Have the States developed similar strategies/approaches? Describe actions taken to focus State attention on persistent and/or bioaccumulative pollutants? (C) Discuss the Region's approach to implementing pollution prevention through municipal and industrial permits.			

USING ECOLOGICAL INDICATORS TO MEASURE REDUCTION IN RISK

A key theme in the Science Advisory Board's Report, "Reducing Risk: Setting Priorities and Strategies for Environmental Protection," and the Office of Water's strategic plan is to reduce ecological risks facing critical aquatic resources. In order to address ecological risks, we need to view the integrity of the water environment holistically -- the sum total of the complex biological, chemical and physical dynamics necessary to sustain long-term processes -- ecological integrity -- of a healthy ecosystem.

Over time, criteria guidance will provide a comprehensive basis on which to design programs that prevent and control pollution and habitat alteration and destruction and loss of species, particularly from nonpoint sources, combined sewer overflows and stormwater runoff. Chemical-specific sediment criteria to protect aquatic life and numeric biological criteria for streams, rivers, lakes, wetlands, and estuaries.

Water programs will focus on measuring the ecological improvements/reductions in risk brought about by EPA and State activities. These monitoring efforts will reveal the extent to which EPA and States are able to prevent targeted pollutants from being released.

The major program highlights in this section are:

- Continuing work on an action plan for Federal assistance to the States to help them develop risk assessment-based fish consumption advisories and bans where fish are contaminated to a level that poses a human health risk. As part of this action plan, OW will develop national guidance on how to develop protective advisories and will evaluate the appropriateness of using fish consumption advisories as an ecological indicator.

- Continuing work on eliminating on-going sources of sediment contamination so that clean sediment can cover contaminated areas. Sediment contamination has been documented as posing both ecological and human health risks through contamination of the aquatic life food chain. Sediment controls provide a good measure of progress in cleaning-up sediment contamination and reducing/eliminating associated risks to human health and the environment.

The following quantitative and qualitative performance measures are designed to be used as the basis to measure our progress in these areas.

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
1. NPDES Permits	(A) How have concentrations of persistent bioaccumulative pollutants in fish tissue changed over the last year? (Based on EPA National Bioaccumulative Study, Fish and Wildlife Service National Contaminant Biomonitoring Program and NOAA National Standards and Trends Report.)			
2. Sediments -- Establish Sediment WQ based limits		(a) Report, by State and by name, waterbodies that have: (1) sediment monitoring for point source; (2) sediment quality-based limits for point	Yes/No WQ-8	Q 4 FY 94

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		sources; and/or (3) sediment quality-based targets for nonpoint sources.		
3. Risk Assess-ment-- Fish Monitoring/ Advisories		(a) Report, by State and by name, waterbodies with fish tissue monitoring and waterbodies with fish consumption advisories.	Yes/No WQ-9	Q 4 FY 94
4. WQS - Ecological Criteria Guidance	(A) Describe in detail the activities that will be conducted (i.e., workshops) to facilitate use of the criteria guidance by States/Tribes in the adoption of ecological standards.	(a) Identify, against targets, the ecological criteria guidance HQ will publish.	Yes/Yes WQ-6	Q 4 FY 93

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

Our geographically targeted approach will ensure that the tools used are the most effective, are applied to priority areas, are used to respond to defined needs and accomplish measurable gains. In concert with the base programs, EPA and States will integrate risk analyses with program operations to identify specific program needs in targeted geographic watersheds. Regions will develop and implement projects designed to address areas of highest priority.

The major program highlights in this section are:

- Implementing Wetlands initiatives that include: focused enforcement projects in areas of high vulnerability or historical noncompliance; targeted public outreach campaigns; advance identifications; and other geographically-oriented initiatives.

- Reducing risks through concentrating efforts on specific permitting, pretreatment, and enforcement decisions in selected geographic areas. In many cases we expect that nontraditional approaches, such as storm water, CSO's and nonpoint source will be included in geographic initiatives.

- Continuing to promote the concept of geographic targeting as the most effective way to address NPS pollution. Geographic targeting enables other State and Federal agencies to direct their water-quality related technical and financial resources to clearly identified priority waters. In the final Section 319 grant guidance (January 1991), EPA has again encouraged States to rank their waters requiring NPS controls and indicated that such rankings should be the basis for funding watershed projects under Section 319. In FY 1992, EPA will begin tracking the percentage of NPS priority waterbodies (identified by the State) which have watershed programs to control or prevent NPS pollution actively underway. These actions provide further incentive for geographic targeting and support the watershed initiative.

- Overseeing and tracking through performance measures the implementation of the Watershed Initiative. The focus of the Initiative is to conduct restoration and protection activities in targeted watersheds selected during FY 1991. These measures would have the States and Regions identify the actions they will undertake for each of the targeted watersheds, and, at the end of the year, to report on the actions completed. This reporting will help ensure that the goal of the Watershed Initiative, achieving risk reduction through <u>action</u> in targeted watersheds, is realized.

- Targeting our water quality monitoring measures for FY 1992 geographically. Specifically, the identification of impaired

waters needing TMDLs that the States will submit by April 1, 1992, and the assessment of targeted waterbodies support the watershed initiative objectives for setting priorities. This information will be used as a baseline for measuring changes in the total size (e.g., lake acres and stream miles) of impaired and threatened waters. In addition, Regions will be responsible for reporting information on the status of water quality in individual targeted waterbodies using either the Waterbody System or other independent information systems.

- Assessing lake water quality and implementing pollution prevention and restoration measures to protect and enhance lake resources. Projects will be conducted in a holistic manner, considering all the biological, chemical, and physical factors necessary to sustain a healthy lake-specific ecosystem. Geographic targeting in high priority lake watersheds will be emphasized to protect critical habitats, such as wetlands, and reduce the health, ecological, and aesthetic risk to a given lake whether these risks are caused by point or nonpoint sources of pollution.

- Reducing the public health risk posed by contamination of underground sources of drinking water (USDA) through geographically targeting Class IV and endangering Class V wells for closure. States and Regions, working with local municipalities, will focus closure efforts on shallow wells in vulnerable watershed areas, unsewered locations, and those close to drinking water wells. Where the risk of USDW endangerment is well documented, as in the case of some industrial drainage and automobile service station wells, a variety of approaches will be used to ensure USDW protection. These include: informal and formal enforcement, permit call-ins, public-private partnerships, and community outreach and education.

- Tracking the development and implementation of Comprehensive Ground-Water Protection Programs which have been recommended by the EPA Ground-Water Task Force. Regions will continue to track efforts to fully implement the Wellhead Protection (WHP) Program, as a key component of Comprehensive Programs. WHP Programs are an effective means of targeting and safeguarding ground water serving as drinking water supplies and, hence, reduce health risks from contaminated drinking water. Regions will also promote the use of geographic information systems as a tool to assist decision makers in targeting ground-water protection activities.

- Recognizing the Chesapeake Bay and Great Lakes Programs are ongoing examples of how EPA is using the concept of geographic targeting to reduce risks in coastal areas. Both programs are working to integrate resources at the Federal, State, Local

and in the case of the Great Lakes Program, international levels to address ecological and health risks in a comprehensive fashion. This approach starts with the identification of risks that are posed within a given geographic area, and then applying whatever tools are available for reducing those risks.

- Developing, with States and other Federal agencies, a comprehensive strategy for reducing risks in the Gulf of Mexico. EPA acts as facilitator in this process, drawing together the various interests that have a stake in protecting the Gulf.

- Convening Management Conferences for estuaries of national significance to develop comprehensive conservation and management plans (CCMPs) that identify the priority problems of the estuary, as well as management actions that will be implemented to address those problems. By focusing on a geographic area the various agency and local interests are drawn together around a common cause: the reduction of risk to the estuary.

The following quantitative and qualitative performance measures are designed to be used as the basis to measure our progress in these areas.

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
1. Wetlands Wetlands Strategic Initiative	A. Describe the strategic initiatives undertaken or planned to achieve this objective.	(a) Number of Advance Identifications completed (STARS)	Yes/No WQ-2	Quarterly FY 93
		(b) Number of major public education and outreach initiatives completed (STARS)	Yes/No WQ-2	Quarterly FY 93
		(c) Number of geographically targeted Section 404 enforcement initiatives completed (STARS)	Yes/No WQ-2	Quarterly FY 93
		(d) Number of comprehensive management and planning initiatives completed, e.g., greenways/river corridor management plans, special area management plans, etc.	Yes/No WQ-2	Quarterly FY 93

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
2. NPDES Permits	(A) Are States issuing permits to marine/estuarine dischargers which follow EPA's near coastal waters strategy efforts? What special conditions, if any, are included in marine/estuarine discharge permits? (B) How does the Region use general permits for storm water discharges? For unpermitted discharges? To reduce minor permit backlog?	(a) Identify the number of permits reissued in near coastal waters (report separately NPDES States, non-NPDES States). (b) Identify the number of permits issued which include limits and appropriate monitoring requirements for CSOs. Of these, how may are in geographically targeted areas?	No/No No/No	Quarterly FY 93 Quarterly FY 93

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(C) What is the Region doing, to facilitate approval of State General Permit programs?	(c) How many permits have been issued due to designation under 402(p)(2)(E)?	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 93
	(D) Where occurring, discuss Regional activities for working with States to transition to basinwide or watershed specific water quality based permit issuance.	(d) How many geographically targeted basins or watersheds were identified for targeted permit issuance?	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 93
	(E) Have final permits been issued to all 304(l) C list facilities?			
3. Implement Targeted Strategy for conducting Section 403(c) Assessments	(A) How is the Region implementing the targeted strategy?	(a) # final Section 403(c) assessments prepared.	Yes/OW	Q 2,4 FY 95

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
4. Pretreatment	(A) What is the Region/States process for identifying pretreatment POTWs which need pretreatment performance evaluations (PPEs) (B) How successful have these PPEs been at identifying implementation problems? What action is the Region/State taking to ensure appropriate follow-up action is taken?			
5. NPDES Enforcement	(A) Are there any special enforcement needs identified in selected geographic areas above the base enforcement program? What particular activities are involved?	(a) List specific projects in each Region which involve geographic targeting. For each project identified, discuss enforcement components and success to date.	No/No	Quarterly

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(B) What rationale is used to select permittees for multi-media inspections? Have these inspections been beneficial? (C) Is the Region undertaking any special efforts to identify unpermitted discharges in geographically targeted areas? If so, what?			
6.NPS - Implementation in Priority Watersheds		(a) Identify, by State, against targets, the percentage of priority waterbodies identified in approved State NPS management programs with watershed control programs actively underway.	Yes/Yes WQ-7	Q 2,4 FY 94

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
7. Lakes Management - Lake Water Quality Assessments	(A) Describe how the results of the lake water quality assessment will be shared with other programs and used to prepare the 1994 305(b) Report.	(a) (1) Report the number of States/ qualified Indian Tribes that conducted lake water quality assessments. (2) List the percentage of lakes for which assessments are conducted by each State/Tribe.	No/No	Q,2 FY 95
8. Lakes Management - Site Visits to Active Clean Lakes Projects	(A) Describe for each project visited the restoration, protection, and pollution prevention measures underway and their potential for success.	(a) Report the number of active Clean Lakes projects, the number of projects which were visited and the number not visited during the year.	No/No	Q,2 FY 95

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
9. Monitoring - 303(d) Lists	(A) What steps have the Regions taken to ensure submittal of Section 303(d) lists including targeted waterbodies? (B) To what extent was public participation used to identify targeted waterbodies?	(a) Report, by Region: (1) the number of States submitting Section 303(d) lists; and (2) number of disapproval actions.	No/No	Q,4 FY 94
10. Monitoring - Targeted TMDL Development	(A) What steps have the Regions taken to ensure periodic reassessment at these sites?	(a) Report, by State: (1) the number of waterbodies targeted for TMDL development in the 1992 Section 303(d) submittal; (2) the total size impaired and total size threatened within these waterbodies; and (3) the number of complex and non-complex TMDLs anticipated.	Yes/No WQ-5	Q 4 FY 94

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
11. UIC -- Reduce Public Health Risk by closing Class IV and endangering Class V injection wells	(A) What are the major initiative and outreach efforts which have resulted in Class IV or endangering Class V well closures through voluntary compliance? (B) What type of enforcement activities has resulted in Class IV and endangering Class V injection well closures (for example, permit calls-ins, formal enforcement, geographic targeting, or other to include ground-water remediation. (C) Describe the steps taken to assess risk to health or the environment at Class IV and endangering Class V sites, and how the risk has been reduced through remediation.	(a) Report, by Region, for EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy the number of Class IV and endangering Class V injection well closures (by well type) achieved under UIC authority or in conjunction with other regulatory programs such as RCRA, UST, CERCLA, for example, or under well-head protection efforts.	Yes/No DW-3	Q 1,2,3,4

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
12. Ground-Water Protection: Assist States in implementing wellhead protection programs and activities as a key component of Compre-hensive Programs	(A) Describe the technical assistance, and outreach efforts. States and other governmental entities to promote implementation of WHP programs or activities	(a) Number of States with Wellhead Protection Programs approved during FY 1992	Yes/STARS GW-2	Quarterly
	(B) Describe progress on WHP data management demonstration projects selected during FY 1990			Mid-Year Review
	(C) Describe progress on WHP demonstration projects selected during FY 1991			
13. Chesa-peake Bay - Work with the Regions and States to Implement CWA Programs and the 1987	(A) How do the Chesapeake Bay Liaison Office (CBLO), and the Region ensure that States implement activities specified in the CWA and the 1987 Agreement?	(a) Track against targets the cumulative number of commitments in the 1987 CB Agreement that are completed.		

