

## Table of Contents

### INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

EPA's Mission .....	1
Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification .....	1
Homeland Security.....	1
Human Capital .....	1
Workforce .....	2

### RESOURCE SUMMARY TABLES

Appropriation Summary .....	3
Budget Authority .....	3
Full-time Equivalents.....	4

### GOAL AND OBJECTIVE OVERVIEW

Goal, Appropriation Summary.....	5
Budget Authority / Obligations.....	5
Clean Air and Global Climate Change .....	7
Clean and Safe Water.....	12
Land Preservation and Retoration.....	16
Healthy Communities and Ecosystems.....	22
Compliance and Environmental Stewardship.....	32

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE AND ASSESSMENT

Performance Assessment Rating Tool (PART) Improvement Plans -	
Spring Update Report .....	39
Performance Assessment Rating Tool (PART) Supplemental Information.....	62
Annual Performance Goals and Measures – Environmental Programs.....	70
Clean Air and Global Climate Change .....	70
Clean and Safe Water.....	82
Land Preservation and Restoration .....	90
Healthy Communities and Ecosystems.....	98
Compliance and Environmental Stewardship.....	123
Annual Performance Goals and Measures – Enabling Support Programs .....	131
Office of Administration and Resources Management.....	131
Office of Environmental Information .....	133
Office of the Inspector General.....	135

### APPENDIX

Coordination with Other Federal Agencies – Environmental Programs .....	137
Clean Air and Global Climate Change .....	137
Clean and Safe Water.....	142
Land Preservation and Restoration .....	146
Healthy Communities and Ecosystems.....	151
Compliance and Environmental Stewardship.....	160
Coordination with Other Federal Agencies- Enabling Support Programs.....	167
Office of the Administrator (OA) .....	167
Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) .....	168
Office of Administration and Resources Management (OARM).....	168

## Table of Contents

Office of Environmental Information (OEI).....	169
Office of the Inspector General (OIG).....	171
Major Management Challenges .....	172
EPA User Fee Program .....	198
Working Capital Fund.....	200
Acronyms for Statutory Authorities.....	201
STAG Categorical Program Grants – Statutory Authority and Eligible Uses.....	206
Program Projects by Appropriation .....	216
Program Projects by Program Area .....	233
Discontinued Programs .....	247
Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds .....	248
Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training .....	249
Categorical Grant: Water Quality Cooperative Agreements .....	250
Expected Benefits .....	251

## Introduction and Overview

### **EPA's Mission**

The mission of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is to protect and safeguard human health and the environment. This budget supports the Administration's commitment to environmental results as we work to increase the pace of improvement and identify new and better ways to carry out our mission. It also emphasizes the need for sound management of our federal resources, as delineated in the President's Management Agenda.

### **Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification**

The EPA's Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification requests \$7.1 billion in discretionary budget authority and 17,217.0 Full Time Equivalents (FTE). This request reflects the Agency's efforts to work with its partners towards protecting air, water, and land, as well as providing for EPA's role in safeguarding the nation from terrorist attacks. This request echoes the Administration's commitment to setting high environmental protection standards, while focusing on results and performance, and achieving goals outlined in the President's Management Agenda.

The budget builds on EPA's long record of accomplishments since its founding 37 years ago. The agency and nation as a whole has achieved enormous successes. This budget builds on these successes by strengthening our geographic initiatives, better leveraging our nation's resources, strengthening citizen involvement, maintaining our enforcement capabilities, and implementing the

President's commitment to efficiently manage Federal resources.

### **Homeland Security**

Following the cleanup and decontamination efforts of 2001, the Agency has focused on ensuring we have the tools and protocols needed to detect and recover quickly from deliberate incidents. The emphasis for FY 2009 is on several areas: biodefense research, decontaminating threat agents, protecting our water and food supplies, and ensuring trained personnel and key lab capacities are in place to be drawn upon in the event of multiple incidents of national significance. Part of these FY 2009 efforts will continue to include activities that support the Water Security Initiative (WSI) and assist in improving response capabilities through specialized Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) training, state-of-the-art field and analytical equipment, and increased technical knowledge relating to chemical, biological, and radiological substances.

### **Human Capital**

EPA will continue to develop workforce planning strategies that link current and future Human Capital needs to mission accomplishment which will result in significant reductions in skills gaps for Mission Critical Occupations. In addition, EPA's recruitment strategy will focus on hiring needs that will encourage the use of hiring flexibilities, build on centralized and local recruitment approaches, and focus on attracting applicants who are talented, diverse and committed to EPA's mission. In part, EPA also will continue to target developmental resources to retain a highly-

skilled and results-oriented workforce with the right mix of technical expertise, professional experience and leadership capabilities. A sound, sustained and strategic approach toward HC will assure EPA and its workforce has sustained mission success.

### **Workforce**

EPA values its world class workforce and its expertise enables us to meet our urgent responsibilities across a broad range of national and local environmental issues. In FY 2009, we are making adjustments to EPA's workforce management strategy that will help us better align resources, skills,

and Agency priorities. A key step in this adjustment is improving the alignment between the total number of positions authorized and actual FTE utilization. As such, in FY 2009 EPA proposed to reduce its Agency authorized FTE ceiling by approximately 89.5 positions (below the FY 2008 Enacted FTE Ceiling) to 17,217.0, which is consistent with the Agency's historical FTE levels. The result of these reductions will not impede Agency efforts to maximize efficiency and effectiveness in carrying out its programs and will not result in an overall change in the number of FTEs at EPA.

## Resource Summary Tables

### APPROPRIATION SUMMARY

Budget Authority  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>
<b>Science &amp; Technology</b>	\$728,339.9	\$754,506.0	\$760,084.0	\$763,527.0
<b>Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>	\$2,321,877.0	\$2,298,188.0	\$2,327,962.0	\$2,338,353.0
<b>Inspector General</b>	\$32,288.4	\$38,008.0	\$41,099.0	\$39,483.0
<b>Building and Facilities</b>	\$39,044.3	\$34,801.0	\$34,258.0	\$35,001.0
<b>Oil Spill Response</b>	\$16,185.2	\$17,280.0	\$17,056.0	\$17,687.0
<i>Superfund Program</i>	\$1,310,820.8	\$1,211,431.0	\$1,216,794.0	\$1,230,652.0
<i>IG Transfer</i>	\$12,286.2	\$7,149.0	\$11,486.0	\$7,164.0
<i>S&amp;T Transfer</i>	\$29,312.3	\$26,126.0	\$25,718.0	\$26,417.0
<b>Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>	\$1,352,419.3	\$1,244,706.0	\$1,253,998.0	\$1,264,233.0
<b>Leaking Underground Storage Tanks</b>	\$83,673.9	\$72,461.0	\$105,816.0	\$72,284.0
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>	\$3,337,543.9	\$2,744,450.0	\$2,937,051.0	\$2,621,952.0
<b><i>SUB-TOTAL, EPA</i></b>	<b>\$7,911,371.9</b>	<b>\$7,204,400.0</b>	<b>\$7,477,324.0</b>	<b>\$7,152,520.0</b>
<b><i>Rescission of Prior Year Funds</i></b>				
<b>Rescission of Prior Year Funds</b>	\$0.0	(\$5,000.0)	(\$5,000.0)	(\$10,000.0)
<b>TOTAL, EPA</b>	<b>\$7,911,371.9</b>	<b>\$7,199,400.0</b>	<b>\$7,472,324.0</b>	<b>\$7,142,520.0</b>

**APPROPRIATION SUMMARY**

Full-time Equivalents (FTE)

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>
<b>Science &amp; Technology</b>	2,425.9	2,405.8	2,405.8	2,387.5
<b>Science and Tech. - Reim</b>	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0
<b>Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>	10,652.2	10,867.0	10,849.7	10,796.1
<b>Envir. Program &amp; Mgmt - Reim</b>	32.3	1.5	1.5	0.0
<b>Inspector General</b>	223.7	287.7	259.8	287.7
<b>Oil Spill Response</b>	90.7	102.2	102.2	102.2
<b>Oil Spill Response - Reim</b>	9.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Superfund Program</i>	2,958.7	3,056.8	3,056.8	3,031.7
<i>IG Transfer</i>	83.8	44.1	72.0	44.1
<i>S&amp;T Transfer</i>	104.5	105.0	105.0	110.0
<b>Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>	3,147.0	3,205.9	3,233.8	3,185.8
<b>Superfund Reimbursables</b>	102.9	77.5	77.5	75.5
<b>Leaking Underground Storage Tanks</b>	67.3	75.3	75.3	75.3
<b>FEMA - Reim</b>	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>WCF-REIMB</b>	111.5	110.7	110.7	116.7
<b>Rereg. &amp; Exped. Proc. Rev Fund</b>	144.2	187.2	187.2	187.2
<b>Pesticide Registration Fund</b>	59.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b><i>SUB-TOTAL, EPA</i></b>	<i>17,071.9</i>	<i>17,323.8</i>	<i>17,306.5</i>	<i>17,217.0</i>
<b><i>Rescission of Prior Year Funds</i></b>				
<b>TOTAL, EPA</b>	<i>17,071.9</i>	<i>17,323.8</i>	<i>17,306.5</i>	<i>17,217.0</i>

## Goal and Objective Overview

### GOAL, APPROPRIATION SUMMARY

Budget Authority  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>
<b>Clean Air and Global Climate Change</b>	\$896,120.0	\$910,364.6	\$971,739.4	\$938,582.3
<b>Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>	\$450,222.1	\$438,093.2	\$435,919.9	\$444,555.5
<b>Science &amp; Technology</b>	\$197,385.5	\$216,316.5	\$224,039.8	\$220,394.6
<b>Building and Facilities</b>	\$8,615.6	\$7,636.6	\$7,514.4	\$7,732.2
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>	\$232,846.4	\$239,194.0	\$294,606.0	\$256,174.0
<b>Inspector General</b>	\$4,155.8	\$5,550.1	\$6,185.4	\$6,047.6
<b>Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>	\$2,894.7	\$3,574.2	\$3,474.0	\$3,678.4
<b>Clean and Safe Water</b>	\$3,195,855.0	\$2,714,506.8	\$2,854,781.9	\$2,580,704.2
<b>Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>	\$476,552.9	\$454,199.6	\$462,519.5	\$464,561.4
<b>Science &amp; Technology</b>	\$125,267.3	\$150,194.4	\$139,019.7	\$148,109.0
<b>Building and Facilities</b>	\$5,985.0	\$5,309.6	\$5,224.6	\$5,241.9
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>	\$2,570,904.0	\$2,085,766.0	\$2,227,415.0	\$1,943,712.0
<b>Inspector General</b>	\$17,145.7	\$19,037.2	\$20,603.2	\$19,080.0
<b>Land Preservation and Restoration</b>	\$1,783,171.9	\$1,662,989.5	\$1,688,592.2	\$1,691,127.9
<b>Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>	\$215,305.2	\$220,341.8	\$214,681.4	\$221,595.9
<b>Science &amp; Technology</b>	\$11,638.0	\$12,367.4	\$12,196.1	\$15,301.1
<b>Building and Facilities</b>	\$4,602.1	\$4,270.1	\$4,201.8	\$4,376.0
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>	\$134,110.3	\$125,620.0	\$115,023.0	\$126,146.0
<b>Leaking Underground Storage Tanks</b>	\$83,673.9	\$72,461.0	\$105,816.0	\$72,284.0
<b>Oil Spill Response</b>	\$16,185.2	\$17,280.0	\$17,056.0	\$17,687.0
<b>Inspector General</b>	\$2,098.5	\$2,659.0	\$2,871.8	\$2,840.2
<b>Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>	\$1,315,558.7	\$1,207,990.2	\$1,216,746.1	\$1,230,897.7

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>
<b>Healthy Communities and Ecosystems</b>	\$1,288,596.5	\$1,174,061.5	\$1,227,362.5	\$1,191,003.6
<b>Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>	\$620,678.4	\$621,787.6	\$652,643.1	\$628,315.8
<b>Science &amp; Technology</b>	\$345,300.8	\$332,682.3	\$342,403.5	\$338,843.1
<b>Building and Facilities</b>	\$13,996.9	\$12,167.4	\$11,947.2	\$12,242.3
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>	\$290,025.9	\$192,117.0	\$204,616.0	\$196,417.0
<b>Inspector General</b>	\$5,886.9	\$6,863.1	\$7,490.6	\$7,338.3
<b>Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>	\$12,707.5	\$8,444.2	\$8,262.1	\$7,847.1
 <b>Compliance and Environmental Stewardship</b>	 \$747,628.5	 \$742,477.6	 \$734,848.0	 \$751,102.0
<b>Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>	\$559,118.4	\$563,765.8	\$562,198.2	\$579,324.5
<b>Science &amp; Technology</b>	\$48,748.3	\$42,945.5	\$42,425.0	\$40,879.2
<b>Building and Facilities</b>	\$5,844.6	\$5,417.3	\$5,369.9	\$5,408.5
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>	\$109,657.3	\$101,753.0	\$95,391.0	\$99,503.0
<b>Inspector General</b>	\$3,001.5	\$3,898.6	\$3,948.1	\$4,177.0
<b>Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>	\$21,258.4	\$24,697.4	\$25,515.8	\$21,809.8
 <i>Sub-Total</i>	 \$7,911,371.9	 \$7,204,400.0	 \$7,477,324.0	 \$7,152,520.0
<b>Rescission of Prior Year Funds</b>				
<b>Total</b>	\$7,911,371.9	\$7,204,400.0	\$7,477,324.0	\$7,152,520.0



## CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Protect and improve the air so it is healthy to breath and risks to human health and the environment are reduced. Reduce greenhouse gas intensity by enhancing partnerships with businesses and other sectors.

### STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES:

- Through 2011, working with partners, protect human health and the environment by attaining and maintaining health-based air-quality standards and reducing the risk from toxic air pollutants.
- Through 2012, working with partners, reduce human health risks by reducing exposure to indoor air contaminants through the promotion of voluntary actions by the public.
- By 2030, through worldwide action, ozone concentrations in the stratosphere will have stopped declining and slowly begun the process of recovery, and overexposure to ultraviolet radiation, particularly among susceptible subpopulations, such as children, will be reduced.
- Through 2011, working with partners, minimize unnecessary releases of radiation and be prepared to minimize impacts to human health and the environment should unwanted releases occur.
- By 2012, 160 million metric tons of carbon equivalent (MMTCE) of emissions will be reduced through EPA's voluntary climate protection programs.
- Through 2012, provide sound science to support EPA's goal of clean air by conducting leading-edge research and developing a better understanding and characterization of human health and environmental outcomes.

### GOAL, OBJECTIVE SUMMARY

Budget Authority  
Full-time Equivalents  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted</b>
<b>Clean Air and Global Climate Change</b>	<b>\$896,120.0</b>	<b>\$910,364.6</b>	<b>\$971,739.4</b>	<b>\$938,582.3</b>	<b>(\$33,157.1)</b>
Healthier Outdoor Air	\$572,756.3	\$587,200.0	\$644,090.6	\$616,455.8	(\$27,634.8)
Healthier Indoor Air	\$45,342.4	\$45,841.6	\$45,581.9	\$43,502.4	(\$2,079.5)
Protect the Ozone Layer	\$19,578.7	\$17,120.9	\$16,865.3	\$17,463.6	\$598.3
Radiation	\$35,584.1	\$39,085.5	\$38,254.1	\$41,396.8	\$3,142.7
Reduce Greenhouse Gas Intensity	\$128,736.6	\$122,819.6	\$130,092.3	\$121,063.3	(\$9,029.0)

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted</b>
Enhance Science and Research	\$94,122.0	\$98,297.0	\$96,855.2	\$98,700.4	\$1,845.2
Total Authorized Workyears	2,597.5	2,610.1	2,608.8	2,628.1	19.3

EPA implements the Clean Air and Global Climate Change goal through national and regional programs designed to provide healthier outdoor and indoor air for all Americans, protect the stratospheric ozone layer, minimize the risks from radiation releases, reduce greenhouse gas intensity, and enhance science and research. These programs are all founded on several common principles: using health and environmental risks to set priorities, streamlining programs through regulatory reforms; encouraging market-based approaches; facilitating deployment of cost-effective technologies; promoting energy efficiency and clean energy supply; using sound science, and maintaining partnerships with states, Tribes, local governments, non-governmental organizations, and industry.

EPA's key clean air programs – including those addressing particulate matter, ozone, acid rain, air toxics, indoor air, radiation and stratospheric ozone depletion – focus on some of the highest health and environmental risks faced by the Agency. These programs have achieved results. Every year, state and Federal air pollution programs established under the Clean Air Act prevent tens of thousands of premature mortalities, millions of incidences of chronic and acute illness, tens of thousands of hospitalizations and emergency room visits, and millions of lost work days.

### ***Clean Air Rules***

The Clean Air Rules are a major component of EPA work under Goal 1, and include a

suite of actions that will dramatically improve America's air quality. Three of the rules specifically address the transport of pollution across state borders (the Clean Air Interstate Rule, the Clean Air Mercury Rule and the Clean Air Nonroad Diesel Rule). These rules provide national tools to achieve significant improvement in air quality and the associated benefits of improved health, longevity and quality of life for all Americans. In FY 2009, EPA will continue to work with the states and industry to implement these rules.

In addition to the Clean Air Rules, EPA will address emission reductions through the Diesel Emissions Reduction Grants program authorized in sections 791-797 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This program will provide immediate emission reductions from existing diesel engines through engine retrofits, rebuilds and replacements, switching to cleaner fuels, idling reduction strategies and other clean diesel strategies that can reduce particulate matter (PM) emissions up to 95 percent, smog-forming emissions, such as hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxide, up to 90 percent and greenhouse gases up to 20 percent. In FY 2009, EPA will issue and manage various categories of Diesel Emission Reduction grants, including grants to target diesel emissions in ports.

### ***Energy***

The Administration has a diverse portfolio of policy measures – including mandatory, incentive-based, and voluntary programs –

to meet the President's goal to reduce the greenhouse gas (GHG) intensity of the U.S. economy by 18 percent by 2012. The President has set a goal of reducing U.S. gasoline usage by 20 percent in the next ten years to lessen the nation's dependence on imported oil. EPA has a substantial role to play in advancing the President's energy and climate strategies, given the Agency's mandate for environmental protection and the close linkage of energy and environment issues.

Ongoing efforts are already very significant. For example, EPA's current efforts will contribute about 70% of the reductions necessary to meet the President's 2012 GHG intensity goal. Moreover, EPA's efforts can and will achieve remarkable results in a number of other critical areas. By the end of 2008, for example, EPA expects to have programs in place that will speed the development of lower-emissions coal, oil, gas, and renewable technologies; partner with the manufacturing sector to develop more energy efficient technologies; and create the framework needed to transform our transportation system from one almost solely reliant on petroleum to one that accommodates an array of alternate fuels.

In 2009, EPA will begin implementation activities associated with the new GHG rules for fuels and vehicles, which will be completed at the start of FY 2009. Needed implementation activities will include upgrading and expanding vehicle engine and fuel data systems to incorporate new data and handle certification, compliance, reporting and tracking requirements; developing and implementing means to validate credit trading; implementing the fuel quality compliance program including field sampling and lab analysis; and stakeholder outreach. In addition to these

implementation activities, the NVFEL will need to begin certifying alternative fuels and vehicles.

By FY 2009, U.S. energy production is expected to grow by almost 10% from FY 2005 levels. To help ensure clean and affordable energy, EPA will enhance related permitting efforts. Anticipated upcoming proposals include 75,000 new oil and gas wells on Tribal and Federal Land, 40 liquefied natural gas terminals, 100+ re-permitting for nuclear power plants and 25 new nuclear plants.

This expansion in the energy sector will result in increased workload for: air and waters modeling and monitoring to determine the ambient impacts of energy activities; analysis of emerging technologies such as carbon sequestration, tidal, wind, biomass, coal liquefaction and oil shale; effective and early collaboration among states, tribes and Federal agencies to expedite NEPA reviews; and, EPA direct implementation of air and water permitting activity on state/Tribal lands where the programs are not authorized and on Federal lands and offshore areas where the program cannot be authorized.

In FY 2009, EPA and states will begin to fulfill the mandate of the Energy Policy Act to increase development of domestic energy resources and meet the demands of the large increase in new energy exploration while ensuring environmentally sound decision-making. This will involve support for state and tribal work to ensure effective and efficient analysis and permitting to avoid slowing the pace of new energy projects. The FY 2009 Budget Request includes \$10.0 million to support Permitting for Energy Production.

### ***Reduce Risks to Indoor Air and Radon Programs***

The Indoor Air Program characterizes the risks of indoor air pollutants to human health, develops techniques for reducing those risks, and educates the public about those techniques and other actions they can take to reduce their risks from indoor air. Through voluntary partnerships with non-governmental and professional organizations, EPA educates and encourages individuals, schools, industry, the health-care community, and others to take action to reduce health risks in indoor environments using a variety of approaches, including national public awareness and media campaigns, as well as community-based outreach and education. EPA also uses technology-transfer to improve the design, operation, and maintenance of buildings – including schools, homes, and workplaces – to promote healthier indoor air. The FY 2009 Budget Request for the Reduce Risk from Indoor Air program totals \$19.9 million. EPA also carries out a national radon program that encourages and facilitates voluntary national, regional, state, and Tribal programs and activities that support initiatives targeted to radon testing and mitigation, as well as to radon resistant new construction. Radon is second only to smoking as a cause of lung cancer. The FY 2009 Budget Request for the Radon programs totals \$14.0 million.

### ***Climate Protection***

For more than a decade, businesses and other organizations have partnered with EPA through voluntary climate protection programs to pursue common sense approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and meeting the President's greenhouse gas intensity goal. Voluntary programs such as Energy Star and

SmartWay Transport have increased the use of energy-efficient products and practices, spurred investment in clean energy development, and reduced emissions of carbon dioxide, methane, and other greenhouse gases with very high global warming potentials. These partnership programs break down market barriers and promote the deployment of cost-effective technologies and processes designed to yield greenhouse gas reductions over the life of the investment. In FY 2009, EPA will continue to work with other countries and government agencies to support the Methane to Markets Partnership and Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate. The FY 2009 Budget Request for the Climate Protection programs totals \$98.3 million.

### ***Stratospheric Ozone – Domestic and Montreal Protocol***

In FY 2009, EPA's Domestic Stratospheric Ozone Protection Program will continue to implement the provisions of the Clean Air Act and the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Montreal Protocol), and contribute to the reduction and control of ozone-depleting substances (ODSs) in the U.S. and lowering health risks to the American public associated with exposure to UV radiation, including prevention of 6.3 million cases of fatal skin cancer in the US. The FY 2009 Budget Request for the Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic program totals \$4.7 million. In addition, through the Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol, EPA will invest in cost-effective projects that are designed to build capacity and eliminate ODS production and consumption in over 60 developing countries. The Multilateral Fund continues to support over 5,150 activities in 139 countries, and when fully implemented, will prevent annual emissions of more than

223,729 metric tons of ODS. Over 80% of already agreed-upon project activities have been implemented to date, with remaining work in these already agreed-upon projects expected to be fully implemented by 2009. The FY 2009 Budget Request for the Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund totals \$9.9 million.

### ***Radiation Monitoring***

In FY 2009, EPA will continue upgrading the national radiation monitoring system to expand the population and geographic areas covered, and to increase the speed at which the system samples the air, analyzes the measurements, and transmits the results. Mobile transportable monitors will be maintained in ready condition so they can be quickly deployed to monitor radiation levels at locations near and downwind from the initial point of release. The Agency will continue to enhance laboratory response capacity and capability to ensure a minimal level of surge capacity for radiological incidents.

EPA conducts research to provide a scientific foundation for the Agency's actions to protect the air all Americans breathe. The Agency's air research program supports implementation of the Clean Air Act, especially the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), which set limits on how much stratospheric ozone, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and lead, are allowed in the atmosphere. EPA also conducts research on ozone and hazardous air pollutants, also known as air toxics.