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
Water Quality Agreement in the Chesapeake Bay (CB) Basin				
14. GLNPO -- Work with GLNPO and the States to implement CWA programs and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA)	(A) How do the Regions ensure that GL States implement activities specified in the CWA and GLWQA?	(a) Track against targets the cumulative number of commitments that have been completed. (b) Track targets by category: the number of Remedial Action Plans, Lakewide Management Plans, and Assessment and Remediation of Contaminated Sediment demonstration projects (1) in progress and (2) completed.		

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
15. NEP -- Work with other federal agencies, the Regions and the States to implement CWA and MPRSA in the GULF OF MEXICO and its drainage basins to implement the Gulf of Mexico Program Five-Year Strategy.	(A) How do the Gulf of Mexico Program Office and Regions IV and VI ensure that the States implement activities in the CWA and MPRSA and the five year strategy?	(a) Track against cummulative number of commitments in the 1988 five year strategy that are completed.		

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
16. NEP -- Management Conferences Convened for Seventeen Estuaries to Implement the Provisions of State/EPA Conference Agreements by Completing Major Milestones to Achieve the Seven Purposes of the Conference as Provided in the Clean Water Act	(A) What is the status of commitments under EPA /State Conference Agreements?	(a) Track, by Regional Project, completion of the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan, as scheduled in the state/EPA Conference.	Yes/STARS	Q 4 FY 95

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

We will continue to promote strong, effective State and Indian programs which fully implement water programs to reduce human and ecological risks and prevent pollution. Through our mobilization initiative, we will work to strengthen State and local capacity to implement the expanding public water system supervision program. Technical assistance, training, and outreach to support State and Indian programs and to maintain the Federal investment in municipal wastewater treatment will remain priorities. We will work to leverage other Federal, State and local agencies to provide the expertise and resources to address the multifaceted problems and solutions we need today.

The major program highlights in this section are:

- Building State, Tribal, and local government capacity to implement a strong permitting, pretreatment, and enforcement program, including delegation where possible.

- Continuing the partnerships between the States and Federal government that have served as the basis for building the construction grants and SRF programs. To assist the States, community outreach programs will continue to assist in technology transfer to promote low cost systems and to provide up-to-date information on new treatment technologies and assistance and information on financial management. The efforts to implement a comprehensive and effective operation and maintenance program for wastewater treatment facilities and a Municipal Water Pollution Prevention program are aimed at controlling and preventing the degradation of the existing water quality. These efforts go towards avoiding end-of-pipe problems and the goal is to institutionalize the gains the program has made to date.

- Maintaining State, tribal, and local government participation in wetlands protection activities is crucial to making progress toward the national no net loss goal. Measures involve monitoring and encouraging both formal assumption of the 404 program and equally important State and locally initiated wetlands protection programs.

- Building State, Tribal and local governments' capacity to implement an effective UIC regulatory program through grants, technical assistance, public outreach and demonstration projects. The effectiveness of such assistance will be periodically evaluated and strengthened by on-site visits from the Regions and Headquarters.

- Emphasizing through Comprehensive Ground-Water Protection Program measures (contained in the Geographical Targeting

Section) Regional efforts to build State capacity to protect ground-water and to better coordinate the various Federal Programs with ground-water responsibilities. States and Regions will jointly develop workplans that eventually lead to the implementation of State Comprehensive Programs. Regional ground-water offices will also work with other Federal Programs to ensure State priorities and approaches to ground-water protection are used to coordinate Federal ground-water protection efforts.

- Continuing, expanding and accelerating nonpoint sources (NPS) management activity at all levels of government and within the private sector, including landowners and land managers, is highly dependent upon the building of effective partnerships and alliances between and among all levels of government and both institutions and individuals in the private sector. The NPS program continues to encourage and support such partnerships and alliances and to fund, through the Section 319 program to States, activities that foster and sustain them.

- Continuing to negotiate annual grant work programs with Regions, States, and Qualified Indian Tribes based on priorities outlined in this guidance, the office of Water Strategic Plan, and State Water Quality Management (WQM) plans and Continuing Planning Process (CPP) documents. The Regions will negotiate work programs with their States and qualified Indian Tribes based on funding targets provided by Headquarters. States and qualified Indian Tribes (as appropriate) are required to meet basic eligibility requirements under the various CWA grant programs, e.g., Section 106 "level of effort." Through formal evaluations, the Regions will monitor the performance of State and Indian Tribes to ensure that activities are leading to expected water quality improvements, and to ensure management accountability and coordination of Federal funds.

- Ensuring water quality assessments under Section 305(b) by State, Federal and other agencies will support integration of water program management activities These assessments will also provide information on waterbodies assessed which over time can be used for evaluating trends in water quality. The Regions will provide training to States and qualified Indian Tribes in watershed assessment methodologies to ensure that State/local personnel have the capability to apply watershed improvement methodologies.

- Encouraging and supporting maximum collaboration between State coastal zone management agencies and lead NPS agencies in implementing Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Management Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990.

- Emphasizing that an important component of the Near Coastal Waters Program is outreach to State and Federal agencies. The purpose of this outreach is to expand the integration of coastal programs beyond the limits of EPA capabilities and develop cooperative linkages to address Regional problems.

- Continuing the mobilization initiative to strengthen the State and local capacity to implement the public water system supervision (PWSS) program, focusing on activities in the Regions, in the States, and through third party coalitions. Areas of emphasis will continue to be public education, building State capacity, strengthening the role of local environmental officials, restructuring to strengthen local capacities, training and low cost technology, and assistance to nontransient water systems.

The following quantitative and qualitative performance measures are designed to be used as the basis to measure our progress in these areas.

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
1. NPDES Permits	(A) What is the status of POTW corrective action determinations and efforts of POTWs to implement such actions? How does the Region/State update their information on POTWs who receive hazardous wastes by dedicated pipe or manifested hazardous waste delivered by truck or rail? (B) How are the Regions, States, POTWs coordinating with RCRA/CERCLA staff in evaluating off-site removal of RCRA/CERCLA wastes into POTW collection systems?	(a) List RCRA and CERCLA clean up projects in which a decision is made to discharge to a POTW. Identify the POTW and specify control measure(s) or pretreatment requirements in place.	No/No	Quarterly FY 93

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(C) What actions have the Regions/States taken to identify major and water quality minor discharges on Federal Indian reservations and assure they are permitted?			
	(D) What outreach and technical assistance has been provided to States and Indian tribes toward assumption of NPDES, pretreatment general permits, Federal facilities, and sludge programs?			
2. Pretreatment	(A) What efforts have you undertaken to get non-pretreatment POTWs to take on some of the pretreatment responsibilities? Describe the successes or failures you have had with these efforts.			

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
3. Municipal Water Pollution Prevention	(A) What actions has the Region taken to promote strong Municipal Water Pollution Prevention programs in States?	(a) How many States have developed Municipal Water Pollution Prevention programs?	No/No	Second and Fourth Quarters FY 94
4. Municipal community Outreach -- Enable municipal-ities to plan, design, finance, construct, operate and maintain affordable wastewater facilities through implement-ation of National community outreach	(A) How are the Regions and States progressing in implementing the Municipal Water Pollution Prevention Program? What further actions are planned for both NPDES and non-NPDES States?			
	(B) What are the States doing to implement comprehensive and effective operation and maintenance (O&M) and operator training programs? What is the Region doing to assist and oversee State programs in these areas? How are these	(a) Number of small POTWs and Tribal facilities that have 1) returned to compliance, 2) maintained compliance, or 3) significantly improved performance as a result of onsite operator training/technical assistance through the	No/No	Q 2,4

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	programs being used by States and Region to support community outreach objectives? (C) To what extent have States adopted active Small Community Outreach and Education (SCORE) programs consistent with *National guidance and* State strategies? (D) What actions have States taken to promote adequate financial management of wastewater utilities (including review of EPA approved user fee system implementation by grantees)? How are financial management activities incorporated into States' community outreach programs?	Onsite Assistance Program [104(g)].		

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(E) What Region/State technology transfer efforts have been taken to promote low-cost and/or recycling/reuse technologies, to provide designers with up-to-date information on new treatment technologies and corrective actions on existing technologies? Taking into account the expanding universe (stormwater, CSOs and sludge). (F) What action has the Region undertaken to distribute information to the States regarding financing alternatives for water quality management projects and activities regarding			

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	options strategies, including public/private partnerships? (G) What action(s) has the Region taken to inform States about the Municipal Water Use Efficiency Program? How has each State incorporated water use efficiency into their State community outreach programs? (H) What Region/State initiatives are in place or planned to increase public awareness of the need for efficient use of water and cost-effective wastewater treatment? Have the States established a centralized point for dissemination of water			

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	and wastewater public education materials? If not, describe plans to encourage the States to establish a conduit for distributing these materials to the public. (I) How are community outreach efforts being coordinated between the public water supply, wastewater and solid waste units?			
5. SRF -- State Revolving Fund Implementation.	(A) Has the Region conducted comprehensive annual reviews consistent with the SRF annual review guidance? What are the findings of the annual reviews conducted? Provide a summary of issues and achievements on a State-by-State basis. What is the Region's assessment of the	(a) Number of SRF Annual Reports submitted. (b) Number of SRF Annual Reviews completed.	No/No No/OW	Q 2,4 Q 2,4

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	financial health of the SRFs? (B) Have the States exercised their option to address geographically targeted high priority watersheds in their IUP goals and objectives?			
6. Wetlands -- State/Local Wetlands Support	A. Describe major activities for promoting State, Tribal, and local programs and assisting in their development. Identify major constraints.	(a) Report number of States or Tribes to whom EPA is providing grant funding for development of Section 404/wetlands protection programs	No/No	Second Quarter
7. UIC -- Oversee States and Indian Tribes with primacy	(A) For each primacy agency, how many formal evaluations were conducted this fiscal year? (A formal evaluation should	(a) Submit separately for States and Indian Tribes with primacy a financial status report on the use of grant funds.	No/No	Annually

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	include a file audit, analysis and discussion of performance issues and progress towards work plan goals.) (B) Other than formal evaluations, what other means are used to assess the effectiveness of the primacy agency? (C) Describe any major unresolved issues that are affecting the primacy agencies ability to carry out an effective program? (D) Describe specific problems that primacy agencies are encountering that merit Regional assistance? (E) List and describe any training sessions provided to primacy agency staff.			

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(F) List the primacy agencies that have a UIC-specific enforcement response strategy. (This strategy should include: timely and appropriate criteria and a penalty policy.) For those that do not, how does the Region evaluate the adequacy of the agency's enforcement response?			
8. UIC -- Develop Indian Tribe programs	List all primacy and Treatment as a State applications under review by the Region and the status of each.			

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
9. Ground-Water Protection: Assist States in Developing and Implementing Compre-hensive Ground-Water Protection Programs	(A) Report: - activities supporting DRA measures to provide Regional cross-program integration in support Comprehensive Ground-Water Protection Programs. - State progress in moving toward the development and implementation of Comprehensive Ground-Water Protection Programs.		Yes/STARS GW-1	Quarterly
	(B) Describe technical assistance efforts to: - assist States in identifying valuable and vulnerable ground-waters, including wellhead protection areas			Mid-Year Review

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	- assist States in evaluating or ranking high priority sources of contamination			Mid-Year Review
	(C) Describe outreach to States, other than technical, promoting the development and implementation of Comprehensive Programs	(a) List date and type of outreach effort (workshop, conference) as well as State and local attendees; identify any outside groups sponsoring event	No/No	Mid-Year Review
	(D) Describe efforts to initiate and manage coordination and integration efforts between Comprehensive Programs and other programs. Specifically:			Mid-Year Review

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	- Describe efforts to assist each State in establishing a formal mechanism for coordinating authorities and programs under various federal statutes			Mid-Year Review
	- Describe, in specific terms, efforts by regional ground-water protection staff and pesticide program staff to make Comprehensive Programs and Pesticides Management Plans mutually supportive and integrated	(a) Number of Pesticides Management Plans reviewed to ensure coordination with Comprehensive Programs	No/No	Mid-Year Review

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	- Describe efforts by Regional ground-water protection staff and Non-Point Source Program staff to provide States with assistance to prioritize and address non-point sources of ground-water contamination.	(b) Number of 319 grant funded activities addressing non-point sources of ground-water contamination	No/No	Mid-Year Review
	- Describe efforts by regional ground-water staff and RCRA staff to assist States in conducting ground-water resource assessments/classifications in support of hazardous waste and solid waste facilities decision-making regarding siting, design, monitoring, corrective action, closure/post-closure care and enforcement			Mid-Year Review

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	and other program operation priorities			
	- Describe efforts by regional ground-water staff and CWA Sludge Management Program staff to ensure that quality standards and wellhead protection factors are appropriately applied in the location and operation of sludge disposal and management activities.			
	- Describe work with USDA (ES,SCS) to ensure State ground-water agency input in implementing water quality provisions of the 1990 Farm Bill.			Mid-Year Review

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
10. Ground-water Protection: Strengthen States' ability to collect and utilize ground-water data	(A) Describe technical assistance provided to States to: - implement minimum data element set - use Geographic Information Systems in ground-water decision making - share data with EPA, other Federal, State and local entities	(a) Number of State using minimum data element set for groundwater	No/No	Mid-Year Review
		(b) Number of Regions implementing a Regional Order for groundwater decision-making	No/No	Mid-Year Review
		(c) Number of States using groundwater indicators	No/No	Mid-Year Review
11. NPS - Federal/ local Support for Imple-menting Approved NPS Management Programs	(A) Describe, by State, the outreach efforts either by the State or jointly by the Region and State for implementation of the approved NPS Management Program.	(a) Report the number of technology transfer workshops, meetings, conferences and consultations conducted by the Region to support implementation of approved NPS Management Programs.	No/No	Q 4 FY 94

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(B) Describe the actions the Region has taken this year to obtain support of State NPS Management Programs by Federal agencies other than EPA.			
12. NPS - Collaboration with Related Programs	(A) What actions did the Region take to ensure that the implementation of State NPS Management Programs has been integrated with the activities of related EPA programs such as estuaries, ground-water and wetlands protection?			

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(B) Describe the actions taken by the Regions to assist State lead NPS agencies, where applicable, in collaborating with their coastal zone management counterparts to implement Section 6217 of the CZMA Reauthorization Amendments of 1990.			
13. Monitoring - waterbodies Assessed Under Section 305(b)	(A) Describe Regional efforts to improve coordination of monitoring by Federal, State, and other Agencies. (B) Describe level of support of the Waterbody System in each State.	(a) Report, by State: (1) total size of waterbodies assessed; and (2) total size of waterbodies fully, partially and not supporting designated uses, and the total size threatened.	Yes/Env. Ind.	Q 4 FY 94

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
14. Monitoring - Oversight of State and Indian Tribe Programs	(A) Describe efforts by Regions to provide technical assistance for State and qualified Indian Tribe monitoring programs and to conduct assessment/assistance projects. (B) Assess the status of State and qualified Indian Tribe implementation of EPA guidance for QA/QC programs and for data entry into EPA data systems. (C) Describe efforts to increase the use of biological and habitat assessment methods with the Region.			

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(D) Describe efforts to assist States to use GIS and other analytical tools for geographic targeting.			
15. Monitoring - Technical Assistance to Assess Watersheds	(A) Describe, by Region, plans to provide for technical assistance to States and Indian Tribes in assessing watershed conditions and identifying controls watershed improvements. Include the extent Regions established and conducted training in assessing watersheds including geographic targeting, use of existing data systems, and integrating available information from other agencies.	(a) Report, by Region, the number of assessment methodologies available to States/qualified Indian Tribes for: (1) targeting; (2) identifying WQ conditions; and (3) development control strategies.	No/No	Q 4 FY 93
		(b) Report, by State, the number of Stat that have received training in watershed assessments. Identify formal RO training sessions and visits by RO Staff to State offices.	No/No	Q 4 FY 93

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
16. WQM - Targeting Resources	(A) Describe how each State and qualified Indian Tribe determines water quality priorities and targets resources on critical water quality problems.	(a) Report, by State and qualified Indian Tribe, for FY91 and for FY92 through second quarter, the amount of funds identified in Section 106 work programs for selected national water quality program elements.	Yes/No WQ-10	Q 2 FY 95
17. WQM - Grants Management	(A) What procedures are used to negotiate, track and evaluate grant work programs and performance? Describe problems encountered in applying these procedures. What sanctions were imposed for non-performance or incentives given for superior performance?	(a) Complete the FY91 budget matrix for each State and qualified Indian Tribe so that the uses of available funds can be determined.	No/No	Q 1 FY 95
		(b) Report, by State, for FY 1991 and for FY 1992 through the second quarter, the percentage of 205(j)(2) awards from Sections 205(j)(1) and 604(b) funds passed-thru to RPCPOs and IOs in accordance with 205(j)(3).	No/No	Q 2 FY 95

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
18. WQM - Grants to Qualified Indian Tribes		(a) Report the names of Indian Tribes that during FY92 receive "treatment as a State" (TAS) status; Tribes receiving WQM grants; and the amount, purpose and funding sources of the grants.	No/No	Q 4 FY 95
19. NCW -- Develop and Implement Regional Near Coastal Waters (NCW) Management Strategies	(C) How are the NCW management Strategies being incorporated into State water quality management work plans?	(c) # of projects undertaken in NCWs by Region cooperatively w/other federal agencies, the States, and local government.	No/No	Q 4 FY 95
	(D) How are NCW strategies and demonstrations involving other federal agencies and/or state and local governments?		No/No	Q 4 FY 95

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
20. PWSS -- Implement ODW's mobilization initiative.	(A) Briefly describe the Region's and State's mobilization activities and accomplishments. What progress have you/they made in using the mobilization strategy, fostering compliance and leveraging resources? Describe current plans, progress to date, and future plans for each of the subinitiatives.			
21. PWSS-- Support and oversee development of primacy programs for Indian Tribes.	(A) Have any Tribes applied, or are any in the process of applying, for Treatment as a State or for development grants? Describe your program to promote primacy among Indian Lands.			

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	(B) What is the status of your Indian land grants -- to which Tribes have you awarded grants -- amounts, purposes, etc?			
22. PWSS-- Manage the PWSS State Grant Program.	(A) Have you made timely grant awards to States? Were there any delays, and if so, describe. (B) Have you used any State grant funds to implement a federal program in absence of any portion of a State program? If yes, describe. (C) Have you withheld 5% of any State's grant funds because of an inadequate lead ban or inadequate enforcement of a lead ban?			

ENSURING MANAGEMENT INTEGRITY

In FY 1992, we will strive to improve data management, including better access and use of existing data systems, and expansion of systems where necessary to allow for collection of additional data mandated by new statutory requirements. This data management effort should improve our ability to conduct national assessments and provide more complete data from which to make decisions.

The major program highlights in this section are:

- Expanding the ability of PCS to more accurately report on the entire universe of permittees and improving our ability to link data from PCS to other data systems to provide more complete data from which to make recommendations/decisions.

- Ensuring effective management of on-going projects to close out the construction grants program in an effective manner, as the multi-billion dollar Federal investment in the nation's wastewater treatment facilities winds down.

- Improving UIC program management by implementing improved data management and enforcement tracking. By the end of FY 1992, the UIC program expects all Class II primacy agency information management systems to include a standard set of minimum data elements and definitions. This well-specific data base will greatly enhance regulatory and management decision making and encourage cross-program USDW protection initiatives. This system will also significantly improve the UIC program's ability to effectively track administrative orders to completion and report on the incidence and resolution of Class II wells on the Exceptions List.

- Expanding the current federal information system to allow for analyses of compliance with the requirements of the new drinking water regulations. In addition, the PWSS program will expand its efforts to assist States in upgrading and improving their data systems to maximize the quality of compliance and enforcement data at both the State and the Federal levels.

The following quantitative and qualitative performance measures are designed to be used as the basis to measure our progress in these areas.

ENSURING MANAGEMENT INTEGRITY

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
1. NPDES Enforcement	(A) What kind of quality assurance is used to ensure adequacy of data entry into PCS? (B) How have you linked the data in PCS through latitude/longitude to other data systems? How has this impacted decision making?			
2. Municipal Pollution Control -- Outlays		(a) Track, by Region, progress against quarterly targets for net outlays for combined construction grants and State Revolving Fund (SRF).	Yes/STARS WQ-18	Monthly/ Quarterly

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
3.Construction Grants Closeout -- Manage completion/ closeout of the construction grants program.	(A) How are the Region and States implementing the State strategies for managing the program to completion, including approval of 205(g) workplans and the use of acceleration initiatives? (B) Is the Region maintaining an integrated and comprehensive overview and follow-up program which covers both the Corps and States for like activities?	(a) Number of Step 3, Step 2+3, Marine CSO and PL 84-660 projects beginning to achieve environmental results.	Yes/STARS WQ-21	Quarterly
		(b) Track, by Regions, quarterly targets for the number of Step 3, Step 2+3, Marine CSO and PL 84-660 projects administratively completed.	Yes/STARS WQ-19	Quarterly
		(c) Track, by Region, progress against quarterly targets for the number of Step 3, Step 2+3, Marine CSO and PL 84-660 project closeouts.	Yes/STARS WQ-20	Quarterly
		(d) The number of Step 1 and Step 2 project closeouts.	No/OW	Quarterly

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
		(e) Percent of Corps utilization versus workplans.	No/No	Quarterly
		(f) Number of final construction inspections conducted by the COE.	No/OW	Quarterly
4. Construction Grants Dispute Resolution - Manage Region/State CG dispute resolution and tracking systems to monitor States.	(A) How does the Region ensure that high quality dispute decisions are issued, i.e., Regional decisions that are not overturned or remanded by the AA when appealed to Headquarters?	(a) Number of disputes arising under 40 CFR, Part 30, Subpart L and Part 31, Subpart F which have decisions issued by the RA, or are settled or withdrawn.	No/OW	Quarterly

ENSURING MANAGEMENT INTEGRITY

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
5. Construction Safety - Maintain a program to ensure quality construction and safety.	(A) How are the Region and the States addressing project safety?			
6. GICS -- Effectively manage GICS to improve usage for program management.	(A) Is the Region managing GICS so that it is reliable and accurate, supportive of priorities, readily available to end-users and utilized as an effective tool by the delegated States?			

ENSURING MANAGEMENT INTEGRITY

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
7. Improve data quality and provide timely and accurate information	(A) For each Class II primacy agency, indicate the progress made toward meeting the requirements established in UIC Guidance #68, Data Management.	(a) Report by well class and operating status, an update of injection well inventories on an annual basis. Report separately for EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy.	No/No	Annually (Nov. 30)
8. PWSS-- Improve data systems and data quality.	(A) Is the Region assisting States with upgrading and improving their data management systems? Briefly describe activities. (B) In which States has the Region conducted a violation & enforcement data audit during the last 2 years? Did your			

PROGRAM AREA	QUALITATIVE MEASURES	QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	IN STARS/ COMMITMENT?	REPORT FREQUENCY/ SUNSET DATE
	audit include a check for system data falsification? In summary, what were the results? What actions are the Regions taking to follow up on these results? Have States modified their data systems to accommodate the new rules? (C) Have all States converted to DTF? If not, how is Region getting data in?			

APPENDIX B

DEFINITIONS

AND

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

FOR

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
1. NPDES PERMITS:	
1(a) Track, against targets, the number of permits reissued to major facilities during FY92 (NPDES States and non-NPDES States).	The universe for measure WQ-12 is the total number of major permits that have or will expire by the end of FY 92. Measure WQ-12 is the total number of major permits issued with dates (i.e., date signed by permit authority) during FY 92. Status as of the close of each quarter will be taken from PCS on the 10th of the month following the end of the quarter (e.g. the second FY 92 data will be pulled from PCS on April 10).
1(b) Identify the number of final permits reissued and the number modified during FY92 that include water quality-based limits for toxics. (NPDES States, non-NPDES States; report majors and minors separately).	Measure WQ-13 is all permits (major and minor) that include water quality based limits on specific chemicals or whole effluent toxicity and with issuance (modification) dates (i.e., date signed by EPA or State permit authority) during FY 92. WQ-13 is specifically designed to count water quality-based permits issued in FY 1992. Since "limit" is specifically designed to exclude permits which only include monitoring requirements, permits with only monitoring requirements will not be counted.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES

DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

A water quality-based permit limit is a limit that has been developed to ensure a discharge does not violate State water quality standards. Such limits are expressed as maximum daily and average monthly values in Part I of the NPDES permit. They can be expressed as concentration values for individual chemicals and/or pollutant parameters such as effluent toxicity. Effluent toxicity can also be expressed in toxic limits. Limits should be reflective of data available through water quality-based assessments and should protect against impacts to aquatic life and human health.

As a matter of policy, EPA regards the 2/4/87 statutory requirements to control point sources as a component of the ongoing national program for toxics control. In the national toxics control program, all known problems due to any pollutant are to be controlled (using both new and existing statutory authorities) as soon as possible, giving the same priority to these controls as for controls where only 307(a) pollutants are involved. Known toxicity problems include violations of any applicable State numeric criteria or violations of any applicable State narrative water quality standard due to any pollutant (including chlorine, ammonia, and whole effluent toxicity), based upon ambient or effluent analysis. States and Regions will continue to issue all remaining permits, including those requiring the collection of new water quality data where existing data are inadequate to assess WQ conditions.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES

DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Performance Expectation: The goal of the State and EPA NPDES program is to have reissued permits in effect on the date the prior permit expires. In cases where unusual, complex and difficult issues prevent timely permit reissuance, Headquarters is offering alternative approaches to address the increasing backlog. We will work with Regions and States to adopt a more flexible performance expectation that allows for reduction of risk, targeting of watersheds and a better approach for balancing the workload facing the Regions and States. While our overall goal is to eliminate the permit backlog, there are different options for achieving this goal. The Regions and States could retain the usual commitment to reissue 100% of all expired or expiring permits. Where the backlog is large, we would encourage the State to look at a five year strategy. No less than 20% of the universe would be targeted for each year (unless the State has a year in which there are less than 20% expired or expiring). This would allow the Regions to focus the strategy in either of the following situations--the strategy can be developed to even out the workload or it could be tied to specific geographic areas. These strategies are to be initiated on a State-by-State basis and must include Headquarters in the approval process.

Regional quarterly reports for these measures will be reported to the Director of the Office of Water Enforcement and Permits.