In FY 2009, the Agency's air research program will continue research to understand the sources and composition of air pollution; develop methods for controlling sources' emissions; study

atmospheric chemistry and model U.S. air quality; investigate Americans' exposure to air pollution; and conduct epidemiological, clinical, and toxicological studies of air pollution's health effects. In FY 2009, the program will continue to focus on the effects of air pollution near roads on human health, as well as the development and evaluation of effective mitigation strategies. The Agency also will fund research grants to universities and nonprofits to study topics such as the relationship between long-term exposure to fine particles in the atmosphere and the frequency and progression of pulmonary and cardiovascular diseases.

## Clean and Safe Water

Ensure drinking water is safe. Restore and maintain oceans, watersheds, and their aquatic ecosystems to protect human health, support economic and recreational activities, and provide healthy habitat for fish, plants, and wildlife.

### STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES:

- Protect human health by reducing exposure to contaminants in drinking water (including protecting source waters), in fish and shellfish, and in recreational waters.
- Protect the quality of rivers, lakes, and streams on a watershed basis and protect coastal and ocean waters.
- By 2011, conduct leading-edge, sound scientific research to support

the protection of human health through the reduction of human exposure to contaminants in drinking water, fish and shellfish, and recreational waters and to support the protection of aquatic ecosystems—specifically, the quality of rivers, lakes, and streams, and coastal and ocean waters.

### GOAL, OBJECTIVE SUMMARY

Budget Authority  
Full-time Equivalents  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted</b>
<b>Clean and Safe Water</b>	<b>\$3,195,855.0</b>	<b>\$2,714,506.8</b>	<b>\$2,854,781.9</b>	<b>\$2,580,704.2</b>	<b>(\$274,077.7)</b>
Protect Human Health	\$1,157,573.7	\$1,156,551.7	\$1,183,199.2	\$1,161,766.0	(\$21,433.2)
Protect Water Quality	\$1,912,954.7	\$1,422,049.0	\$1,536,958.8	\$1,286,409.9	(\$250,548.9)
Enhance Science and Research	\$125,326.6	\$135,906.1	\$134,623.9	\$132,528.3	(\$2,095.6)
Total Authorized Workyears	2,854.7	2,901.8	2,901.0	2,863.4	-37.6

EPA implements the Clean and Safe Water goal through programs designed to provide improvements in the quality of surface waters and drinking water. In FY 2009, EPA will work with states and tribes to continue to accomplish measurable improvements in the safety of the nation's drinking water and in the conditions of rivers, lakes, and coastal waters. With the

help of these partners, EPA expects to make important progress in these areas and support additional focused water initiatives, including carbon sequestration, energy permitting, water security, and sustainable infrastructure.

The National Water Program will continue to place special emphasis on sustainable

infrastructure and watershed stewardship, through its “four pillars” program, specifically focusing on innovative financing and leveraging for infrastructure sustainability, banking for wetlands conservation, and trading among point sources and non-point sources for water quality upgrades. In FY 2009, the Agency will continue advancing the water quality monitoring initiative and a water quality standards strategy under the Clean Water Act, as well as, important rules and activities under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Related efforts to improve monitoring and surveillance will help advance water security nationwide.

### ***Drinking Water***

During FY 2009, EPA, the states and community water systems will build on past successes while working toward the FY 2009 goal of assuring that 90 percent of the population served by community water systems receives drinking water that meets all applicable health-based standards. To promote compliance with drinking water standards, states carry out a variety of activities, such as conducting onsite sanitary surveys of water systems and working with small systems to improve their capabilities. EPA will work to improve compliance rates by providing guidance, training, and technical assistance; ensuring proper certification of water system operators; promoting consumer awareness of drinking water safety; maintaining the rate of system sanitary surveys and onsite reviews; and taking appropriate action for noncompliance. In FY 2009, states and EPA will process Underground Injection Control permit applications for experimental carbon sequestration and gather information from these pilots to facilitate the permitting of large-scale commercial carbon sequestration in the future. To help ensure that water is

safe to drink, EPA provides \$842.2 million for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund.

### ***Clean Water***

In FY 2009, EPA will work with states to continue progress toward the clean water goals to implement core clean water programs, including innovations that apply programs on a watershed basis, and to accelerate efforts to improve water quality on a watershed basis. Building on the progress toward clean water achieved over the past 30 years, EPA is working with states and tribes to implement the Clean Water Act by focusing on: scientifically sound water quality standards, effective water monitoring, strong programs for controlling nonpoint sources of pollution, and strong discharge permit programs. To keep pace with the nation’s burgeoning energy exploration and development, EPA will place an increased focus on energy related permitting in FY 2009. The work involves NPDES permit actions related to conventional oil and gas, coalbed methane, coal mining, ethanol, power plants, refineries, uranium, natural gas liquids, liquefied natural gas terminals, pipelines, and oil shale/tar sands.

The Agency’s request continues the monitoring initiative begun in 2005 to strengthen the nationwide monitoring network and complete the baseline water quality assessment of the nation’s waters. These efforts are resulting in scientifically defensible water quality data and information essential for cleaning up and protecting the nation’s waters. Progress in improving coastal and ocean waters documented in the National Coastal Condition Report will be maintained by focusing on: assessing coastal conditions, reducing vessel discharges, implementing

coastal nonpoint source pollution programs, managing dredged material, and supporting international marine pollution control. EPA will continue to provide annual capitalization to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF). In FY 2009 EPA will provide \$555.0 million and will allow EPA to meet the Administration's capitalization target of \$6.8 billion total for 2004-2011 and enable the program to meet its long-term revolving target of \$3.4 billion.

### ***Homeland Security***

EPA has a major role in supporting the protection of the nation's critical water infrastructure from terrorist threats. In FY 2009, EPA will continue to support the Water Security Initiative (WSI) pilot program and water sector-specific agency responsibilities, including the Water Alliance for Threat Reduction (WATR), to protect the nation's critical water infrastructure. The FY 2009 budget provides \$35.2 million for water security efforts. This includes \$22.6 million for WSI and WATR which will continue efforts to demonstrate the concept of an effective contamination warning system that drinking water utilities in high threat cities of all sizes and characteristics could adopt. In FY 2009, there will be increased training and outreach exercises for Regional Water Emergency Response/Technical Assistance Team members, consistent with the National Approach to Response. Also, the Agency, in collaboration with our water sector security stakeholders, will continue efforts to develop, implement and initiate tracking of national measures related to homeland security critical infrastructure protection activities.

### ***Research***

EPA's drinking water and water quality research programs conduct leading edge,

problem-driven research to provide a sound scientific foundation for Federal regulatory decision-making. These efforts will result in strengthened public health and aquatic ecosystem protection by providing data methods, models, assessments, and technologies for EPA program and Regional Offices, as well as state and local authorities.

In FY 2009, these research programs will conduct studies and deliver science products needed by the nation to realize clean and safe water. The drinking water research program will focus on treatment strategies, exposure and analytical methods, and health effects information that can be applied to classes of contaminants in the context of the drinking water hydrologic cycle – source water, treatment, and distribution. The water quality research program will continue providing approaches and methods the Agency and its partners need to develop and apply criteria to support designated uses, support implementation of watershed management approaches, and application of technological options to restore and protect water bodies using information on effective treatment and management alternatives. These programs also will conduct research that will yield tools and strategies to manage our nation's aging water infrastructure.

Other important areas of research in FY 2009 will include: 1) studies on aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) on the safety of drinking water and the impacts of subsurface carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) storage on drinking water quality; 2) revising aquatic life guidelines, recreational water criteria, the effects of emerging contaminants, nutrients, biocriteria and multiple stressor effects on stream biota; 3) watershed management work that supports diagnoses of impairment, mitigation and pollutant load reduction from headwater streams and isolated wetlands;



and 4) improving the control of microbial releases from publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) during periods of significant wet weather events.

Recognizing that environmental policy and regulatory decisions will only be as good as the science upon which they are based, EPA makes every effort to ensure that its science is of the highest quality and relevance, thereby, providing the basis for sound environmental results. EPA uses the Research and Development (R&D) Investment Criteria of quality, relevance, and performance in its decision-making processes through the use of research strategies and plans, program review and evaluation by the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) and the Science Advisory Board (SAB), and peer review.

## Land Preservation and Restoration

Preserve and restore the land by using innovative waste management practices and cleaning up contaminated properties to reduce risks posed by releases of harmful substances.

### STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES:

- By 2011, reduce adverse effects to land by reducing waste generation, increasing recycling, and ensuring proper management of waste and petroleum products at facilities in ways that prevent releases.
- By 2011, control the risks to human health and the environment by mitigating the impact of accidental or intentional releases and by cleaning up and restoring contaminated sites or properties to appropriate levels.
- Through 2011, provide and apply sound science for protecting and restoring land by conducting leading-edge research, which through collaboration, leads to preferred environmental outcomes.

### GOAL, OBJECTIVE SUMMARY

Budget Authority  
Full-time Equivalents  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted</b>
<b>Land Preservation and Restoration</b>	<b>\$1,783,171.9</b>	<b>\$1,662,989.5</b>	<b>\$1,688,592.2</b>	<b>\$1,691,127.9</b>	<b>\$2,535.7</b>
Preserve Land	\$235,637.7	\$231,785.2	\$237,813.1	\$232,718.3	(\$5,094.8)
Restore Land	\$1,497,066.2	\$1,382,689.3	\$1,403,339.5	\$1,405,042.6	\$1,703.1
Enhance Science and Research	\$50,468.1	\$48,515.1	\$47,439.6	\$53,367.1	\$5,927.5
Total Authorized Workyears	4,514.9	4,579.3	4,574.3	4,550.2	-24.1

Land is one of America's most valuable resources. If they are not controlled, hazardous and non-hazardous wastes on the land can migrate to the air, groundwater, and surface water, contaminating drinking water supplies, causing acute illnesses or chronic diseases, and threatening healthy ecosystems in urban, rural, and suburban areas. To address these issues, EPA implements the Land Preservation and Restoration goal with

the following approaches—prevention, protection, and response activities to address risks posed by releases of harmful substances on land; emergency preparedness, response and homeland security to address immediate risks to human health and the environment; enforcement and compliance assistance to determine what needs to be done and who should pay; and sound science and research

to address risk factors and new, innovative solutions.

### **Prevention, Protection, and Response Activities**

EPA leads the country's activities to prevent and reduce the risks posed by releases of harmful substances and to preserve and restore land with effective waste management and cleanup methods. In FY 2009, the Agency is requesting \$1,637.8 million to continue to apply the most effective approach to preserve and restore land by developing and implementing prevention programs, improving response capabilities, and maximizing the effectiveness of response and cleanup actions. This approach will help ensure that human health and the environment are protected and that land is returned to beneficial use.

In FY 2009, EPA also will continue to use a hierarchy of approaches to protect the land: reducing waste at its source, recycling waste, managing waste effectively by preventing spills and releases of toxic materials, and cleaning up contaminated properties. The Agency especially is concerned about threats to our most sensitive populations, such as children, the elderly, and individuals with chronic diseases, and prioritizes cleanups accordingly.<sup>1</sup>

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, or Superfund) provides legal

authority for EPA's work to protect the land. The Agency and its partners use Superfund authority to clean up uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites, allowing land to be returned to productive use. The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) also provides legal authority for EPA to fulfill this goal. Under RCRA, EPA works in partnership with states and tribes to address risks associated with leaking underground storage tanks and with the generation and management of hazardous and non-hazardous waste.

In addition, EPA uses authorities provided under the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to protect against spills and releases of hazardous materials. Controlling the many risks posed by accidental and intentional releases of harmful substances presents a significant challenge. In FY 2009, EPA will continue to ensure that it is adequately prepared to minimize contamination and harm to the environment from spills and releases of hazardous materials by improving its readiness to respond to emergencies through training as well as maintaining a highly skilled, well-trained, and equipped response workforce.

The following themes characterize EPA's land program activities under Goal 3 in FY 2009: Revitalization; Recycling, Waste Minimization and Energy Recovery; and implementation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct).

- **Revitalization:** All of EPA's cleanup programs (Superfund Remedial, Superfund Federal Facilities Response, Superfund Removal, RCRA Corrective Action, Brownfields, and Underground Storage Tanks) and their partners are taking proactive steps to facilitate the cleanup and revitalization of

---

<sup>1</sup> Additional information on these programs can be found at: [www.epa.gov/superfund](http://www.epa.gov/superfund), <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/programs/er/index.htm>, <http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/ca/>, <http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/>, <http://www.epa.gov/swerstl/>, <http://www.epa.gov/swerffrr/> and <http://www.epa.gov/swerrims/landrevitalization>.

contaminated properties. In FY 2009, the Agency is requesting \$914.8 million to help communities revitalize these once productive properties by removing blight, satisfying the growing demand for land, helping limit urban sprawl, fostering ecologic habitat enhancements, enabling economic development, and maintaining or improving quality of life. In reflection of the high priority the Agency has placed on land revitalization, EPA recently adopted a series of acres-based, cross-program revitalization measures (CPRMs)<sup>2</sup> to help document progress in cleaning up and promoting the protective use of previously contaminated land. The CPRMs will help EPA communicate the extent of land subject to its cleanup programs, and the subset of that land that is protective for people for current conditions, and that is ready (i.e., protective) for anticipated future uses. EPA cleanup programs began implementing these new measures in FY 2007. Data from the CPRMs will be available in FY 2008 and beyond.

- Recycling, Waste Minimization and Energy Recovery: EPA is requesting \$10.8 million in FY 2009 to support EPA's strategy for reducing waste generation and increasing recycling. EPA's strategy will continue to be based on: (1) establishing and expanding partnerships with businesses, industries, tribes, states, communities, and consumers; (2) stimulating infrastructure development and environmentally responsible behavior by product manufacturers, users, and disposers; and (3) helping businesses, government, institutions, and consumers reduce waste

generation and increase recycling through education, outreach, training, and technical assistance. In FY 2009, EPA will continue the Resource Conservation Challenge (RCC) as a major national effort to find flexible, yet more protective ways to conserve our valuable natural resources through waste reduction, energy recovery, and recycling. Through RCC, the Agency also will pursue the advancement of alternative domestic energy sources as well as clean energy, which power our economy and drive our environmental successes.

- Implementing the EPAAct: The EPAAct<sup>3</sup> contains numerous provisions that significantly affect Federal and state underground storage tank (UST) programs and requires that EPA and states strengthen tank release and prevention programs. In FY 2007, working with its tank partners, EPA developed grant guidelines<sup>4</sup> which implement the UST provisions of the EPAAct. In FY 2009, EPA is requesting \$35.1 million to provide assistance to states to help them meet their new responsibilities, which include: (1) mandatory inspections every three years for all underground storage tanks, (2) operator training, (3) prohibition of delivery for non-complying facilities<sup>5</sup>, and (4) secondary containment or financial responsibility for tank manufacturers and installers. EPA also

<sup>2</sup> For more information on the CPRMs, go to <http://www.epa.gov/swerrims/landrevitalization/docs/cprmguidance-10-20-06covermemo.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> For more information, refer to [http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=109\\_cong\\_public\\_laws&docid=f:publ058.109.pdf](http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=109_cong_public_laws&docid=f:publ058.109.pdf) (scroll to Title XV - Ethanol And Motor Fuels, Subtitle B – Underground Storage Tank Compliance, on pages 500-513 of the pdf file).

<sup>4</sup> For more information, refer to <http://www.epa.gov/OUST>

<sup>5</sup> Refer to *Grant Guidelines to States for Implementing the Delivery Prohibition Provision of the Energy Policy Act of 2005*, August 2006, EPA-510-R-06-003, [http://www.epa.gov/oust/fedlaws/epact\\_05.htm#Final](http://www.epa.gov/oust/fedlaws/epact_05.htm#Final).

is submitting legislative language to allow states to use alternative mechanisms such as the Environmental Results Program (ERP) to meet the mandatory three-year inspection requirement. This proposal provides states with a less costly alternative to meet the objectives of the EPAct. EPA also will continue implementing the UST Tribal strategy<sup>6</sup> developed in FY 2006 in Indian country.

In addition to these themes, EPA's Homeland Security and Enforcement work are important components of the Agency's prevention, protection, and response activities.

### Homeland Security

EPA will continue to improve its emergency preparedness and response capability, including homeland security capabilities. In FY 2009, the Agency is requesting \$54.6 million to improve its capability to respond effectively to incidents that may involve harmful chemical, oil, biological, and radiological substances. The Agency will provide training to build the cadre of volunteers in the Response Support Corps (RSC) and/or as part of an Incident Management Team (IMT) and also will continue to participate in multi-agency training and exercises.

In FY 2009, EPA will build the Environmental Laboratory Response Network (eLRN) through the improvement of an electronic data deliverable for use by all eLRN laboratories. EPA also will continue to maximize the effectiveness of its involvement in national security events

through pre-deployments of assets such as emergency response personnel and field detection equipment.

EPA also will maintain and improve the Emergency Management Portal (EMP). FY 2009 will be the first year for complete integration of the basic management modules (i.e., environmental assessment, equipment, personnel, and decontamination). EPA will continue to manage, collect, and validate new information for new and existing Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) agents as new decontamination techniques are developed or as other information emerges from the scientific community.

### Enforcement

Enforcement authorities play a unique role under the Superfund program: they are used to leverage private-party resources to conduct a majority of the cleanup actions and to reimburse the Federal government for cleanups financed by appropriations. In FY 2009, the Agency is requesting \$173.9 million to support enforcement activities at Federal and non-Federal Superfund sites. The Superfund program's "enforcement first" policy ensures that sites with viable potentially responsible parties (PRPs) are cleaned up by those parties, allowing EPA to focus appropriated resources on sites where viable PRPs either do not exist or lack funds or capabilities needed to conduct the cleanup. In tandem with this approach, various reforms have been implemented to increase fairness, reduce transaction costs, and promote economic development and make sites available for appropriate reuse.<sup>7</sup> The Department of Justice supports EPA's Superfund Enforcement program through

---

<sup>6</sup> Refer to *Strategy for an EPA/Tribal Partnership to Implement Section 1529 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005*, August 2006, EPA-510-F-06-005, [http://www.epa.gov/oust/fedlaws/epact\\_05.htm#Final](http://www.epa.gov/oust/fedlaws/epact_05.htm#Final).

---

<sup>7</sup> For more information regarding EPA's enforcement program and its various components, please refer to <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/cleanup/superfund/>.

negotiations and judicial actions to compel PRP cleanup and litigation to recover Trust Fund monies spent.

EPA also works to ensure that required legally enforceable institutional controls and financial assurance instruments are in place and adhered to at Superfund sites and at facilities subject to RCRA Corrective Action to ensure the long-term protectiveness of cleanup actions.

EPA has ongoing cleanup and property transfer responsibilities at some of the Nation's most contaminated Federal properties, which range from realigning and closing military installations and former military properties containing unexploded ordnance, solvents, and other industrial chemicals to Department of Energy sites containing nuclear waste. EPA's Superfund Federal Facilities Response and Enforcement program helps Federal and local governments, tribes, states, redevelopment authorities and the affected communities ensure contamination at Federal or former Federal properties is addressed in a manner that protects human health and the environment.<sup>8</sup>

In FY 2009, the Agency will continue to establish and use Special Accounts within the Superfund Trust Fund. As of the end of FY 2007, EPA maintains more than 700 Special Accounts within the Superfund Trust Fund. These accounts segregate site-specific funds obtained from responsible parties that enter into settlement agreements with EPA. These funds may create an incentive for other PRPs at that specific site to perform cleanup work. In addition, these funds may be used by the Agency to fund cleanup activities if there are no known or

viable PRPs. The Agency will practice good fiscal stewardship in cleaning up sites by maximizing the use of site-specific Special Account funds while preserving appropriated Trust Fund dollars for sites without viable PRPs.

In FY 2009, the Agency will negotiate remedial design/remedial action cleanup agreements and removal agreements at contaminated properties. Where negotiations fail, the Agency will either take unilateral enforcement actions to require PRP cleanup or use appropriated dollars to remediate sites. When appropriated dollars are used to cleanup sites, the program will recover this money from the PRPs whenever possible.

### **Enhancing Science and Research to Restore and Preserve Land**

The FY 2009 Land Research program supports the Agency's objective of reducing or controlling potential risks to human health and the environment at contaminated waste sites by providing the science to accelerate scientifically defensible and cost-effective decisions for cleanup at complex sites in accordance with CERCLA.

In FY 2009, EPA is requesting \$53.4 million in support of EPA's efforts to enhance science and research for land preservation and restoration. Research activities in FY 2009 will focus on contaminated sediments, ground water contamination, multi-media, and site-specific technical support. Research will advance EPA's ability to accurately characterize the risks posed by contaminated sediments and determine the range and scientific foundation for remedy selection options. In addition, research aimed at developing data to support dosimetric and toxicologic assessment of amphibole asbestos, fiber-containing

---

<sup>8</sup> For more information on the Superfund Federal Facilities Response and Enforcement program, please refer to <http://www.epa.gov/fedfac>.

material from Libby, Montana will be conducted. Groundwater research will focus on the transport of contaminants in that medium and the subsequent intrusion of contaminant vapors into buildings and continue research on developing applications for permeable reactive barriers.

Oil spill remediation research will continue on physical, chemical, and biological risk management methods for petroleum and non-petroleum oils spilled into freshwater and marine environments as well as development of a protocol for testing solidifiers and treating oil. Underground storage tank research will address the development of online transport models that can be used by state project managers. Research areas such as resource conservation, corrective action, multi-media modeling, leaching, containment systems, and landfill bioreactors will constitute the major areas of research and support for RCRA activities in FY 2009. EPA also will continue to develop a site-specific management approach of brownfields sites, develop validated acceptable practices for land revitalization, collaborate with the private sector to conduct field sampling, and with the states to optimize operations and monitoring of several landfill bioreactors and determine their potential to provide alternative energy in the form of landfill gas while increasing the nation's landfill capacity.

In FY 2009, additional resources will be invested to research nanotechnology fate and transport in response to an independent review of the RCRA portion of the Land Research program to address emerging issues and strategic EPA issues. The primary objective of this research will be to determine the physicochemical properties controlling the movement of nanomaterials through soil and aquatic ecosystems.

Research questions include the identification of system parameters that alter the surface characteristics of nanomaterials through aggregation (e.g. pH effects), complexation (e.g., surface complexation by dissolved organic carbon) or changes in oxidation state (e.g., chemical- or biological-mediated electron transfer).

## **2007 PART**

The following programs were assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) for the 2007 PART process:

- Land Protection and Restoration Research

More detailed information is provided in specific program project descriptions.

## HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

Protect, sustain, or restore the health of people, communities, and ecosystems using integrated and comprehensive approaches and partnerships.

### STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES:

- By 2011, prevent and reduce pesticide and industrial chemical risks to humans, communities, and ecosystems.
- Sustain, clean up, and restore communities and the ecological systems that support them.
- Protect, sustain, and restore the health of critical natural habitats and ecosystems.
- Through 2011, identify and synthesize the best available

scientific information, models, methods, and analyses to support Agency guidance and policy decisions related to the health of people, communities, and ecosystems. Focus research on pesticides and chemical toxicology; global change; and comprehensive, cross-cutting studies of human, community, and ecosystem health.

### GOAL, OBJECTIVE SUMMARY

Budget Authority  
Full-time Equivalents  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted</b>
<b>Healthy Communities and Ecosystems</b>	<b>\$1,288,596.5</b>	<b>\$1,174,061.5</b>	<b>\$1,227,362.5</b>	<b>\$1,191,003.6</b>	<b>(\$36,358.9)</b>
Chemical and Pesticide Risks	\$410,407.9	\$390,946.1	\$387,933.0	\$396,717.0	\$8,784.0
Communities	\$324,279.5	\$234,851.1	\$239,667.5	\$235,626.1	(\$4,041.4)
Restore and Protect Critical Ecosystems	\$169,769.5	\$178,088.3	\$220,411.0	\$181,029.0	(\$39,382.0)
Enhance Science and Research	\$384,139.6	\$370,176.0	\$379,351.0	\$377,631.4	(\$1,719.6)
Total Authorized Workyears	3,743.2	3,761.1	3,735.6	3,749.7	14.1



In FY 2009, the Environmental Protection Agency will protect, sustain or restore the health of communities and ecosystems by bringing together a variety of programs, tools, approaches and resources, including partnerships with stakeholders and Federal, state, Tribal, and local government agencies. EPA manages environmental risks to watersheds, communities, homes, and workplaces to protect human health and the environmental integrity of ecosystems. The Agency employs a mix of regulatory programs and partnership approaches to achieve results in ways that are efficient, innovative, and sustainable. Ideally, EPA can implement a strategy of preventing pollution at the source; however, where programs to prevent pollution or ecosystem damage are not viable, EPA promotes waste minimization, avoidance of impact on habitat, safe disposal, and remediation.