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
1(d) Track the number of municipal permits reissued/modified to include comprehensive pretreatment implementation requirements, including PIRT and DSS. (NPDES States; non-NPDES States)	In FY 92, Regions and States will continue to focus municipal permit reissuance on improving the quality of permits by enumerating the minimum requirements and expectations of the approved program, including compliance with DSS and PIRT rules, and appropriate follow up to findings contained in audits and PCIs.
1(f) Identify, by Region, the number of pending evidentiary hearing requests and track, by Region, for the evidentiary requests for major permit *pending at the beginning of* FY 92 resolved by EPA and for the number resolved by NPDES States.	The term "evidentiary hearing" is meant to encompass not only EPA issued permit appeals pursuant to 40CFR 124 but also any NPDES State issued permit appeals (whether adjudicatory or non-adjudicatory in nature). The meaning includes any and all administrative appeals to permit conditions for major facilities, whether the appeals stay or do not stay permit conditions. Evidentiary hearings for EPA issued permits are not considered to be pending if they are on appeal to the Administrator as of the beginning of FY 1992. An evidentiary hearing should be regarded as resolved once an ALJ decision has been issued, a negotiated settlement has been reached, or the evidentiary hearing request has been denied or withdrawn.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	Evidentiary hearings should be resolved as expeditiously as possible. The target should reflect resolution of all pending hearings. Although the measure is intended to reduce the backlog of pending hearings, consideration should be given to new hearing requests made during FY 92 that have priority over pending requests. Such requests may be counted against commitments where they are priority cases (based on Regional/State evaluation).
1(g) Identify by Region, the number of permits for which EPA has objected to, for which final resolution is pending as of 10/1/91. Report in second and fourth quarters: number of permits objected to; number of permits transferred to EPA; and number of permits issued by EPA.	Permit objections refer to the specific objections provided under 40 CFR section 123.44. It is not our intention to track general objections or other comments provided by EPA that are not specific objections.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
1(h) Track, against targets, the total number of permits issued to priority sludge facilities containing sludge conditions necessary to meet requirements of CWA section 405.	Priority sludge facilities or "Class I Sludge Management Facilities" are: 1) pretreatment POTWs; 2) POTWs that incinerate their sludge; and 3) any other POTWs with known or suspected problems with their sludge quality or disposal practices. Non-pretreatment POTWs that incinerate sewage sludge may be considered non-priority if such decision is supported by information showing no cause for concern (i.e., existing controls adequately implement existing federal requirements and otherwise protect public health and the environment). The sludge conditions are to be included in permits as the NPDES permit expires and is reissued. The sludge conditions may be in another permit (such as a permit issued under the Clean Air Act, or a State permit) and incorporated by reference in the NPDES permit. NPDES permits issued by a State may be counted if pursuant to an EPA/State agreement and the Region has certified the permit as meeting CWA requirements. "Sludge conditions necessary to meet CWA section 405" are those conditions required by the sludge permitting and state program regulations (May 2, 1989), adequate monitoring requirements; existing federal regulations, where applicable (e.g., 40 CFR Part 257 and after

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	promulgation, 40 CFR, Part 503) and any additional case-by-case conditions necessary to protect the public health and environment. Performance Expectation: The universe from which targets should be calculated is the number of priority sludge facilities found in the Region. The targets should be a minimum of 20% of the universe of priority sludge facilities. Report NPDES States and EPA together as one number.
1(j) Track the number of State program approvals in accordance with established schedules: --full/partial NPDES program; --pretreatment program; --federal facility program; --general permit authority; and --sludge program.	Acceptable Regional performance is having and effectively pursuing a current written strategy for each State to achieve full NPDES program administration. In some cases, under provisions of the 87 WQA, when full program approval is not achievable, partial program approval may be a desirable alternative and should be included in the strategy. The strategy was to have been prepared by the Region in consultation with the State, identifying obstacles to full program approval and setting forth

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	work plans for overcoming obstacles. The work plan should describe what needs to be done, make recommendations on how it can be accomplished and provide needed and reasonable estimates of time required. Regions will approve remaining State pretreatment/Federal facility programs and will condition FY 92 grants as necessary, and may begin program withdrawal if States fail to seek full program authority. Sludge, either as part of NPDES program approvals or separately, would be tracked under this item.
1(l) Track, by Region and NPDES State the number of baseline general permits issued for industrial stormwater activity.	While there are some States who have not received general permitting authority, this measure will begin to assess the activities of those States who have taken the incentive to begin working on their storm water issues. A baseline general permit is a permit issued focusing on regulating storm water discharges associated with industrial activities. Report general permits issued by NPDES States and EPA issued for non-NPDES States.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
1(m) Track, by Region and State, the number of Part One stormwater applications submitted for large and medium cities and counties (population greater than 100,000)	One year from date of notice in the Federal Register (i.e., November 18, 1991), all large cities and counties (population greater than 250,000) are required to submit a Part One application for a storm water permit. One year and six months from date of notice in the Federal Register (i.e., May 18, 1992) all medium cities (population between 100,000 and 250,000) are required to submit Part One application for storm water permit. This is the first step in a process that has a significant environmental result of controlling and cleaning up storm water. The element of pollution prevention plays a large role in the whole process. The entire universe of large cities and counties would be the commitment in the first quarter (Federally mandated deadline) and the entire universe of medium cities and counties would be the commitment for the third quarter, and progress in meeting these deadlines would be monitored throughout the year. Report EPA, NPDES States separately.
2. PRETREATMENT	
2(c) Report, by Region, the number of State pretreatment civil and criminal referrals sent to State Attorneys General and the number of State civil and criminal cases filed.	The active case docket consists of all referrals currently with the State Attorney General and the number of referrals filed in State Courts. OE will report the same data for Federal referrals; State referrals will be reported to the Regions.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
2(d) Track, by Region, against quarterly targets, for approved local pretreatment programs: 1) the number audited by EPA and by approved pretreatment States; and 2) the number inspected by EPA and by approved pretreatment States.	A local pretreatment program audit is a detailed on-site review of an approved program to determine its adequacy. The audit report identifies needed modifications to the approved local program and/or the POTW's NPDES permit to address any problems. The audit includes a review of the substantive requirements of the program, including local limits, to ensure protection against pass through and interference with treatment works and the methods of sludge disposal. The audit reviews the procedures used by the POTW to ensure effective implementation and reviews the quality of local permits and determinations (such as implementation of the combined wastestream formula). In addition, the audit includes, as one component, all the elements of a pretreatment compliance inspection (PCI). In certain cases, non-pretreatment States will be allowed to conduct audits for EPA. If a non-pretreatment State has the experience, training, resources and capabilities to effectively conduct audits, these audits could be counted. A determination of whether a non-pretreatment State could conduct the audit for EPA will be worked out between EPA HQ and the Region during the commitment negotiation process on a case-by-case basis.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	The pretreatment compliance inspection (PCI) assesses POTW compliance with its approved pretreatment program and its NPDES permit requirements for implementation of that program. The checklist to be used in conducting a PCI assess the POTW's compliance monitoring and enforcement program, as well as the status of issuance of control mechanisms and program modifications. A PCI must include a file review of a sample of industrial user files. Note that this measure tracks "coverage" of approved pretreatment programs, not the number of audits or inspections conducted, which may be greater than the number of programs since some programs may be inspected/audited more than once a year. Performance Expectation: At a minimum, audits should be performed at least once during the term of the POTW's permit. Although an audit includes all the elements of a PCI, as one component, the activity should not be counted as both an audit and a PCI; it should be counted as an audit. In any given year, all POTWs that are not audited should have a PCI as part of the routine NPDES inspection at that facility, i.e. audits plus inspections should equal 100 percent of approved POTWs, except where mitigating circumstances prevent this. Mitigating circumstances will be

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	approved during negotiation process and could include the need to target audits to support watershed initiatives or to conduct an in-depth audit. For purposes of reporting, both audits and pretreatment compliance inspections should be lagged by one quarter, i.e. same NPDES inspections. Also, where both an audit and an inspection are conducted for a POTW, for purposes of coverage, only that audit will be counted. There should be one number for EPA plus pretreatment States for audits and one number for EPA plus pretreatment States for inspections.
2(e) Identify the number of POTW's that need to conduct local limits headworks analysis. (unapproved States; approved States)	Local limits are periodically reevaluated to reflect conditions such as new or revised water quality based NPDES permit limits, new sludge requirements and changes in industrial contributions. The need for POTWs to conduct a local limit headworks analysis may also be prompted by POTW audits or revisions to the NPDES permit. For whichever reason, the number of POTWs needing to conduct a local limit headworks analysis is reported.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
3. NPDES ENFORCEMENT	
3(a) Report, by Region and State, the number of major permittees. Of these track by track by Region and State the number and percentage in SNC.	A facility is reported to be in significant noncompliance SNC for failure to comply with NPDES permit requirements if it meets the criteria in the QNCR Guidance Manual, 1985. An approved pretreatment program should be identified as in significant noncompliance when it meets the criteria for SNC identified in the FY 1990 Reporting an Evaluating POTW noncompliance with Pretreatment Requirements, issued September 27, 1989.
3(b) Report, by Region and State, the number of approved pretreatment programs. Of these, track by Region and State the number and percentage in SNC.	
3(c) Report, by Region, the total number of: (a) EPA administrative compliance orders and the total number of State equivalent actions issued; of these, report the number issued to POTWs for not implementing pretreatment; (b) Class I and	Headquarters will report EPA Administrative Compliance Orders (AOs) and State equivalent actions from PCS. All AOs must be entered into PCS by the 2nd update of the new quarter to be counted in the report. For pretreatment, only AOs issued to POTWs should be counted here. AOs issued to industrial users are counted in OWAS. Where an AO or APO includes both pretreatment and NPDES violations, the AO/APO should

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
Class II proposed administrative penalty orders issued by EPA for NPDES violations and pretreatment violations; and (c) administrative penalty orders issued by States for NPDES violations and pretreatment violations.	be counted once and considered a pretreatment AO/APO. For purposes of counting State penalty orders, any order which proposes the assessment of a cash penalty against a violator may be counted. Where the State has a two step process (similar to EPA's process) the proposed order should be counted.
3(d) Report, by Region, the active State civil case docket, the number of civil referrals sent to the State Attorneys General, the number of civil cases filed, the number of civil cases concluded, and the number of criminal referrals filed in State courts.	The active case docket consists of all referrals currently at the State Attorney General and the number of referrals filed in State Court. A case is concluded when a signed consent decree is filed with the State Court; the case is dismissed by the State Court; the case is withdrawn by the State Attorney General after it is filed in a State Court; or the State Attorney General declines to file the case. OE will report the same data for Federal referrals; State referrals will be reported to the Regions.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
3(e) Track, by Region, against targets, the number of major permittees inspected at least once (combine EPA and State inspections and report as one number).	As the inspections strategy states, all major facilities should receive the appropriate type of inspection each year by either EPA or the State. Individual inspection programs developed on a State specific basis to target inspections and produce better compliance would be considered as meeting this definition if approved by Headquarters. As part of the NPDES inspection, verification of sludge management practices as defined in guidance and training should be conducted as appropriate. EPA and States collectively commit to the number of major permitees inspected each year with a Compliance Evaluation Inspection (CEI), Compliance Sampling Inspection (CSI), Toxic Inspection (TOX), Biomonitoring Inspection (BIO), Performance Audit Inspection (PAI), Diagnostic Inspection (DIAG), or Reconnaissance Inspection (RI). Reconnaissance Inspections will only count toward the commitment for majors coverage when they are done on facilities that meet the following criteria:

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	(1) The facility has not been in SNC any of the four quarters prior to the inspection. (2) The facility is not a primary industry as defined by 40 CFR, Part 122, Appendix A. (3) The facility is not a municipal facility with a pretreatment program. Commitments for major permittee inspections should be quarterly targets and are to reflect the number of major permittees inspected at least once, unless an alternative approach has been agreed to with Headquarters. The universe of major permittees to be inspected is defined as those listed as majors in PCS. Multiple inspections of one major permittee will count only as one major permittee inspected (however, all multiple NPDES inspections will be included in the count for the measure that tracks the total number of all inspections, see next paragraph). The measure for tracking total inspection activity will not have a commitment. CEI, CSI, TOX, BIO, PAI, RI, and DIAG of major and minor permittees will be counted. Pretreatment inspections for IUs and POTWs will be counted only toward pretreatment inspection commitments. Multiple inspections of one permittee will be counted as separate inspections; Reconnaissance Inspections will be counted. It is expected that up to 10% of EPA resources will be set aside for neutral inspections of minor facilities.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES

DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

When conducting inspections of POTWs with approved pretreatment programs, a pretreatment inspection component (PCI) should be added, using the established PCI checklist. An NPDES inspection with a pretreatment component will be counted toward the commitments for majors, and the PCI will count toward the commitment for POTW pretreatment inspections. (This will be automatically calculated by PCS.) Regions are encouraged to continue CSI inspections of POTWs where appropriate. Industrial user (iu) inspections done in conjunction with audits or PCIs or those done independent of POTW inspections will be counted as IU inspections. Tracking of inspections will be done at Headquarters based on retrievals from the Permit Compliance System (PCS) according to the following schedule:

INSPECTIONS

	RETRIEVAL DATE The First Working Day after the second update in:
July 1, 1991 - Sept. 30, 1991	Jan. 1992
July 1, 1991 - Dec. 31, 1991	April 1992
July 1, 1991 - March 31, 1992	July 1992
July 1, 1991 - June 30, 1992	Oct. 1992

Inspections may not be entered into PCS until the inspection report with all necessary lab results has

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	been completed and the inspector's reviewer or supervisor has signed the complted 3560-3 form. Note: STARS only tracks the number of major permittees inspected. OWAS tracks the number of inspections. Regional and State inspection plans should be established by FY 1992 in accordance with guidance on inspection plans.
3(f)(g) Exceptions List	Note: For STARS report the number only. As part of OWAS, report both the number and the name and the number of quarters the facility has been in SNC. Also, the name list must be submitted with the numbers; only the fact sheet, with justification, will be reported by the 15th day of the beginning of the next quarter. In regard to all major permittees listed in significant noncompliance on the Quarterly Noncompliance Report (QNCR) for any quarter, Regions/NPDES States are expected to ensure that these facilities have returned to compliance or have been addressed with a formal enforcement action by the permit authority within the following quarter (generally within 60 days of the end of that quarter). In the rare circumstances where formal enforcement action is not taken, the administering Agency is

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	expected to have a written record that clearly justifies why the alternative action (e.g., enforcement action, permit modification in process, etc.) was more appropriate. Where it is apparent that the State will not take appropriate formal enforcement action before the end of the following quarter, the States should expect the Regions to do so. This translates for Exceptions List reporting as follows: Exceptions List reporting involves tracking the compliance status of major permittees listed in significant noncompliance on two or more consecutive QNCRs without being addressed with a formal enforcement action. Reporting begins on January 1, 1992 based on permitees in SNC for the quarters ending June 30, and September 30, that have not been addressed with a formal enforcement action by November 30. Regions are also expected to complete and submit with their Exceptions List a fact sheet which provides adequate justification for a facility on the Exceptions List. The fact sheet should be submitted by the 15th day of the beginning of the next quarter. After a permittee has been reported to compliance or addressed by a formal enforcement action, it should be dropped from subsequent lists. Reporting is to be based on the quarter reported in the QNCR (one quarter lag).