In managing risk, EPA directs its efforts toward the greatest threats in our communities, homes, and workplaces, including threats to sensitive populations such as children and the elderly, and to communities with potential disproportionately high and adverse environmental and public health effects including minorities and/or low-income communities. In general, because of their unique anatomy, biological make-up and behavior patterns, children may be more at risk for exposure to potential toxics. Even older Americans in good health may be at increased risk from exposure to environmental pollutants. As people age, their bodies are less able to detoxify and eliminate toxins. Native Americans represent another segment of the population with a different risk profile. Their traditional sources for food

and ways of life may lead to higher levels of exposure to certain toxics.

### ***Pesticides Programs***

A key component of protecting the health of people, communities, and ecosystems is identifying, assessing, and reducing the risks presented by the thousands of chemicals on which our society and economy have come to depend. Toward that end, EPA is investing \$133.8 million in Pesticides Licensing programs in FY 2009. Chemical and biological pesticides help meet national and global demands for food; provide effective pest control for homes, schools, gardens, highways, utility lines, hospitals, and drinking water treatment facilities; and control animal vectors of disease.

During FY 2009, EPA will continue to review and register new pesticides, new uses for existing pesticides, and other registration requests in accordance with Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) standards and Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA 2) timeframes. EPA will continue to process these registration requests, with special consideration given to susceptible populations, especially children. Specifically, EPA will focus special attention on the foods commonly eaten by children, to reduce pesticide exposure to children where the science identifies potential concerns.

Reduced concentrations of pesticides in water sources indicate the efficacy of EPA's risk assessment, management, mitigation, and communication activities. Using sampling data collected under the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) National Water Quality

Assessment Program, EPA will monitor the impact of our regulatory decisions for four pesticides of concern—diazinon, chlorpyrifos, malathion, and azinphos-methyl—and consider whether any additional action is necessary.<sup>9</sup> In FY 2009 the Agency will continue to work with USGS to develop sampling plans and refine goals, and we will ask USGS to add additional insecticides to sampling protocols and establish baselines for newer products that are replacing organophosphates, such as synthetic pyrethroids.

EPA's statutory and regulatory functions include registration, reregistration, Reregistration Eligibility Decisions implementation, registration review, risk reduction implementation, rulemaking and program management. Many of these actions will be for reduced-risk pesticides for which, once registered and utilized by pesticide users, increased benefits will accrue to society. Working together with the affected user communities through programs such as the Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program and the Strategic Agricultural Initiative, the Agency will find ways to accelerate the adoption of these lower-risk products.

Along with assessing the risks that pesticides pose to human health, EPA conducts ecological risk assessments under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to determine potential effects on plants, animals, and ecosystems. To ensure unreasonable risks are avoided,

EPA may impose risk mitigation measures such as modifying use rates or application methods, restricting uses, or denying uses. EPA must ensure that pesticide regulatory decisions will not adversely modify critical habitat or jeopardize the continued existence of species listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service as threatened or endangered.

In the biodefense arena, EPA will continue work to develop and validate methods to evaluate the efficacy of antimicrobial products against bioterrorism agents, expanding this work to address unique formulations, additional surface types, and additional bioterrorism agents and emerging pathogens. The Agency will address critical gaps in efficacy test methodology and knowledge of microbial resistance. In addition to vegetative bacteria, in FY 2009, EPA will address threatening viruses and other emerging pathogens in environmental media. EPA will invest in the development and evaluation of efficacy test protocols for products designed to control viruses in the environment during decontamination. The development of "decon toolboxes" for specific bioterrorism agents or classes of bacteria/viruses will continue into FY 2009.

In order to improve the Agency's ability to respond to events involving biothreat agents, EPA will increase the number of standardized and validated methods for evaluating the efficacy of decontamination agents. EPA will continue to seek independent third-party analysis for method validation efforts through recognized standard setting

---

<sup>9</sup> Gilliom, R.J., et al. 2006. *The Quality of Our Nation's Waters: Pesticides in the Nation's Streams and Ground Water, 1992–2001*. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1291. 171p. Available on the internet at: <http://pubs.usgs.gov/circ/2005/1291/>.

organizations. As new methods are developed, statistical modeling for various biodefense scenarios will be critical to the development of science based performance standards. Microbial persistence, resistance to antimicrobial agents, and an understanding of biofilm environments are also key factors in evaluating the efficacy of decontamination tools. This work is taking place in the Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response and Recovery program.

### ***Toxics Programs***

EPA programs under this goal have many direct and many indirect benefits. For example, each year the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) New Chemicals program reviews and manages the potential risks from approximately 1,500 new chemicals and 40 products of biotechnology that enter the marketplace. This new chemical review process not only protects the public from the possible immediate threats of harmful chemicals, but it also has contributed to changing the behavior of the chemical industry, making industry more aware and responsible for the impact these chemicals have on human health and the environment.

The Acute Exposure Guideline Levels (AEGLs) program was designed by EPA to provide scientifically credible data to directly support chemical emergency planning, response, and prevention programs mandated by Congress. Emergency workers and first responders addressing accidental or intentional chemical releases need to know how dangerous a chemical contaminant may be to breathe or touch, and how long it may remain dangerous. The program

develops short-term exposure limits applicable to the general population for a wide range of extremely hazardous substances and has assigned values to 218 chemicals to date.

In addressing chemicals that have entered the market before the inception of the New Chemical Review program, EPA will continue to implement its voluntary High Production Volume (HPV) Chemicals program. The HPV Chemicals Program challenges industry to develop chemical hazard data on existing chemicals that it chooses to “sponsor.” EPA will make data publicly available for approximately 1,800 HPV chemicals sponsored under the program and issue initial risk screening reports for the highest priority of those chemicals. Complementing HPV is the Voluntary Children’s Chemical Evaluation Program (VCCEP), a high-priority screening program targeting existing chemicals believed to have particular impact on children’s health.

The Agency will continue to manage its programs to address specific chemicals and toxics of concern, including lead, mineral fibers, mercury, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), and persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic (PBT) chemicals. The Lead Program is focusing efforts on reducing lead hazards, and in FY 2009 will implement a final regulation to address lead-safe work practices for renovation, repair and painting activities in homes with lead-based paint. The program also will continue to improve methods to reach vulnerable populations and communities with a high concentration of children with elevated blood-lead levels and emphasize grant-supported activities

such as state-implemented lead-based paint training and certification programs.

### ***Water Programs***

EPA's ecosystem protection programs encompass a wide range of approaches that address specific at-risk regional areas and larger categories of threatened systems, such as estuaries and wetlands. Locally generated pollution, combined with pollution carried by rivers and streams and through air deposition, can accumulate in these ecosystems and degrade them over time. Large water bodies, such as the Gulf of Mexico, the Great Lakes, and the Chesapeake Bay, have been exposed to substantial pollution over many years. Coastal estuaries and wetlands are also vulnerable. As the populations in coastal regions grow, the challenges to preserve and protect these important ecosystems increase. Working with stakeholders, EPA has established special programs to protect and restore these unique resources.

In FY 2009, EPA will continue cooperation with Federal, state and Tribal governments and other stakeholders to achieve the President's goal, set in 2004, to restore, improve, and protect three million acres of wetlands by 2009. FY 2009 funding supports and monitors all 28 NEPs in implementing approved Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plans (CCMPs), which identify more than 2,000 priority actions needed to protect and restore the estuaries. The FY 2009 budget for NEPs and coastal watersheds is \$17.2 million.

The Great Lakes Program ecosystem's FY 2009 budget request continues

support of strategic Great Lakes activities pursuant to Executive Order 13340 and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. The program will monitor ecosystem indicators; support toxics reduction through contaminated sediment remediation and pollution prevention; protect and restore habitat; and address strategic issues such as aquatic invasive species and investigation of the Lake Erie dead zone and the decline of *Diporeia*, a key lower-food web organism. The FY 2009 request to implement the Great Lakes Legacy Act continues to support the cleanup of contaminated sediments.

The FY 2009 budget request also will enable the Chesapeake Bay Program to continue work with program partners to accelerate implementation of pollution reduction and aquatic habitat restoration efforts and ensure that water quality objectives are achieved as soon as possible. EPA is committed to its ambitious long-term goals of 100 percent attainment of dissolved oxygen standards in waters of the Chesapeake Bay and 185,000 acres of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV). The FY 2009 request will bring the Agency closer to addressing key priority coastal and ocean issues in the Gulf of Mexico, such as coastal restoration, water quality for healthy beaches and shellfish beds through improved detection and forecasting of harmful algal blooms and microbial source tracking methodologies, and reduction of nutrient inputs to coastal ecosystems.

In conducting special initiatives and planning activities, in FY 2009 EPA is investing \$2.1 million in the South Florida Program to assist with coordinating and facilitating the ongoing

implementation of the Water Quality Protection Program for the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS), conduct studies to determine cause and effect relationships among pollutants and biological resources, implement wastewater and storm water master plans, and provide public education and outreach activities.

New strategic targets are proposed for the South Florida Program in the 2006-2011 Strategic Plan. The new strategic targets address important environmental markers such as stony coral cover, health and functionality of seagrass beds, water quality in the FKNMS, and phosphorus levels throughout the Everglades Protection Area and effluent limits for all discharges, including storm water treatment areas.

### ***Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE)***

CARE is a competitive grant program that offers an innovative way for communities to take action to reduce toxic pollution. Through CARE, communities create local collaborative partnerships that implement local solutions to minimize exposure to toxic pollutants and reduce their release. In FY 2009 the Agency is investing \$2.4 million in the program to award approximately 12 new grants, provide technical resources and training to approximately 50 communities, and work with other federal agencies to coordinate support for communities.

### ***Brownfields***

Improving a community's ability to make decisions that affect its environment is at the heart of EPA's

community-centered work. EPA shares information and builds community capacity to consider the many aspects of planned development or redevelopment. EPA encourages community development by providing funds to assist communities with inventory, assessment, and clean up of the contaminated properties ("Brownfields") that lie abandoned or unused. In addition, the Smart Growth Program works with stakeholders to create an improved economic and institutional climate for Brownfields redevelopment. Addressing these challenges requires combining innovative and community-based approaches with national guidelines and interagency coordination to achieve results.

### ***International Activities***

EPA leads efforts to address global environmental issues. To sustain and enhance domestic and international environmental progress, EPA enlists the cooperation of other nations and international organizations to help predict, understand, and solve environmental problems of mutual concern. By assisting developing countries to manage their natural resources and protect the health of their citizens, EPA also helps to protect human health and the environment in the U.S.

The Agency also works to include environmental protection provisions and commitments to effectively enforce environmental laws and regulations in all international trade agreements negotiated by the United States. As an example, EPA contributes to the associated environmental reviews and environmental cooperation agreements

by developing baseline assessments of existing environmental law and enforcement regimes in a number of U.S. trading partner countries, advocating for greater attention to invasive species, and addressing other concerns associated with the movement of traded goods. Addressing local pollution and infrastructure deficiencies along the U.S.-Mexico border are also priorities for Mexico and the United States under the Border 2012 Agreement. The key to sustaining and enhancing progress, both domestically and internationally, is the collaborative efforts of national, Tribal, state, and local governments, international organizations, the private sector, and concerned citizens.