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	Returned to compliance (refer to QNCR Guidance for a more detailed discussion of SNC and SNC resolution) for Exceptions List facilities refers to compliance with the permit, order, or decree requirement for which the permittee was placed on the Exceptions List (e.g., same outfall, same parameter). Compliance with the conditions of a formal enforcement action taken in response to an Exception List violation counts as an enforcement action (rather than return to compliance) unless the requirements of the action are completely fulfilled and the permittee achieves absolute compliance with permit limitations. The Exceptions List includes pretreatment SNC. Formal enforcement actions against non-federal permittees include any statutory remedy such as Federal Administrative Order or State equivalent action, a judicial referral (sent to HQ/DOJ/SAG), or a court approved consent decree. A section 309(g) penalty administrative Order (AO) will not, by itself, count as a formal enforcement action since it only assesses penalties for past violations and does not establish remedies for continuing noncompliance. Unless the facility has returned to compliance, a 309(a) compliance order should accompany the 309(g) penalty order. Formal enforcement actions against federal permittees include Federal Facility Compliance Agreements, documenting the dispute and forwarding it to Headquarters for resolution, or granting them Presidential exemption.

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
4. WETLANDS PERMITTING	
4(a) Number of §404 permit resolutions.	Total number of resolutions of permits reviewed by EPA. Resolutions include permit issuance, denial, or withdrawal, and can include either acceptance or rejection of EPA's comments by the Corps or applicant.
5. WETLANDS ENFORCEMENT	
5(a) Number of administrative compliance orders issued this quarter	§309(a) administrative compliance orders issued by EPA. As a general rule, such orders should require the violator not only to stop the illegal discharge, but also where feasible to take affirmative action to remove the fill/or restore the site.
5(b) Number of administrative penalty complaints issued this quarter (STARS)	§309(g) administrative penalty complaints issued by EPA.
5(c) Number of civil cases referred to DOJ this quarter (STARS)	Civil §404 cases that a Region refers, either independently or jointly with the Corps, to DOJ for judicial action.
5(d) Number of criminal cases referred to DOJ this quarter	Criminal §404 cases that a Region refers to DOJ for prosecution.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
5(e) Total number of enforcement cases resolved this quarter (STARS)	Number of cases resolved through voluntary compliance, which occurs where the Region has not initiated any formal enforcement action against an illegal discharger, but instead achieves compliance through informal processes. Number of §309(a) compliance orders where the violator has complied with the terms of the order. Number of §309(g) administrative penalty actions in which the respondent has paid the penalty to the Region or, in those situations where payment is due and not forthcoming, where a federal district court has issued a final order requiring payment of the assessed penalty. Number of civil judicial referrals which have resulted in a federal district court entering a final order in the case. Number of criminal judicial referrals which have resulted in a federal district court entering a final order in the case.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
10 UIC -- (a) Report, by Region, progress against quarterly targets for the number of wells that have had mechanical integrity tests performed by operators and verified by EPA, States and Indian tribes with primacy. (See STARS DW-2)	A complete MIT is composed of a test for significant leaks in the casing, tubing or packer and a test for significant fluid migration into a USDW through vertical channels adjacent to the well bore. An MIT consists of a field test on a well or an evaluation of a well's monitoring records (i.e., annulus pressure, etc.) or cement records. At a minimum, the mechanical integrity of a Class I, II, or III (solution mining) well should be demonstrated at least once every five years during the life of the well.
11 UIC -- (a) Report, by Region, the number of Class I hazardous waste injection wells for which land ban petitions have been received and processed.	This measure provides indication of how well EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy are identifying operators of hazardous waste wells and ensuring that there is minimal impact on USDWs from the operation of these wells. To carry out the land ban petition process Headquarters will supply the latest information to the Regions, and they in turn will use this work one-on-one with the operators of hazardous waste injection wells. The objectives are to have the operators ready to submit their petitions at the earliest possible time, and the Regions ready to act on those petitions in a timely manner. The expectation is that the Regions will carry this out so that petition reviews are completed when the ban takes effect.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
12 UIC -- (a) Report, by Region, for EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy, the number of Class I, II, III, IV and V wells found in SNC. (See STARS DW/E-6)	Definition of SNC: The term "significant noncompliance" means: (a) any violation by the owner/operator of a Class I or a Class IV well, (b) the following violations by the owner/operator of a Class II, III or V well: (1) any unauthorized emplacement of fluids (where formal authorization is required); (2) well operation without mechanical integrity which causes the movement of fluid outside the authorized zone of injection if such movement may have the potential for endangering a USDW; (3) well operation at an injection pressure that exceeds the permitted or authorized injection pressure and causes the movement of fluid outside the authorized zone of injection if such movement may have the potential for endangering a USDW; (4) failure to perform an MIT when requested; (5) the plugging and abandonment of an injection well in an unauthorized manner; (6) any violation of a formal enforcement action, including an administrative or judicial order, consent agreement, judgement or equivalent State or Indian Tribe action; (7) the knowing submission or use of any false information in a permit application, periodic report or special request for information about a well. NOTE: In the absence of information to the contrary, MIT failures and pressure exceedences are presumed to be SNCs.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
13 (a) Report, by Region, for EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy all wells that appear on the Exceptions List from the date the violation becomes an exception through the date the violation is resolved, noting the date formal enforcement action was taken, if any. (See STARS DW/E-8)	This measure focuses on injection well owners/operators who have remained in SNC for 90 or more consecutive days and who have not been subject to formal enforcement action. The primacy agency will track the owner/operator on the Exceptions List until the owner/operator returns to compliance, or the primacy agency transfers the enforcement responsibility to the civil or criminal justice system or out of the UIC program.
13 (b) Report, by Region, for EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy the number of administrative orders and equivalent actions and the total number of §1431 emergency orders issued by well class. (See STARS DW/E-9)	This measure provides an indication of how many and what types of enforcement actions EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy are taking when violations are discovered. Report, the number of proposed AOs, equivalent actions by States and Indian Tribes with primacy, and the total number of Sect. 1431 emergency orders issued by well class (list separately EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy.) Since many Class V wells present high contamination risks to ground water, EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy should place an increased emphasis on issuing AOs for this Class. When counting proposed AOs, only those proposed orders that have been signed and sent to operators should be included. Draft information type orders performance for the number of AOs is expected to be roughly equivalent to the benchmark targets derived in the FY 1991 Enforcement Workload Model.

COMPLETING AND MAINTAINING THE NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
14 (a) Report by State those which have adopted new regulations, States which have received EPA approval of a primacy revision application, and States which have received approvals for an extension.	Regions will report those States which have adopted newly promulgated drinking water regulations and the date these rules were adopted. Regions will also report those States which have received EPA approval of their primacy program revision application and the States which have received approval of any extension. Note: ODW will provide the form for this report.
15 (a) Negotiate, with each State, annual targets for the number of SNCs occurring as of the compliance period ending March 31, 1991 and the number of exceptions existing as of June 1, 1991 [both will be contained on the July 1991 SNC/Exception Report] that will be appropriately addressed or returned to compliance by June 1, 1992, and reported to ODW by June 22, 1992 for each of the two categories listed below. 1) micro/turbidity/TTHM SNCs and exceptions 2) chem/rad SNCs and exceptions (Note: data are lagged one quarter.)	Each Region shall negotiate with each State, annual targets for the number of SNCs and the number of exceptions that will be appropriately addressed or returned to compliance by June 1, 1992. States shall set two targets, one for the microbiological/ turbidity/TTHM SNCs and exceptions, and one for the chemical and radiological SNCs & exceptions. The baseline for the targets shall be the number of systems contained on the July 1991 SNC/Exception Report which will be provided by ODW to the Regions in mid to late July 1991. This report will include the systems identified as SNCs for the first time as of the compliance period ending March 31, 1991 those previously identified for which "timely and appropriate" has not expired and the systems identified by the Regions as exceptions as of June 1, 1991. Targets shall be set based on the number of those SNCs and exceptions that will be appropriately

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	addressed or returned to compliance by June 1, 1992. Regions are to negotiate each State's target based upon the State's current compliance statistics and capabilities for violation reduction.
	An SNC is a public water system which meets any of the following criteria:
	1. Microbiological/Turbidity:
	(a) Systems on monthly monitoring:
	- 4 or more violations of the microbiological or turbidity MCL during any 12 consecutive months.
	- 6 or more combined "major"* violations of the microbiological or turbidity monitoring/reporting requirements and/or violations of the microbiological or turbidity MCL during any 12 consecutive months.
	- 10 or more combined microbiological or turbidity monitoring/reporting ("major" or "minor"**) and/or MCL violations during any 12 consecutive months.
	(b) Systems on quarterly monitoring:
	- 2 or more violations of the microbiological MCL during any 4 consecutive quarters.
	- 3 or more combined "major" violations of the microbiological monitoring/reporting requirements and/or MCLs during any 4 consecutive quarters.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	(c) Systems on annual monitoring: - 2 or more combined "major" violations of the microbiological monitoring/reporting requirements and/or MCLs during any 2 consecutive one-year periods.
	2. Chemical/Radiological
	(a) Exceeds the unreasonable risk to health level identified for that contaminant (Unreasonable risk to health guidance/criteria will be distributed under separate cover.)
	(b) Fails to monitor for or report the results of any of the currently regulated contaminants for 2 consecutive compliance periods.
	* A "major" monitoring/reporting violation is one where no samples were taken or results reported during a compliance period.
	** A "minor" monitoring/reporting violation is one where an insufficient number of samples were taken or results reported during a compliance period.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	(Note: At the time the FY 1992 OWAS was being developed, the SNC definition for the new Total Coliform (TC) and Surface Water Treatment (SWT) rules was under discussion. The SNC definition is being revised to include these rules, and will be further revised to include the Phase II and Lead & Copper rules. The SNC definition for the TC and SWT rules will be issued under separate cover prior to April 1, 1991.
15 (b) Report, using the SNC/Exception Report format, against all SNCs, those systems that: returned to compliance; had an appropriate enforcement action taken against them; remained unresolved; or became exceptions this quarter. Report separately for each of the following two groups: (Note: Date are lagged one quarter.) 1) micro/turbidity/TTHM SNCs 2) chem/rad SNCs	This measure will report those systems, which met any of the SNC criteria, which returned to compliance, had an appropriate enforcement action taken against them, remain unresolved, or became an exception for the first time this quarter. In addition to reporting system by system follow-up information, Regions are to report two summary numbers, one for each of the following categories: 1) micro/turbidity/TTHM SNCs, and 2) chemical/radiological SNCs. "Returned to Compliance" for SNCs of a microbiological MCL and/or M/R requirement, a turbidity MCL and/or M/R requirement, or a TTHM M/R requirement, is having no months of violation (either MCL or M/R), of the same contaminant which caused the system to become a SNC, during the six month period after the system was identified as a SNC.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	"Returned to Compliance" for SNCs of a chemical or radiological analytical level is conducting analyses that demonstrates that the system no longer exceeds the MCL. "Returned to Compliance" for SNCs of a chemical (other than TTHM) or radiological monitoring requirement is conducting the required monitoring and determining that the system does not exceed the MCL. An "appropriate enforcement action" for SNCs is any of the following: (a) the issuance of a bilateral, written compliance agreement signed by both parties, which includes a compliance schedule. (only appropriate for use by States) (b) the issuance of a State or final Federal Administrative Order, or Compliance Order. (c) the referral of a civil judicial case to the State Attorney General, or DOJ. (d) the filing of a criminal case in an appropriate State or U.S. District court. Timeliness for SNCs is eight months after the system became an SNC. (Two months for the State to determine, and become aware of, the system's SNC status and six months in which to complete the follow-up/enforcement action).

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	An "exception" is a system which was: a) a SNC which has not returned to compliance or was not addressed timely and/or appropriately, b) a SNC previously addressed appropriately which fails by more than 60 days to meet a milestone of a compliance schedule, or c) a SNC system appropriately addressed by referring a civil or criminal case to the State AG but which has not been filed within 120 days of the referral.
15 (c) Report using the SNC/Exception Report format those systems identified as exceptions through the prior quarter which have since returned to compliance, had an appropriate enforcement action taken against them, or remained exceptions as of this quarter. Report separately for each of the following two groups: 1) micro/turbidity/TTHM exceptions 2) chem/rad exceptions (Note: data are lagged one quarter)	This measure will report those systems which previously became exceptions, which have returned to compliance, had an appropriate enforcement action taken against them, or remained exceptions during the past quarter. In addition to reporting system by system follow-up information, Regions are to report two summary numbers, one for each of the following categories: 1) micro/turbidity/TTHM exceptions, and 2) chemical/radiological exceptions. The definitions of returned to compliance and appropriate enforcement actions are contained in the previous section on DW/E-2.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
15 (d) Report, State by State: (1) the total number of EPA NOVs proposed administrative orders, final administrative orders, complaints for penalty, civil referrals, criminal filings, and §1431 emergency orders issued, and the amount of each administratively assessed/collected penalty, during the quarter. (2) the number of State administrative orders; bilateral compliance agreements; civil cases referred to State Attorneys General (AGs), filed, and concluded; and the number of criminal cases filed by the AGs and concluded. (OECM will report the same data for EPA referrals.) (Note: State data are lagged 1 quarter)	This measure is intended to identify the level of effort of enforcement activity occurring at the State and Federal levels. The measure is to include actions taken against any system (regardless of whether it is classified as an SNC, or non-SNC. Only those State actions that are against violators of "SDWA requirements" should be counted. Actions against violators of non-SDWA requirements (e.g., violations of State operator certification requirements) should not be counted. For State actions report the number of bilateral compliance agreements; administrative orders; civil cases referred, filed, and concluded; and criminal cases filed and concluded. For Federal actions, report by State, the number of NOVs, proposed AOs, final AOs, complaints for penalty, §1431 emergency actions, each administrative penalty amount assessed and collected, and the numbers of civil referrals, and criminal filings. The information should include all the actions occurring during the quarter. This measure will be compiled all four quarters during FY '92. AO actions "in the works" should not be counted. These will likely be completed in the subsequent three months and States and Regions will get "credit" for them in the following reporting period.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	The performance expectations for individual Regions for the number of proposed and final AOs should be roughly equivalent to the actions predicted as being achievable in the FY '92 Enforcement Resources Model. Criminal charges filed by the AGs include criminal indictments and criminal information.

REDUCING RISK THROUGH IMPROVED SCIENCE

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
WATER QUALITY STANDARDS 1(a) Identify, against targets, the States/Tribes completing a Section 303(c)(1) triennial review that includes, biological criteria and salt water criteria, where appropriate, antidegradation policies and implementation methods and water quality standards for wetlands and coastal/ estuarine waters; and for which EPA takes formal action (approval, or disapproval and request for promulgation).	The water quality standards program requirements reflect priorities in the Science Advisory Board Report, "Reducing Risk: Setting Priorities and Strategies for Environmental Protection" and the Office of Water's "Strategic Plan." The emphasis of these documents and of the water quality standards program is on the reduction of ecological risk in critical surface waterbodies. The water quality standards program requirements for the FY 1991 - 1993 triennium were published in the FY 1991 Agency Operating Guidance. States are to adopt narrative biological criteria, salt water criteria, as appropriate, and antidegradation policies and implementation methods into water quality standards to further protect the nation's waterbodies. The critical waterbodies that must be addressed include wetlands and coastal/estuarine waters, but also may include lakes, streams and rivers. The requirements are designed to enhance the ability of States to adopt water quality standards that will serve as the foundation for programs to reduce the ecological risks facing our critical aquatic resources, particularly from nonpoint sources, combined sewer overflows and stormwater runoff.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	In particular, the requirements include: o By September 30, 1993, States and qualified Indian Tribes must adopt narrative biological criteria. The biological criteria shall be developed in accordance with either the Biological Criteria Program Guidance Document (April, 1990) or some other scientifically valid method. Criteria shall be developed that define the structure and function of the waterbody, including species richness, diversity, trophic composition, and abundance and/or biomass, that relate to the designated uses in the water quality standards. Such criteria may be used in refining the uses of the waters and in determining if the designated uses have been attained. o By September 30, 1993, water quality standards must contain salt water criteria, as appropriate. These criteria are for pollutants for which EPA has published Section 304(a) criteria guidance. o Also, by September 30, 1993, water quality standards must contain an acceptable antidegradation policy and implementation methods. This requirement is discussed in the FY 1988 national water quality standards program guidance and in proposed revisions to the Water Quality Standards Regulation.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	o In addition, by September 30, 1993, States and qualified Indian Tribes must adopt narrative water quality standards that apply directly to wetlands. Wetland water quality standards shall be established in accordance with either the National Guidance, Water Quality Standards of Wetlands (July, 1990) or some other scientifically valid method. In adopting water quality standards for wetlands, States and qualified Indian Tribes, as a minimum, shall: (1) define wetlands as "State waters"; (2) designate uses that protect the structure and function of the wetlands; (3) adopt aesthetic narrative criteria (the "free froms") and appropriate numeric criteria in the standards to protect the designated uses; (4) adopt narrative biological criteria into the standards; and (5) extend the antidegradation policy and implementation methods to wetlands. Unless results of a use attainability analysis show that the Section 101(a) goals can not be achieved, States and qualified Indian Tribes shall designate uses for wetlands that provide for the protection of fish, shellfish, wildlife, and recreation. When extending the antidegradation policy and implementation methods to wetlands, consideration should be given to designating critical wetlands as Outstanding National Resource Waters. As necessary, the antidegradation policy and implementation methods should be revised to reflect the unique characteristics of wetlands.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	o Finally, by September 30, 1993, State and qualified Indian Tribe water quality standards must apply directly to estuaries, as appropriate. In accordance with existing regulations and guidance, water quality standards for estuaries shall include designated uses, salt water criteria for pollutants for which EPA has published Section 304(a) criteria guidance, narrative biological criteria to protect the designated uses of the estuaries, and an antidegradation policy and implementation methods. When including the antidegradation policy and implementation methods in water quality standards for estuaries, consideration also should be given to designating the estuaries as Outstanding National Resource Waters. For States and qualified Indian Tribes included in the targets for this measure in FY 1992, the State or qualified Indian Tribe must complete a triennial review of water quality standards and EPA must take formal action by September 30, 1992. Formal action includes approval, or disapproval and a request that the Administrator promulgate Federal standards. Targets for this measure have to be developed for the second and fourth quarters of FY 1992.
2(a) Identify, against targets, the States for which Regions approve the numeric criteria	Section 303(c)(2)(B) of the CWA, as amended, requires that whenever a State reviews water quality standards in accordance with Section 303(c)(1), the State must

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
adopted by the States that are necessary to bring the States into full compliance with Section 303(c)(2)(B).	adopt numeric criteria into water quality standards for Section 307(a) priority pollutants that could be reasonably expected to interfere with designated uses. This measure tracks the States for which the Regions approve the numeric criteria adopted by the States that are necessary to bring the States into full compliance with Section 303(c)(2)(B). Not all States have complied fully with the requirements of Section 303(c)(2)(B). Where the Regions disapproved water quality standards or portions of those standards because the Section 303(c)(2)(B) requirements were not met, the Agency initiated action to propose Federal standards. If a State adopts sufficient criteria to fully comply with Section 303(c)(2)(B), EPA will not promulgate Federal standards for that State. Targets for this measure have to be developed for the second and fourth quarters of FY 1992.
EFFLUENT GUIDELINES	
4. (a) Publish two regulations in the Federal Register: final amendments for the Organic Chemicals, Plastics and	This measure tracks the development of two regulatory projects that will enhance the control of wastewater discharges to surface waters and municipal wastewater treatment systems. The majority of Organic Chemicals,

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
Synthetic Fibers Industry Categories; and final rule for the Offshore Oil and Gas Extraction Subcategory.	Plastics and Synthetic Fibers (OCPSF) manufacturing facilities are located in the industrialized, highly-populated areas that typically coincide with the geographically targeted areas of the U.S. Many Offshore oil and gas platforms are located in or near sensitive marine environments. The current schedules call for promulgation of the OCPSF amendments in April 1992 and promulgation of the Offshore Oil and Gas regulation in June 1992.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
SEDIMENTS/RISK ASSESSMENT	
2(a) Report, by State, the number of waterbodies that include sediment quality-based limits for point sources and sediment quality-based targets for nonpoint sources.	This measure reflects the Agency's increased emphasis on water quality impaired by contaminated sediments and begins to measure progress toward controlling sources of sediment contamination. The first step needed is an assessment of sediment quality. Sediment monitoring should be performed whenever known fish contamination exists. Regions should work with the States to ensure that in each State, where contamination is suspected, sediments at three or more locations are sampled for metals, persistent organic pollutants, total organic carbon (TOC), acid-volatile sulfides (AVS) and toxicity. Where organic or metal contaminants, normalized by TOC and AVS respectively, are found at levels greater than promulgated, proposed or draft chemical-specific sediment quality criteria, Regions should reasonably assure that States begin adoption of Section 303 sediment quality standards for those contaminants found at levels above criteria. (Six non-ionic organic chemical criteria for sediments will be published in the Federal Register by the end of FY 91.) Based on EPA's sediment criteria and bioaccumulation policy, Regions should work with the States to reasonably assure that where a State has adopted sediment criteria and sediment quality-based control procedures, the State implements sediment-quality based permit limits for point sources during

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	permit reissuance (unless conditions warrant an immediate reopening), and sediment-quality based targets for nonpoint sources. Where the Region administers the NPDES program, and where EPA adopts sediment criteria and sediment quality-based control procedures, the Region should develop sediment quality-based permit limits for the contributing sources whose permits reissued. In reporting on this measure, Regions should indicate by waterbody any and all of the three activities listed, i.e., sediment monitoring for point sources, sediment quality-based limits for point sources, and/or sediment quality-based targets for nonpoint sources. FY 92 will be a transition year and will demonstrate progress States are making in addressing this important pollution problem.
3(a) Report, by State, and by name, waterbodies with fish tissue monitoring and waterbodies with fish consumption advisories.	Environmental agencies and health departments at the State level are responsible for protecting the public from the risks of consuming contaminated fish that are harvested locally by issuing consumption advisories or bans when necessary. The public health advisory is a management tool available to regulators to warn the public of high levels of toxic substances in fish. EPA will develop guidance to promote the use of risk assessments in determining the potential risk to

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	humans from the consumption of contaminated fish and will encourage the States to generate fish tissue monitoring data for this purpose. This data can then be used for a risk assessment to determine if a fish advisory is necessary. Initially, States will be required to: 1. Report in the Waterbody system the names of waterbodies with fish tissue monitoring data. In the STORET system store information on the pollutants analyzed in fish and the type of analysis that was performed, i.e., whole body, fillet, etc. 2. Report in the Waterbody system the names of waterbodies for which fish consumption advisories have been issued. The Section 305(b) report should indicate the pollutants covered in the advisory, the type of advisory issued (i.e., fish consumption ban, a consumption ban only for pregnant women and children, a fish advisory which recommends so many meals/ounces of fish per month), the risk assessment approach used in the determination to issue a fish advisory (i.e., EPA risk assessment methodology, FDA action level, etc.), the extent of the advisory, and the common name of the fish covered by the advisory.

USING ECOLOGICAL INDICATORS TO MEASURE REDUCTION IN RISK

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
4(a) Identify, against targets, the ecological criteria guidance HQ will publish.	A key theme in the Science Advisory Board Report, "Reducing Risk: Setting Priorities and Strategies for Environmental Protection," and the Office of Water's "Strategic Plan" is to reduce ecological risks facing critical aquatic resources. We also need to view the integrity of the water environment holistically -- the sum total of the complex biological, chemical and physical dynamics necessary to sustain long-term processes -- ecological integrity -- of a healthy aquatic ecosystem. Over time, criteria guidance will provide a comprehensive basis on which to design programs that prevent and control pollution and habitat alteration and destruction and loss of species, particularly from nonpoint sources, combined sewer overflows and stormwater runoff. Chemical-specific sediment criteria to protect aquatic life and numeric biological criteria for streams, rivers, lakes, wetlands and estuaries are the most pressing priority needs. Then, as resources allow, criteria will be published to protect habitat in critical waterbodies.

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
1. WETLANDS STRATEGIC INITIATIVES	The following four WQ-2 measures represent specific categories of activities that have historically been combined under the title "Strategic Initiative (SI)," which can continue to be used as a blanket descriptor. The SI encompasses a fairly wide range of strategic activities undertaken by a Region to improve protection of wetlands and/or other critical aquatic habitats on a broad (temporal/spatial) scale. An SI may be extensive involving increased EPA action on a broad geographic scale in a major program activity area (e.g. increasing public outreach throughout a State). Alternatively, it may be intensive in being targeted to a more limited geographical area (e.g. enforcement in that area). At a minimum, an SI must include problem analysis, identification of goals for the target wetlands, evaluation of options to achieve the goals, an action plan, implementation, and evaluation of results. An SI should be a non-recurring project that is beyond the scope of what are generally considered to be "normal," day-to-day activities. As a guide, an SI should constitute a program component that represents one-tenth or more of the Region's wetlands program resources. To "complete" an initiative means to have (1) implemented all components of the action plan, with no more than the evaluation of results remaining to be done; and

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	(2) submitted to Headquarters a brief (e.g., one-page) summary of the project, including start- and end-dates, approximate resources expended, activities undertaken, and anticipated benefits of the initiative. These summaries will provide useful data to Headquarters on Regional activities and can serve as valuable information-transfer vehicles among Regions. It is understood that specific projects can cut across the definitions below, e.g., an Advance Identification can, and should, involve a substantial public outreach component. Regions are requested to avoid "double-counting" by choosing the most appropriate category under which to report the completion of an initiative.
1(a) Number of Advance Identifications completed (STARS)	Completion of an Advance Identification as defined in 40 CFR Part 230.80 of the CWA §404(b)(1) Guidelines and further described in the 1989 "Guidance to EPA Regional Offices on the Use of Advance Identification Authorities Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act."
1(b) Number of major pubic education and outreach initiatives completed (STARS)	Completion of a major educational effort directed either to a specific sector of the regulated community (e.g., agricultural community, fishing industry) or to residents of a particular geographic area (e.g., communities in prairie pothole regions.)