### ***Environmental Justice***

EPA is committed to protecting the health and environment of all people, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income. Toward that end, the Agency will focus its environmental justice efforts on the following eight national priorities:

- Reducing asthma attacks;
- Reducing exposure to air toxics;
- Increasing compliance with regulations;
- Reducing incidence of elevated blood lead levels;
- Ensuring that fish and shellfish are safe to eat;
- Ensuring that water is safe to drink;
- Revitalizing brownfields and contaminated sites; and
- Using collaborative problem-solving to address environmental and public health concerns.

### ***Research***

EPA has a responsibility to ensure that efforts to reduce potential environmental risks are based on the best available scientific information. Strong science allows for identification of the most important sources of risk to human health and the environment, as well as the best means to detect, abate, and avoid possible environmental problems, and thereby guides our priorities, policies, and deployment of resources.

To accelerate the pace of environmental protection for healthy people, communities, and ecosystems, EPA will engage in high-priority, cutting-edge, multidisciplinary research efforts in areas related to human health, ecosystems, mercury, global change, pesticides and toxics, endocrine disruptors, computational toxicology, nanotechnology and Homeland Security.

In FY 2009, the Human Health Research Program is working to maintain its successful program in reducing uncertainties in risk assessment while orienting this work toward developing and linking indicators of risk along the source-exposure-effects-disease continuum that can be used to demonstrate reductions in human risk. This strategic shift is designed to include research that addresses limitations, gaps, and challenges articulated in the 2003 and 2007 Reports on the Environment. Research includes development of sensitive and predictive methods to identify viable bio-indicators of exposure, susceptibility, and effect that could be used to evaluate public health impacts at various geospatial and temporal scales.

The Agency's human health risk assessment (HHRA) research program will implement a process to identify, compile, characterize, and prioritize new scientific studies into Integrated Science Assessments (ISAs) of criteria air pollutants to assist EPA's air and radiation programs in determining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), deliver final ISAs for environmental effects of sulfur oxide and nitrogen oxides, and release a draft ISA for carbon monoxide. In addition, the HHRA research program will complete multiple human health assessments of high priority chemicals for interagency review or external peer review and post several completed human health assessments in the integrated risk information system.

In order to assess the benefits of ecosystem services to human and ecological well-being, it is important to define ecosystem services and their implications, measure, monitor and map those services at multiple scales over time, develop predictive models for quantifying the changes in ecosystem services, and develop decision platforms for decision makers to protect and restore ecosystem services through informed decision making. This represents a transition for the Ecosystems research program in FY 2009. To meet these objectives, the Agency's ecosystems research will build on existing work in environmental monitoring and assessment, landscape ecology, modeling ecological stressor-response relationships, and assessing vulnerability to natural and human stressors.

Over the last decade, the endocrine disruptor research program conducted

the underlying research, developed and standardized protocols, prepared background materials for transfer, briefed Agency advisory committees, participated on international committees on harmonization of protocols, and participated in validation of 19 different *in vitro* and/or *in vivo* assays for the development and implementation of the Agency's two tiered Endocrine Disruptors Screening Assay. In FY 2009, research will continue in the following areas:

- Development of novel *in vitro* assays as improved alternatives that may further reduce the numbers of animals used;
- Finalization of the Tier 2 amphibian developmental/reproductive assay and the fish 2 generation study for validation; and
- Leadership on the guidance document and multi-laboratory standardization of the Tier 2 mammalian protocol.

In FY 2009, the National Center for Computational Toxicology (NCCT) will play a critical role in coordinating and implementing these activities across the Agency. In addition, in FY 2009, greater emphasis will be placed on using systems biology-based approaches to advance health-based assessments.

The computational toxicology research program's strategic direction is guided by three long term goals:

- Improving the linkages in the source-outcome paradigm;
- Providing tools for screening and prioritization of chemicals under regulatory review; and

- Enhancing quantitative risk assessment.

In FY 2009, continued research in the pesticides and toxics research program will characterize toxicity and pharmacokinetic profiles of perfluoroalkyl chemicals, examine the potential for selected perfluorinated telomers to degrade to perfluorooctanoic acid or its precursors, and develop methods and models to forecast the fate of pesticides and byproducts from source waters through drinking water treatment systems and ultimately to the U.S. population. The program also will conduct research to develop spatially-explicit probabilistic models for ecological assessments and evaluate the potential environmental and human health impacts of genetically engineered crops.

EPA will increase efforts to investigate nanotechnology's environmental, health, and safety implications in FY 2009. This research will examine which processes govern the environmental fate of nanomaterials and what data are available/needed to enable nanomaterial risk assessment. Research will continue on improving our measurement, understanding, and control of mercury, with a research focus on the fate and transport of mercury and mercury compounds, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Clean Air Mercury rule. The Agency will also cultivate the next generation of environmental scientists by awarding fellowships to pursue higher education in environmentally related fields and by hosting recent graduates at its facilities.

EPA will continue research to better understand how global change (*e.g.*,

climate change) will affect the environment, including the environmental and human health implications of greenhouse gas mitigation strategies, and the implications of climate change for the Agency's fulfillment of its statutory, regulatory and programmatic requirements. The Agency's climate change research also includes the development of decision support tools to help resource managers adapt to a changing climate.

In FY 2009, the Agency will continue to enhance the nation's preparedness and response and recovery capabilities for homeland security incidents through research, development, and technical support activities. EPA will significantly increase its emphasis on biodefense research related to anthrax including sampling, decontamination, and risk assessment methods and models to aid first responders in determining the extent of an outdoor release of anthrax as well as to aid in the identification of appropriate decontamination options. More specifically, EPA will strengthen its research in the following areas:

- Development and adaptation of methods to test for anthrax including the extent of contamination and clearance following wide-area decontamination;
- Determination of deposition and adhesion properties of anthrax and its ability to re-aerosolize from materials common to wide-area settings;
- Development of methods to effectively decontaminate anthrax in wide area



- environments while minimizing the generation of waste; and
- Development and adaptation of methods and models for hazard and exposure assessments needed to determine risk-based clean up goals for anthrax.

Recognizing that environmental policy and regulatory decisions will only be as good as the science upon which they are based, EPA makes every effort to ensure that its science is of the highest quality and relevance, thereby providing the basis for sound environmental results. EPA uses the Research and Development (R&D) Investment Criteria of quality, relevance, and performance in its decision-making processes through the use of research strategies and plans, program review, peer review, and evaluation by the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) and the Science Advisory Board (SAB).

Six major research programs in this goal have undergone OMB's PART evaluation through FY 2007. They include endocrine disruptors research, ecosystems protection research, human health research, global change research, human health risk assessment research, and safe pesticides/safe toxics research.

## Compliance and Environmental Stewardship

Protect human health and the environment through ensuring compliance with environmental requirements by enforcing environmental statutes, preventing pollution, and promoting environmental stewardship. Encourage innovation and provide incentives for governments, businesses, and the public that promote environmental stewardship and long-term sustainable outcomes.

### STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES:

- By 2011, maximize compliance to protect human health and the environment through enforcement and other compliance assurance activities by achieving a 5 percent increase in the pounds of pollution reduced, treated, or eliminated by regulated entities, including those in Indian country. (Baseline: 3-year rolling average FYs 2003-2005: 900,000,000 pounds.)
- By 2011, enhance public health and environmental protection and increase conservation of natural resources by promoting pollution prevention and the adoption of other stewardship practices by companies, communities, governmental organizations, and individuals.
- Protect human health and the environment on tribal lands by assisting federally-recognized tribes to build environmental management capacity, assess environmental conditions and measure results, and implement environmental programs in Indian country.
- Conduct leading-edge, sound scientific research on pollution prevention, new technology development, socioeconomic, sustainable systems, and decision-making tools. By 2011, the products of this research will be independently recognized as providing critical and key evidence in informing Agency policies and decisions and solving problems for the Agency and its partners and stakeholders.

### GOAL, OBJECTIVE SUMMARY

Budget Authority  
Full-time Equivalents  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted</b>
<b>Compliance and Environmental Stewardship</b>	<b>\$747,628.5</b>	<b>\$742,477.6</b>	<b>\$734,848.0</b>	<b>\$751,102.0</b>	<b>\$16,254.0</b>
Achieve Environmental Protection through Improved Compliance	\$492,019.1	\$506,199.5	\$506,581.5	\$516,901.6	\$10,320.1

	<b>FY 2007 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted</b>
Improve Environmental Performance through Pollution Prevention and Other Stewardship Practices	\$117,520.8	\$109,079.8	\$101,403.7	\$107,098.6	\$5,694.9
Improve Human Health and the Environment in Indian Country	\$78,703.7	\$74,343.8	\$73,238.6	\$75,902.7	\$2,664.1
Enhance Societies Capacity for Sustainability through Science and Research	\$59,384.9	\$52,854.5	\$53,624.2	\$51,199.1	(\$2,425.1)
Total Authorized Workyears	3,361.3	3,471.4	3,486.7	3,425.5	-61.2

The EPA will work to improve the nation's environmental protection practices and enhance natural resource conservation on the part of government, business, and the public. To accomplish these goals, the Agency will employ a mixture of effective inspection, enforcement and compliance assistance strategies; provide leadership and support for pollution prevention and sustainable practices; reduce regulatory barriers; and refine and apply results-based, innovative, and multi-media approaches to environmental stewardship and safeguarding human health.

In addition, EPA will assist Federally-recognized tribes in assessing environmental conditions in Indian Country, and will help build their capacity to implement environmental programs. EPA also will strengthen the scientific evidence and research supporting environmental policies and decisions on compliance, pollution prevention, and environmental stewardship.

### ***Improving Compliance with Environmental Laws***

In order to be effective, the EPA requires a strong enforcement and compliance program, which: identifies and

reduces noncompliance problems; assists the regulated community in understanding environmental laws and regulations; responds to complaints from the public; strives to secure a level economic playing field for law-abiding companies; and deters future violations. EPA's total proposed FY 2009 budget to improve compliance with environmental laws is \$516.9 million.

In order to meet the Agency's goals, the program's strategy employs an integrated, common-sense approach to problem-solving and decision-making. An appropriate mix of data collection and analysis, compliance monitoring, assistance and incentives, civil and criminal enforcement resources, and innovative problem-solving approaches address significant environmental issues and achieve environmentally beneficial outcomes.

The Civil Enforcement program's overarching goal is to protect human health and the environment, targeting enforcement actions according to degree of health and environmental risk, and noncompliance rates. The program works with the Department of Justice to ensure consistent and fair enforcement of all environmental laws and regulations. The program seeks to

level the economic playing field by ensuring that violators do not realize an economic benefit from noncompliance, and to deter future violations. The civil enforcement program develops, litigates, and settles administrative and civil judicial cases against serious violators of environmental laws. In FY 2009, the Civil Enforcement program's proposed budget is \$132.4 million.

EPA's criminal enforcement program investigates and helps prosecute environmental violations which seriously threaten public health and the environment and which involve intentional, deliberate or criminal behavior on the part of the violator. The criminal enforcement program deters violations of environmental laws and regulations by demonstrating that the regulated community will be held accountable, through jail sentences and criminal fines, for such violations. Bringing criminal cases sends a strong message for potential violators, enhancing aggregate compliance with laws and regulations. In FY 2009, the Criminal Enforcement program's proposed budget is \$52.2 million.

Furthermore, the Agency's Enforcement and Compliance Assurance program uses compliance assistance and incentive tools to encourage compliance with regulatory requirements and reduce adverse public health and environmental problems. To achieve compliance, the regulated community must first understand its regulatory obligations and then learn how to best comply with them.

The Agency's Compliance Monitoring program reviews and evaluates the activities of the regulated community to determine compliance with applicable laws, regulations, permit conditions and settlement agreements, to determine whether

conditions present imminent and substantial endangerment, and to analyze compliance rates. FY 2009 Compliance Monitoring activities will be both environmental media- and sector-based, and will also seek to begin addressing statistically valid compliance rates. The traditional media-based inspections complement those performed by states and tribes. They are a key part of our strategy for meeting the long-term and annual goals established for improving compliance in the air, water, pesticides, toxic substances, and hazardous waste environmental programs. As part of this program, the Agency reviews and responds to 100 percent of the notices for trans-boundary movement of hazardous waste, ensuring that these wastes are properly handled in accordance with international agreements and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act regulations. The proposed budget for Compliance Monitoring activities in FY 2009 is \$97.2 million.