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
1(c) Number of geographically targeted §404 enforcement initiatives completed (STARS)	Completion of an intensive §404 enforcement/compliance effort in a specific geographic area. Enforcement Initiatives are generally undertaken for their deterrent value in areas with histories of particularly poor compliance or with particularly vulnerable resources.
1(d) Number of comprehensive management and planning initiatives completed, e.g., greenways/river corridor management plans, special area management plans, etc.	Completion of a management or planning initiative designed to provide the Region with a comprehensive strategy for addressing a variety of wetlands protection issues. Examples include development of greenway/river corridor management plans and special area management plans, development of water quality standards for wetlands, and development of strategies for improved interaction with State, Tribal, local, and/or other federal government bodies.
2(a) Identify the number of permits reissued in near coastal waters (report separately NPDES States, non-NPDES States).	In accordance with EPA's near coastal waters initiative and the EPA Coastal and Marine Policy, Regions with coastal dischargers will accelerate actions for reissuing permits to these facilities. A near coastal water is one with measurable salinity and tidal influences, including discharges in an estuary drainage areas and Great Lakes dischargers. Permits should contain water quality based limits based on available wasteload allocations and should be analyzed for conventional pollutants and persistent, bio-concentratable toxicants.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
2(b) Identify the number of permits issued which include limits and appropriate monitoring requirements for CSOs. Of these, how many are in geographically targeted areas?	Monitoring requirements for all combined sewer systems should be developed to achieve the following three objectives: characterize the hydraulic relationships between the POTW, the collection system, and CSOs; characterize the CSO discharge itself; and, evaluate the water quality impacts of CSO discharges. The initial phase of monitoring should include in-system flow monitoring as well as overflow monitoring. The second essential part of a monitoring program is CSO discharge sampling. Overflow discharges must be sampled to determine the volume, frequency, and duration, as well as pollutant loadings discharged to receiving waters. For a definition of a geographically targeted area, please see (E).
2(c) How many permits have been issued due to designation under 402(p) (2)(E)?	Although EPA has recently amended regulatory requirements for permit applications for industrial and municipal storm water discharges, some storm water discharges had previously had been identified as representing significant sources of pollutants with discernable adverse effects on water quality. Regional Offices and States can designate those storm water dischargers for permitting under the authority of Section 402(p)(2)(E) as soon as possible after their impact is documented. Under this provision,

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	permitting can occur for "a discharge which the Regional Administrator or the State Director, as the case may be, determines that the storm water discharge contributes to a violation of a water quality standard or is a significant contributor of pollutants to the waters of the United States."
2(d) How many geographically targeted basins or watersheds were identified for targeted permit issuance?	Geographically targeted permit issuance is defined as the designation of a water body, drainage basin, hydrologically similar area, or geographic location in which all permits, mostly requiring water quality based limits, are issued in a comprehensive planned manner. The area selected would be considered as a unit for which permit issuance would occur at an identical or closely timed period. TMDLs/WLAs would form the basis of the limits, where available.
MARINE DISCHARGE WAIVERS AND OCEAN DISCHARGE CRITERIA EVALUATIONS	
3(a) # of final 403(c) assessment activities.	For each point source subject to 403 requirements, the Regions will issue a final permit based on an evaluation of ocean discharge criteria and determination of either unreasonable degradation or irreparable harm. It is expected that the Region will review monitoring data of dischargers who permits will be considered for renewal in the next fiscal year.

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
4(a) What is the Regions/States process for identifying pretreatment POTWs which need pretreatment performance evaluations (PPE)?	The PPE is an additional tool for assessing the compliance of a pretreatment POTW and IUs within that POTW. It includes a more comprehensive review of the compliance status of IUs within a POTW and the effectiveness of the enforcement program conducted by the POTW than is now provided for in the PCI or audit. While the concept is still under development, it is likely to be modeled on the approach used by Region IX and described at the Pretreatment Coordinator's meeting in Seattle in May 1991.
NONPOINT SOURCES:	
6(a) Identify, by State, against targets, the percentage of priority waterbodies identified in their approved State NPS management programs with watershed control programs actively underway.	This measure tracks the degree of which States are actively implementing NPS management practices in the watersheds of the priority waterbodies which they have identified in their approved NPS management programs as needing protection from or abatement of NPS pollution. All States have approved NPS management programs which identify priority waterbodies requiring actions to abate or prevent NPS pollution. States have had available to them two Section 319 grant awards, technical and financial support from other EPA programs such as the National Estuaries program, and from other Federal agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service of the U.S.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Land Management of the U.S. Department of the Interior, as well as funding and technical support from State and local sources to assist them in initiating and expanding the needed actions. This measure identifies the percentage of its priority watersheds in which each State is actively implementing such activities. In reporting on this measure, Regions should use as a base the number of priority waterbodies identified by each State in its approved NPS management program. For the purposes of this measure, "active implementation" means that: landowners/land managers within the watershed have adopted or have formally committed to adopting approved BMPs and/or BMP control systems; regulations/ordinances requiring approved BMPs within the watershed exist or are being actively developed; or outreach/technology transfer/demonstration programs targeted to obtaining adoption of approved BMPs by specific categories of landowners/land managers within the watershed are being actively conducted.

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
MONITORING:	
10(a) Report, by State: (1) the number of waterbodies targeted for TMDL development in the 1992 Section 303(d) submittal; (2) the total size impaired and the total size threatened within these waterbodies; and (3) the number of complex and non-complex TMDLs anticipated.	Report, in the fourth quarter, by State: (1) the number of waterbodies targeted for Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) development in the 1992 303(d) submittal; (2) the total size impaired and the total size threatened within these waterbodies; and (3) the number of complex and non-complex TMDLs anticipated. The measure begins a process for measuring environmental results in a subset of the impaired and threatened waterbodies. Pursuant to CWA Section 303(d) and Office of Water program guidance issued in 1990, every two years starting in April 1992, States will identify water-quality limited waterbodies and the subset of these waterbodies for which TMDLs will be developed during subsequent two years. States should use the Waterbody System (WBS) Waterbody Identification Number to identify the Section 303(d) targeted waterbodies. The total size impaired is the sum of the portions of these waterbodies partially and not supporting uses as reported under Section 305(b). The total size threatened is the sum of the portions of these waterbodies threatened under Section 305(b). Regions will ensure that they can determine the status of water quality in the individual targeted waterbodies using either the WBS or an independent information system. This information collected in

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	1992 will be used as a baseline for measuring changes in the total size impaired and threatened. We anticipate using a four year cycle for comparison. In 1994, a different set of targeted waterbodies will be identified and similarly evaluated on a four year cycle.
11(a) Report, by Region, for EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy the number of Class IV and endangering Class V injection well closures (by well type) achieved under UIC authority or in conjunction with other regulatory programs such as RCRA, UST, CERCLA, for example, or under wellhead protection efforts.	Class IV includes any unauthorized hazardous waste (defined under RCRA) injection practice that typically discharges directly into or above a USDW or violates CFR 144.13. Endangering Class V well types ranked by priority for permit and enforcement actions include industrial drainage, industrial waste disposal, motor vehicle facility waste disposal and any other Class V well(s) that the Region has identified as special problems.

REDUCING RISK THROUGH GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	Well closure describes a process to permanently discontinue injection of an unauthorized and endangering fluid contaminant which is in violation of RCRA or SDWA or applicable regulations. At this time, closure must include immediate cessation of injection of unauthorized waste stream to satisfy SDWA requirements. To satisfy both SDWA and RCRA, well closure may require additional action: -- Remove injection fluids deposited in well, sludge and any visibly contaminated soil. -- Segregate hazardous waste streams from sanitary waste streams (septic system) and redirect HW to holding tank. -- Restrict injection to authorized waste stream. -- Seal floor drain. -- Obtain authorized sewer hook-up. -- Remove well, injectate and contaminated soil; dispose in authorized facility. -- Imminent threat to USDW may require monitoring and ground-water remediation.
12 (A)(a) Number of States with Wellhead Protection Programs approved during FY 1992	This measure reflects the national objective of having all States with approved Wellhead Protection Programs. Performance Expectation: It is expected that each Region will work to ensure the implementation of Wellhead Protection Programs so that 100% of States have an approved program in place by the close of FY 1992.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
4. MUNICIPAL COMMUNITY OUTREACH	
4 (a) Number of small POTWs and Tribal facilities that have 1) returned to compliance, 2) maintained compliance, or 3) significantly improved performance as a result of onsite operator training/technical assistance through the Onsite Assistance Program [104(g)].	The Onsite Assistance Program (OAP) is a problem diagnostic and on-site assistance program to assist small (up to 5 mgd) POTWs and Tribal facilities improve performance and attain and/or maintain compliance. The Region and States should emphasize facilities in noncompliance with NPDES effluent requirements, although facilities with performance problems which would soon result in noncompliance may also be addressed. Candidate POTWs are identified through DMR, on-site, or Quality Assurance/Quality Control sample reviews. The Region and States are expected to provide on-site assistance to an extent consistent with FY 1991 resource allocations. At the start of each fiscal year, the Regions/States should report the number of minor POTWs with expected new training and technical assistance starts in the fiscal year and the number of carryover OMEs from the previous fiscal year. At mid-year and end-of-year, the Regions should report (1) actual new OAP starts; (2) the number of minor POTWs and Tribal facilities attaining and/or maintaining

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	compliance for at least three consecutive months during the fiscal year as a result of the OAP, regardless of when the training was initiated; and (3) the number not yet in compliance but which have significantly improved performance. Reports should distinguish Regional and State performance. Federal and State funded onsite assistance meeting the above definition should be counted.
5 A (a) Track, by Region, progress against quarterly Regional-Headquarters targets for the number of annual reports on SRF.	Each State which has received a SRF Capitalization Grant is required to submit an annual report on activities under SRF. The Report must be submitted to the Region within 90 days from the end of the year.* * The year referred to here is the State or Federal fiscal year as agreed to by the State and Regional office. Performance Expectation: The Region is expected to receive annual reports from SRF States within the 90-day time frame.

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
5 A (b) Number of annual reviews completed	An annual review should generally be conducted within 60 days of receipt of the Annual Report. Regions are to commit to the number of reviews conducted by mid-year and end-of-year.
7 (a) Submit separately for States and Indian Tribes with primacy a financial status report on the use of grant funds.	Performance Expectation: States and Indian Tribes with primacy are expected to report the use of UIC grants to program activity and object class in accordance with UIC program guidance.
9 (A) Report:	
- activities supporting DRA measures to provide Regional cross-program integration in support of Comprehensive Ground-Water Protection Programs	Identifies Regional ground-water office contribution to DRA efforts improving both coordination among EPA/State grant programs workplans and consistency in implementation of regulations related to ground-water protection.
- State progress in moving toward the implementation of Comprehensive Ground-Water Protection Programs	For each State, describe state efforts to: (1) complete self-assessment of ground-water protection programs and (2) identify and prioritize gaps in current ground-water protection efforts which need to be filled in order to develop a fully Comprehensive Ground-Water Protection Program. Self-assessments should also specify those Federal regulations and programs needing modification on further integration to ensure the development of a Comprehensive Program.

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
9 (C)(a) List date and type of outreach effort (workshop, conference) as well as State and local attendees; identify any outside groups sponsoring event	This measure identifies formal contacts aimed at encouraging support of Comprehensive Programs with State and local executive decision makers, citizens, and environmental and industry groups.
9 (D)(a) Number of Pesticides Management Plans reviewed to ensure coordination with Comprehensive Programs	This measure focuses on the extent to which the Regions' Office of Ground-Water participates in the decision making processes of other programs concerned with ground-water issues.
9 (D)(b) Number of 319 grant funded activities addressing non-point sources of ground-water contamination	This measure focuses on the extent to which the Regions' Office of Ground-Water participates in the decision making processes of other programs concerned with ground-water issues.
10 (A)(a) Number of States using minimum data element set for ground-water	This measure focuses on the need for consistency in ground-water data collection so that data can be shared among users.
10 (A)(b) Number of Regions implementing a Regional order for ground-water data management	This measure focuses on the need to have a data management strategy in each Region concerning the collection, storage, use, and sharing of ground-water data across all programs (wellhead protection, PWSS, UIC, RCRA, Superfund, Pesticides).

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
10 (A)(c) Number of States using ground-water indicators	This measure focuses on the need for the States to report in their submittal to EPA for the 305(b) report to Congress ground-water indicators. These indicators provide the States and trends of the Nation's ground-water quality.
11 (a) Report the number of technology transfer workshops, meetings, conferences, and consultations conducted by the Region to support implementation of approved NPS management programs.	This measure tracks the amount of technical assistance and support provided by the Region to assist States in implementing NPS Management Programs. Workshops, meeting and conferences are self-explanatory. Consultations are technical exchanges between State or project staff and EPA Regional/EPA contractor or other Federal/State agency experts to resolve a specific issue or problem.
13 (a) Report, by State: (1) total size of water-bodies assessed; and (2) total size of waterbodies fully, partially and not supporting designated uses, and the total size threatened.	Report, in the fourth quarter: (a) the total size of waterbodies assessed by the States either through monitoring or evaluation, according to EPA Guidance for Section 305(b) reports; and (b) the total size of waterbodies fully, partially and not supporting designated uses, and the total size threatened.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	This measure requires that the total size of stream miles, lake acres, estuary square miles, coastal miles, and Great Lakes shoreline miles assessed by the States, Territories, Interstate Commissions, and qualified Indian Tribes be reported in the fourth quarter. In addition, the water quality status of the waters (i.e., whether designated uses are fully, partially, or not supported, or whether the waters are fully supporting uses but threatened) should also be reported for this measure. The Section 305(b) guidelines establish two categories of assessed waters: monitored waters for which current site-specific monitoring data exist, and evaluated water for which there are other types of data such as land use information and ambient data older than five years. These two categories provide a general level of confidence for most of the water quality data. A waterbody is defined as a fixed hydrologic unit as designated by the State. Waterbodies are limited to one type of water (e.g., river, lake estuary). Consult the WBS User's Guide for additional guidance. [DATA SOURCE: Guidelines for

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	the Preparation of the 1990 State Water Quality Assessment and future editions. Relevant data contained in State NPS Management Programs and Assessments and Section 106/604(b) Work Programs.]
15 (a) Report, by Region, the number of assessment methodologies available to State and Indian Tribe for (1) targeting; (2) identifying WQ conditions, and (3) development of control strategies.	This measure requires Regions to make watershed assessment methods available to States and Indian Tribes. It includes at least one method each for: (1) geographic targeting to identify potential problems; (2) analysis/models to determine the extent of the problem(s); and (3) selection of optimum control of alternatives to improve the quality of ground-water and surface water in the watershed. Regions are expected to find methods using information from as many EPA programs and other Agency programs as possible. Automated methods are preferred if States have the computer hardware to handle them. EPA HQ will provide technical assistance on use of PC and mainframe systems to obtain and analyze information. Regions should have methodologies and their uses clearly defined for States and Indian Tribes, including computer hardware/software requirements and when/whom to call to obtain information and for technical assistance.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
16. WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT	
16 (a) Report, by State and qualified Indian Tribe, for FY91 and for FY92 through second quarter, the amount of funds identified in Section 106 work programs for selected national water quality program elements.	This measure provides Headquarters with the best available information on distribution of Section 106 surface water grant funds among selected national water quality program elements. In addition, this information will enable EPA to better justify and defend future Section 106 budget requests before Congress and OMB. More detailed data related to all WQM funding sources and activities are reported annually under quantitative measure 17(a). This measure requires that the amount of funds identified in Section 106 work programs for the following national water quality program elements be reported in the second quarter: permits/enforcement; source and ambient monitoring and laboratory costs (combined); water quality standards; and NPS implementation.
17 (a) Complete the FY91 budget matrix for each State and qualified Indian Tribe so that the uses of available funds can be determined.	The budget matrix columns include ten funding sources while the rows include 15 national program elements. Column and row totals are also included in the matrix format. Completing the budget matrix requires entering the dollar amount for each available funding source committed in a work program for the activities in each program element. The ten funding sources in the matrix are: (1) State (the sum of all required and voluntary contributions included in grant work programs); (2) the sum of

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	Wetlands; (4) 205(g); (5) 205(j)(2) [from 604(b) and 205(j)(1) reserves]; (6) 205(j)(5); (7) 201(g)(1)(B); (8) 314; (9) 319; and (10) other Federal and non-Federal sources. The national program elements are: (1) CMAG/O&M; (2) PERMITS; (3) PRETREATMENT; (4) ENFORCEMENT; (5) SOURCE MONITORING; (6) AMBIENT MONITORING; (7) LAB COSTS; (8) WQ STANDARDS; (9) WQ PLANNING; (10) NPS IMPLEMENTATION; (11) GROUND WATER; (12) SLUDGE MANAGEMENT; (13) EMERGENCY RESPONSE; (14) ADMINISTRATION; and (15) OTHER. [A copy of the matrix is available from the Office of Water.]
17 (b) Report, by State for FY91 and for FY92 through the second quarter, the percentage of 205(j)(2) awards from Sections 205(j)(1) and 604(b) funds passed-thru to RPCPOs and IOs in accordance with 205(j)(3).	Section 205(j)(3) requires that each State pass-thru a minimum of 40 percent of funds awarded under 205(j)(2) from Section 205(j)(1) and 604(b) reserves to Regional Public Comprehensive Planning Organizations (RPCPOs) and Interstate Organizations (IOs). This requirement can be waived only if a Governor determines, after consultation with RPCPOs and IOs, that these funds will not contribute significantly to the development or implementation of the State's WQM plan and the Regional Administrator approves these findings. A Governor's determination and EPA approval are limited to funds awarded in a single fiscal year. Regions must ensure that the proper funding amounts are passed-thru from each year's reserve of planning funds.

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AND ALLIANCES AMONG ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	For each State, list the pass-thru percentage from. - FY 1990 205(j)(1) and 604(b) funds awarded in FY 1991. - FY 1991 604(b) funds awarded in FY 1991 and thru second quarter FY 1992. - FY 1992 604(b) funds awarded thru second quarter FY 1992.
18 (a)Report the names of Indian Tribes that during FY 92 receive "treatment as a State" (TAS) status; Tribes receiving WQM grants; and the amount, purpose and funding sources of the grants.	This measure assesses Agency progress in awarding CWA program grants to qualified Indian Tribes as required by the Act. Specifically, it requires a listing of Indian Tribes qualified to be treated as States and the names of qualified Indian Tribes that receive CWA program grants (including major activities and funding sources).

ENSURING MANAGEMENT INTEGRITY

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
2. OUTLAYS/OBLIGATIONS 2 (a) Track, by Region, progress against quarterly targets for net outlays for combined construction grants and State Revolving Fund (SRF).	Percents of cumulative net outlays for construction grants and State Revolving Fund (SRF) to program commitment - The net sum of payments made and recovered from PL 84-660 projects, PL 92-500 contract authority projects, as well as projects funded with Talmadge/Nunn, FY 1977 supplemental, FY 1978 through FY 1990 budget authority, Section 205(g) funds, Section 205(m) funds, 604(b) funds, including all Title VI funds appropriated expressly of SRF. Performance Expectation: The cumulative Regional commitment will be a combined construction grants and SRF component. The performance expectation for the commitment will be ± 5%.
3 (a) Number of Step 3, Step 2+3, Marine CSO and PL 84-660 projects beginning to achieve environmental results.	A Step 3, Step 2+3, Marine CSO or PL 84-660 project is considered to have begun to achieve environmental results when the project initiates operations, i.e., when one of the following occurs: o For projects awarded **after 12/29/81**, the date of "Initiation of Operation": N7 = "Ab' or "Bb" or "Fb". o For projects awarded **before 12/29/81**, the date of "Physical Completion": N5 = "Ab" or "Bb" or "Fb".

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	Performance Expectation: An acceptable commitment would be 85% or greater of the number of projects projected to begin operations during FY 1992.
3 (b) Track, by Region, quarterly targets for the number of Step 3, Step 2+3, Marine CSO and PL 84-660 projects administratively completed.	Number of Step 3, Step 2+3, Marine CSO, and PL 84-660 projects administratively completed - A project is considered administratively complete when a final audit is requested; or, for projects that cannot be sent to the OIG because of related ongoing projects, when all of the administrative completion requirements have been satisfied. Performance Expectation: The goal will be to begin FY 1993 with no backlogged projects. An acceptable commitment would be the number of projects that must be completed in FY 1992 in order to enter FY 1993 with no backlogged projects, minus those projects the Region and Headquarters mutually agree are not able to be administratively completed during FY 1992. If a State's FY 1992 administrative completion commitment, in its approved completion/closeout strategy, is less than this goal but commits to virtually all administrative completions by the end of FY 1995, the strategy's commitment should be recognized as part of this performance expectation.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	A "backlogged" project is defined as: o A Step 3, Step 2+3, or PL 84-660 project awarded **before 1/29/81** which has been physically complete for more than **12 months,** but has not yet been administratively completed. o A Step 3, Step 2+3, or Marine CSO project awarded **after 12/29/81** which has initiated operations for more than **18 months,** but has not yet been administratively completed.
3 (c) Track, by Region, progress against quarterly targets for the number of Step 3, Step 2+3, Marine CSO and PL 84-660 project closeouts.	Number of Step 3, Step 2+3. Marine CSO and PL 84-660 project closeouts - A closeout occurs after: (1) An audit has been resolved or a determination has been made by OIG that an audit will not be performed; (2) Funds owed the Government by the grantee (or vice versa) have been recovered (or paid); and (3) A closeout letter has been issued to the grantee; or (4) Any disputes filed under 40 CFR, Parts 30 and 31 have been resolved. Performance Expectation: Project closeout is expected to occur within 6 months of final audit resolution, project "screenout" or, for projects under $1 million, within 6 months of administrative completion. However, the time-based goal does not apply when:

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	o The grantee appeals a final decision in accordance with 40 CFR, Parts 30 and 31; or o The action official has referred the project to the servicing finance office to establish an accounts receivable based on the audit findings. The estimated number of Step 3, Step 2+3, Marine CSO and PL 84-660 projects awaiting closeout or awaiting audit resolution at the beginning of the fiscal year or any project planned for "screen out" by OIG during the fiscal year should be planned for closeout by the end of the fiscal year.
3 (d) The number of Step 1 and Step 2 project closeouts.	Number of Step 1 and Step 2 project closeouts - A closeout occurs after: (1) An audit has been resolved or a determination has been made by OIG that an audit will not be performed; (2) Funds owed the Government by the grantee (or vice versa) have been recovered (or paid); and (3) A closeout letter has been issued to the grantee; or (4) Any disputes filed under 40 CFR, Parts 30 and 31 have been resolved. Performance Expectation: Project closeout is expected to occur within 6 months of final audit resolution; or, for project "screenout", within 6 months after the project is returned by the OIG; or for projects under $1 million, within six months of administrative completion, unless they will be audited together with

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
	another Step 3 or Step 4. However, the time-based goal does not apply if: o The grantee appeals a final decision in accordance with 40 CFR, Parts 30 and 31; or o The action official has referred the project to the servicing finance office to establish an accounts receivable based on the audit findings. An acceptable commitment would be the number of Step 1 and Step 2 projects that will be closed out in conjunction with the FY 1992 STARS commitment for Step 3, Step 2+3, Marine CSO, and PL 84-660 closeouts, plus all Step 1 and Step 2 projects awaiting closeout at the beginning of the fiscal year that are not associated with an ongoing Step 3 or Step 2+3 project.
3 (e) Percent of Corps utilization vs workplans.	Although this is not regarded as a Regional commitment, Headquarters does intend to track and evaluate how well the Region integrates Corps work planning and State planning and management. Both State and Corps performance should be evaluated on the same standard. Where outputs require input/output from both, evaluation must consider joint planning and execution.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES

3 (f) Number of final construction inspections conducted by the CoE.

DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Final construction inspections determine whether construction of a project has been completed. A determination is made that:

- All construction associated with the last contract under that grant is completed in accordance with the approved plans, specifications, and change orders (except for minor components such as landscaping;
- All equipment is operational;
- Laboratory facilities, if part of the approved plans and specifications, are available to conduct tests in certain States;
- The facilities are operational as designed (note that the Corps may not be responsible for this in certain States).

Performance Expectation: A final construction inspection will be conducted on all grant projects approximately at the time of initiation of operations or physical completion. Accordingly, the commitment will be reviewed against the related OWAS commitment for those States where CoE final construction inspection is performed.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
4 (a) Number of disputes arising under 40 CFR, Part 30, Subpart L and Part 31, Subpart F, for which decisions are issued by the RA, or are settled or withdrawn.	The commitment for this measure is comprised of two parts: (a) a commitment for the first two quarters, based on disputes "in house" as of 9/30/91; and (b) a second commitment at mid-year for disputes received during the first half of FY 1992. Note: The commitment includes only construction grants/OMAG assistance disputes arising under Subparts F and L. Performance expectation: Since FY 1986, the Region has been required to incorporate time-based goals into the steps of the Regional dispute resolution process (i.e., date of formal conference, dates of program/legal conferences, dates when program/legal reviews were completed, and date RA decision was issued). Accordingly, these goals may vary according to the level of difficulty (simple, moderate or difficult). The target performance expectation is that timely decisions are issued for all disputes that are submitted to the RA. Based on the Region's FY 1991 year-end commitments, the Headquarters goal is to substantially reduce the number of pending RA decisions. The Region is strongly encouraged to resolve or otherwise conclude by year's end 90% of the disputes that were in-house at mid-year. This requires that each Region's year-end commitment be calculated/adjusted to reduce the overall backlog.

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES	DEFINITION/PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS
7 (a) Report by well Class and operating status, an update of injection well inventories on an annual basis. Report separately for EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy.	EPA, States and Indian Tribes with primacy should develop and maintain injection well inventories in an automated data system. Headquarters will allocate Regional/State resources based on updated inventory data as of November 30 of each year (fourth quarter report).