The Enforcement program addresses violations of environmental laws, to ensure that violators come into compliance with Federal laws and regulations and reduce pollution. In FY 2009, the program will achieve these environmental goals through consistent, fair, and focused enforcement of all environmental statutes. The overarching goal of the Enforcement program is to protect human health and the environment, targeting its actions according to degree of health and environmental risk. The program is considering utilizing analyses and evaluations of statistically valid compliance rates. In FY 2009, EPA will continue to implement its national compliance and enforcement priorities, which address the most widespread types of violations that also pose the most substantive health and environmental risks. In addition, in FY 2009 EPA anticipates reducing, treating, or eliminating an estimated 890 million pounds

of pollutants building upon our achievements to date in reducing pollution through enforcement settlement agreements and compliance incentives by an estimated 4.5 billion pounds over the last six fiscal years.

Maximum compliance requires the active efforts of the regulated community. EPA's Audit Policy encourages corporate audits of environmental compliance and subsequent correction of self-discovered violations, providing a uniform enforcement response toward disclosures of violations. Under the Audit Policy, when companies voluntarily discover and promptly correct environmental violations, EPA may waive or substantially reduce civil penalties. Evaluation of the results of violations disclosed through self-reporting will occur in order to understand the effectiveness and accuracy of such self-reporting. Throughout FY 2009, EPA will continue to investigate options for encouraging self-directed audits and disclosures with particular emphasis on companies in the process of mergers and/or acquisitions. Also in FY 2009, EPA's Enforcement and Compliance Assurance program will continue to develop meaningful measures to assess the impact of enforcement and compliance activities and target areas that pose the greatest risks to human health or the environment, display patterns of noncompliance, or include disproportionately exposed populations.

EPA fulfills its uniquely Federal responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act by reviewing and commenting on other Federal agency Environmental Impact Statements (EISs), and making the comments available to the public. NEPA requires that Federal agencies prepare and submit EISs to identify potential environmental consequences of

major proposed activities and develop plans to mitigate or eliminate adverse impacts. The FY 2009 NEPA budget is \$16.3 million.

### ***Improving Environmental Performance through Innovation and Pollution Prevention and Stewardship***

In FY 2009, with a budget of \$18.4 million, the Pollution Prevention program will continue being one of the Agency's primary tools for minimizing and preventing adverse environmental impacts by preventing the generation of pollution at the source. Through pollution prevention integration, EPA will work to bring about a performance-oriented regulatory system that develops innovative, flexible strategies to achieve measurable results; promotes environmental stewardship in all parts of society; supports sustainable development and pollution prevention; and fosters a culture of creative environmental problem-solving. In total, the Agency proposes \$107 million to improve environmental performances through pollution and other stewardship practices.

- **Partnering with Businesses and Consumers:** In FY 2009, through the Pollution Prevention (P2) program, EPA will promote stronger regional partnerships and geographically tailored approaches to address unique community problems. Also in FY 2009, EPA will continue to encourage, empower, and assist government and business to "green" the nation's supply and demand structures to make them more environmentally sound. Through the Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Program, the Agency will provide enhanced guidance to the Federal building community on

model green construction specifications and help Federal agencies identify and procure those products that generate the least pollution, consume fewest non-renewable natural resources, and constitute the least threat to human health and to the environment. EPA's innovative Green Suppliers Network Program works with large manufacturers to increase energy efficiency; identify cost-saving opportunities; optimize resources and technology through the development of sound business approaches incorporating pollution prevention; and to promote those approaches among their numerous suppliers. P2 grants to states and tribes enable them to provide technical assistance, education and outreach to assist businesses and industries in identifying strategies and solutions to reduce wastes and pollution at the source. The importance of tracking outcomes from P2 grants has been reinforced by adding key P2 environmental outcome targets to program guidance reporting measures.

In FY 2009, through the National Partnership for Environmental Priorities (NPEP), the Agency will continue to reduce priority chemicals in wastes. As of August 2007, the NPEP program has obtained industry commitments for 6.5 million pounds of priority chemical reductions through 2011. Reductions will be achieved primarily through source reduction made possible by safer chemical substitutes.

- **Promoting Innovation and Stewardship:** In FY 2009, EPA will

work to bring about a performance-oriented regulatory system that develops innovative, flexible strategies to achieve measurable results; promote environmental stewardship in all parts of society; support sustainable development and pollution prevention; and foster a culture of creative environmental problem-solving.

The Performance Track (PT) program will improve program reporting, develop and implement national and regional challenge commitments, and leverage state environmental leadership programs by aligning PT with 20 state programs. In addition, EPA will sponsor a formal program evaluation of the program in FY 2009.

Also in FY 2009, EPA will continue to grow its partnerships and track environmental performance trends with major manufacturing sectors, such as steel, cement, forest products, and shipbuilding, plus important non-manufacturing sectors like agribusiness, construction, and ports. The Agency will address barriers to improved performance, provide sector-specific "drivers" for continuous improvement and stewardship, and use the partnerships to tackle high priority environmental issues.

EPA will also continue to promote environmental performance through the Environmental Results Program (ERP), a state-run program promoting environmental performance and efficiency through assistance and incentives to both states and businesses. In FY 2009, EPA will support the growing demand for the ERP program beyond the 16 States and 10 sectors currently active in the program.

Finally, EPA will continue the State Innovation Grant program in FY 2009, which provides support to states, allowing them to develop their own innovative approaches, including flexible permitting, ERP, and environmental leadership programs (e.g. PT). Measurement and program evaluation also will continue to be priorities.

### ***Improve Human Health and the Environment in Indian Country***

Since adopting the EPA Indian Policy in 1984, EPA has worked with tribes on a government-to-government basis in recognition of the Federal government's trust responsibility to Federally-recognized tribes. EPA will continue to work with Tribal communities in FY 2009 with a budget of \$80.2 million directed to Tribal programs. Under Federal environmental statutes, the Agency is responsible for protecting human health and the environment in Indian Country. EPA's American Indian Environmental Office (AIEO) leads an Agency wide effort to work with tribes, Alaska Native Villages, and inter-tribal consortia to fulfill this responsibility. EPA's strategy for achieving this objective has three major components:

- **Establish an Environmental Presence in Indian Country:** The Agency will continue to provide funding through the Indian General Assistance Program (GAP) so each Federally-recognized tribe can establish an environmental presence.
- **Provide Access to Environmental Information:** EPA will provide the information tribes need to meet EPA and Tribal environmental priorities, as well as characterize the environmental and public health

improvements that result from joint actions.

- **Implementation of Environmental Goals:** The Agency will provide opportunities for the implementation of Tribal environmental programs by tribes, or directly by EPA, as necessary.

In FY 2009, GAP grants will build tribal environmental capacity to assess environmental conditions, utilize available information, and build an environmental program tailored to tribes' needs. The grants will develop environmental education and outreach programs, develop and implement integrated solid waste management plans, and alert EPA to serious conditions that pose immediate public health and ecological threats. Through GAP program guidance, EPA emphasizes outcome based results.

### ***Sustainability***

In total, the Agency proposes \$51.2 million to enhance capacity for sustainability through science and research. EPA has developed and evaluated tools and technologies to monitor, prevent, control, and clean up pollution throughout its history. Since the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, the Agency has increasingly focused on preventative and sustainable approaches to health and environmental problems. EPA's efforts in this area support research specifically designed to address the issue of advancing sustainability goals – EPA's Science and Technology for Sustainability (STS) program.

Sustainable approaches require: innovative design and production techniques that minimize or eliminate environmental liabilities; integrated management of air,

water, and land resources; and changes in the traditional methods of creating and distributing goods and services. And in addition to conducting research related to human health and environmental threats, EPA is committed to promoting sustainability—achieving economic prosperity while protecting natural systems and quality of life for the long term.

In FY 2009, EPA's Sustainability research program will embark on a new effort that is aimed at creating a suite of science-based sustainability metrics that are readily understood by the public. This work will address both large and small systems. In addition, the People, Prosperity, and Planet Award will support up to 50 student design projects from around the country, focusing on challenges in areas such as materials and chemicals, energy, resources, and water. Recognizing that environmental policy and regulatory decisions will only be as good as the science upon which they are based, EPA makes every effort to ensure that its science is of the highest quality and relevance, thereby, providing the basis for sound environmental results. EPA uses the Research and Development Investment Criteria of quality, relevance, and performance in its decision-making processes through (a) the use of research strategies and plans, (b) peer review, and (c) program review and evaluation by the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) and the Science Advisory Board.

## **FY 2006 PART**

- EPA's Pollution Prevention Program, including the Categorical Grant Program, underwent PART review in FY 2006 and received a "moderately effective" rating.



## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
10000218	Drinking Water State Revolving Fund	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Implement recommendations from the second triennial drinking water data quality review which are designed to improve the overall quality of the data in EPA's drinking water compliance reporting system.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop a new long-term outcome performance measure to assess the impact of drinking water compliance improvements on public health.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop an efficiency measure that is more useful and meaningful for tracking annual programmatic efficiency.	Action taken, but not completed
10000220	EPA Enforcement of Environmental Laws (Civil)	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Continue to expand and improve use of statistically valid non-compliance rates.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop meaningful baseline and targets for outcome oriented performance measures, with particular emphasis on pounds of pollutants reduced characterized for risk.	Action taken, but not completed
			Target resources based on workload analysis and take into account recommendations by the intra-agency Superfund Review completed in April 2004.	Action taken, but not completed
			Direct funds toward completion of the Permit Compliance System (PCS)	Action taken, but not completed
			EPA will consider contracting for an independent evaluation of the program that can serve as the basis for further improvements.	Action taken, but not completed
			Calculate and evaluate recidivism rates.	Action taken, but not completed
			Direct funds toward completion of the Permit Compliance System (PCS)	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Begin to transition from a tool-oriented to a problem-oriented GPRA Architecture; and incorporate in the next EPA Strategic Plan.	Action taken, but not completed
10000222	EPA Tribal General Assistance Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Implementation of the GAP tracking system proceeds. Regional training will occur Sept-Dec. 2007. System evaluation and updated recommendations are scheduled for Feb. 2008, with any necessary system updates occurring in March-May 2008.	Action taken, but not completed
			Implementation of the GAP tracking system proceeds. Regional training will occur Sept-Dec. 2007. System evaluation and updated recommendations are scheduled for Feb. 2008, with any necessary system updates occurring in March-May 2008.	Action taken, but not completed
			A long term measure for GAP related to solid waste issues and activities is being developed.	Action taken, but not completed
10000224	Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Grants	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			To continue to improve this program and meet its long-term goals, EPA will focus on ensuring its funds are used for the most beneficial projects.	Action taken, but not completed
			EPA will consider contracting for an independent evaluation of the program that can serve as the basis for further improvements.	Action taken, but not completed
10000226	Toxic Air Pollutants - Regulations and Federal Support	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Increase funding for toxic air pollutant programs by \$7 million in State grants for monitoring to help fill data gaps.	Completed
			Focus on maximizing programmatic net benefits and minimizing the cost per deleterious health effect avoided.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Establish better performance measures, including an appropriate efficiency measure.	Action taken, but not completed
			Use the newly developed efficiency measure to demonstrate efficiency improvements.	No action taken
10000228	Leaking Underground Storage Tank Cleanup Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			In response to initial findings that the program needed better long-term outcome goals with adequate baselines and targets, the program has been participating in an Office of Pesticide	Completed
			Seek out regular independent evaluations and a systematic process to review the program's strategic planning.	Action taken, but not completed
			Programs initiative on performance indicators. The program has proposed new measures for this reassessment.	Completed
			Backlog characterization study and potential refinement of LUST efficiency measure.	Action taken, but not completed
10000234	Pesticide Registration	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			The Administration recommends maintaining funding at the 2004 President's Budget level adjusted for the annual pay increase.	Completed
			The program will develop long-term risk-based outcome performance measures that will supplement the existing long-term measures.	Completed
			The program will also work on long-term outcome efficiency measures.	Completed
			Implement new strategic plan architecture into FY 08 management activities and day-to-day operations.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Establish executive leads to provide senior leadership for each of the 3 mission areas in the new Strategic Plan.	Completed
			Brief staff on new Strategic Plan in order to incorporate stronger alignment between Strategic Plan individual Performance Agreement and Recognition System (PARS) agreements.	Action taken, but not completed
			Executive leads working toward the development and refinement of meaningful outcome oriented measures for each of the three mission area in the new Strategic Plan	Action taken, but not completed
10000236	Pesticide Reregistration	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			The original PART assessment found that the program was not measuring its level of efficiency. As a result, the program has proposed new output efficiency measures that will promote better management and a more direct focus on efficiently achieving outcomes.	Completed
			To address the issue of not meeting annual targets and concerns about meeting statutorily-required deadlines, the program did use additional resources for reviewing antimicrobial pesticides and inert ingredients as proposed in the FY 2004 President's Budget.	Completed
			The original PART assessment found that the program was not measuring its level of efficiency. As a result, the program has proposed new output efficiency measures that will promote better management and a more direct focus on efficiently achieving outcomes.	Completed
			Per the Agency targets develop and finalize appropriate regional performance targets.	Completed
			Implement new strategic plan architecture into FY 08 management activities and day-to-day operations.	Action taken, but not completed
			Establish executive leads to provide senior leadership for each of the 3 mission areas in the new Strategic Plan.	Completed
			Brief staff on new Strategic Plan in order to incorporate stronger alignment between Strategic Plan individual Performance Agreement and Recognition System (PARS) agreements.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Executive leads working toward the development and refinements of meaningful outcome-oriented measures for each of the three mission areas in the new Strategic Plan	Action taken, but not completed
10000238	Superfund Removal	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Investigate the feasibility of outcome-oriented measures that test the linkage between program activities and impacts on human health and the environment.	Action taken, but not completed
			Modernize the program's data repository (CERCLIS) to ensure accurate and complete information on program performance and financial management.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop a plan for regular, comprehensive and independent assessments of program performance.	Action taken, but not completed
10001131	EPA Acid Rain Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Program should develop efficiency measures to track and improve overall program efficiency. Measures should consider the full cost of the program, not just the federal contribution.	Action taken, but not completed
			Remove statutory requirements that prevent program from having more impact including (but not limited to) barriers that; set maximum emissions reduction targets, exempt certain viable facilities from contributing, and limit the scope of emission reduction credit trading. The Administration's Clear Skies proposal adequately addresses these and other statutory impediments. Program should work as appropriate to promote the enactment of the Clear Skies legislation.	Action taken, but not completed
10001132	Brownfields Revitalization	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Improve grantee use of electronic reporting systems to reduce data lags in performance information.	Action taken, but not completed
			Conduct regional program reviews to share and implement best practices among regional offices that will improve the program's overall performance and efficiency.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Complete performance measures that are under development including a new cross-agency measure that tracks brownfields redevelopment.	Action taken, but not completed
10001133	Clean Water State Revolving Fund	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			EPA will focus on improving the quality and breadth of CWSRF performance data. In particular, EPA needs to focus on collecting data on minor systems, which receive a significant proportion of CWSRF funding, and waterborne disease.	Action taken, but not completed
10001134	EPA Enforcement of Environmental Laws (Criminal)	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Developing a baseline and targets for the outcome measure, pounds of pollutants reduced, that is characterized as to risk.	Action taken, but not completed
			Created standardized definitions (completed) and merging databases from within the agency to allow easier implementation and evaluation of measures.	Action taken, but not completed
			Developing baselines and targets to measure recidivism.	Action taken, but not completed
10001135	EPA Ecological Research	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Refine the questions used in independent scientific reviews to improve EPA's understanding of program utility and performance in relationship to environmental outcomes.	Action taken, but not completed
			Increase the transparency of budget, program, and performance information in budget documents.	No action taken
			Develop and publish a revised multi-year research plan clearly demonstrating how the program's research supports the EPA mission and avoids duplication with other research programs.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
10001136	EPA Environmental Education	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			The administration is continuing its recommendation to terminate the program at EPA and rely on NSF programs to fulfill scientific education initiatives.	Action taken, but not completed
			The administration is continuing its recommendation to terminate the program at EPA and rely on NSF programs to fulfill scientific education initiatives.	No action taken
10001137	National Ambient Air Quality Standards Research	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Convene annual program reviews in which extramural expert discipline scientists and clients will assess the state of ORD science, ensure progress toward outcome goals, and determine the need for strategic mid-course adjustments to maximize program efficiency and assist with outyear planning.	Action taken, but not completed
			The program must develop at least one efficiency measure that adequately reflects the efficiency of the program.	Completed
			Improve multi-year plan (MYP) and financial data tracking systems and procedures to better and more transparently integrate grantee and program performance with financial information.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop an annual measure that more directly demonstrates progress on toward the long-term goal of reducing uncertainty in identified research areas of high priority.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop and implement adequate methods for determining progress on the program's two new long-term measures (uncertainty and source-to-health linkage measures) as well as for the new annual measure (customer survey measure).	Action taken, but not completed
			Assess the current efficiency measure, and revise it, if necessary, to best capture the cost effectiveness of research activities.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
10001138	Pollution Prevention and New Technologies Research	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Shift funding from this research program to another Environmental Protection Agency pollution prevention program that has shown results (see New Chemicals PART).	Completed
			Improve the program's strategic planning. These improvements should include a plan for independent evaluation of the program, responses to previous evaluations, and should clearly explain why the program should pursue projects instead of other capable parties.	Completed
			Establish performance measures, including efficiency measures.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop and publish a revised multi-year research plan with an improved strategic focus and clear goals and priorities. This plan must include explicit statements of: specific issues motivating the program; broad goals and more specific tasks meant to address the issue; priorities among goals and activities; human and capital resources anticipated; and intended program outcomes against which success may later be assessed.	Action taken, but not completed
			Institute a plan for regular, external reviews of the quality of the program's research and research performers, including a plan to use the results from these reviews to guide future program decisions.	Completed
			Assess the current efficiency measure, and revise it, if necessary, to best capture the cost effectiveness of research activities.	Action taken, but not completed
10001139	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Corrective Action	2007 SPR	Implement follow-up recommendations resulting from the Technology for Sustainability Subcommittee Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) review. Follow up actions are those actions committed to in the Pollution Prevention and New Technologies Research Assessment program's formal response to the BOSC	No action taken
			<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Program must define a new baseline for performance measures and establish appropriate annual targets to make goals more ambitious in achieving long-term objectives of the program.	Completed



## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Program should establish appropriate efficiency measures to adequately track program efficiency over time.	Completed
10002272	Alaska Native Village Water Infrastructure	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Correcting incomplete data fields and reporting deficiencies in database to support analysis for cost effectiveness and efficiency by January 30, 2007.	Action taken, but not completed
			Finalizing web based project reporting system to include all projects funded by EPA dollars by April 30, 2007.	Action taken, but not completed
			EPA will develop regulations for the management and oversight of the program, including all grant funds to the State of Alaska and any subsidiary recipients of EPA funds via the State of Alaska. By March 1, 2007, EPA shall provide a draft regulation to OMB for review and comment.	Action taken, but not completed
			The program will issue a contract for an independent review of the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium financial processes and records. The independent review will begin in January 2007.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop an annual programmatic efficiency measure, which managers will find useful for improving operational performance of the program.	No action taken
10002274	EPA Climate Change Programs	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			EPA will complete an assessment and comparison of the potential benefits and efforts of the Clean Automotive Technology program to other agency's efforts with similar goals by April 1, 2005.	Action taken, but not completed
			The Clean Automotive Technology program will work to develop better performance measures that more clearly link to greenhouse gas reduction potential in the near term.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
10002276	Public Water System Supervision Grant Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Implement recommendations from the second triennial drinking water data quality review which are designed to improve the overall quality of the data in EPA's drinking water compliance reporting system.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop a new long-term outcome performance measure to assess the impact of drinking water compliance improvements on public health.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop an efficiency measure that is more useful and meaningful for tracking annual programmatic efficiency.	No action taken
10002278	Underground Injection Control Grant Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Develop an outcome-based annual performance measure and an efficiency measure, which demonstrate the protection of source water quality.	Action taken, but not completed
			Implement recommendations from the second triennial drinking water data quality review which are designed to improve the overall quality of the data in EPA's drinking water compliance reporting system.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop an efficiency measure that is more useful and meaningful for tracking annual programmatic efficiency.	No action taken
10002280	Endocrine Disruptors	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Maintain funding at approximately the FY 2005 President's Budget level.	Completed
			Articulate clearly R&D priorities to ensure compelling, merit-based justifications for funding allocations.	Completed
			By the end of CY 2006, develop baseline data for an efficiency measure that compares dollars/labor hours in validating chemical assays.	Completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			By the end of CY 2007, collect data for first year of new contracts and compare to baseline efficiency measures.	Action taken, but not completed
10002282	U. S.-Mexico Border Water Infrastructure	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Develop baselines and targets for its long-term and efficiency measures.	Completed
			Follow-up on the results of the business process review to help EPA implement program changes that could improve effectiveness.	Completed
			Implement a new program requirement that detailed project schedules be included in future subgrant agreements.	Action taken, but not completed
			Implement program management controls that expedite project completions.	Action taken, but not completed
10002284	Mobile Source Air Pollution Standards and Certification	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Request \$66 million for EPA's mobile source programs, \$1.5 million more than the 2005 President's Budget request.	Completed
			Systematically review existing regulations to maintain consistency and ensure that regulations maximize net benefits. Conduct thorough ex ante economic analyses and evaluations of alternatives in support of regulatory development.	Action taken, but not completed
			Begin collecting data to support two new efficiency measures - one long and one short-term - to enable the program to measure further efficiency improvements.	Action taken, but not completed
10002286	EPA Pesticide Enforcement Grant Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Work to develop appropriate outcome performance measures.	Completed
			Develop targets and baselines.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Evaluate why cost effectiveness appears inversely proportional to amount of Federal funding.	Action taken, but not completed
10002288	EPA's Recycling, Waste Minimization, and Waste Management Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Develop an efficiency measure for the waste minimization component of the RCRA base program.	Action taken, but not completed
			Continuously improving the program by identifying where compliance costs are excessive and reducing the cost of compliance where appropriate (i.e. RCRA manifest rule).	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop a new regulatory definition of solid waste that satisfies the judicial requirements while ensuring that costs are not inappropriately shifted to the Superfund or other corrective action programs by narrowing the exclusion of previously regulated substances.	Action taken, but not completed
10002290	Stratospheric Ozone Protection	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Convert long-term health effects measure into a rate of skin cancer prevalence so that an actual baseline can be established once statistics are available.	Completed
			Continue to support the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol.	Action taken, but not completed
			Continue to monitor progress to ensure that the program is on track to meet goals.	Action taken, but not completed
			Program will develop a performance measure and targets to track intermediate outcomes by measuring "thickness" of the ozone layer in the atmosphere. Many of the program's outcome performance measures are extremely long-term, so it is important to establish measurable performance objectives for the near term.	Action taken, but not completed
			Program will develop a long-term performance measure and set ambitious targets for reduced incidence of non-melanoma skin cancers.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
10002292	Superfund Remedial Action	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Implement the recommendations of the Agency's 120-day study on management of the Superfund program.	Action taken, but not completed
			Modernize the program's data repository (CERCLIS) to ensure accurate and complete information on program performance and financial management.	Action taken, but not completed
			Validate the reporting method for performance data and develop a new Superfund cleanup efficiency measure.	Action taken, but not completed
10002426	Pesticide Field Programs	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Include a \$1 million reduction in funding for the Field Programs WQ program in the FY 2006 President's Budget. EPA must ensure that WQ program activities affected by this reduction are adequately addressed in the Office of Water's Surface Water Protection program.	Completed
			Make the Field Programs budgeting more transparent and more clearly link to adequate and relevant program-specific measures.	Completed
			Develop and implement annual goals and efficiency measures and continue development of baselines and targets for long-term outcome measures for all Field Programs.	Completed
			Develop and implement a method of compiling and disseminating Field Programs grantee performance data in a manner easily accessible to the public. EPA worked with states to develop a simplified, electronic, EOY reporting system for worker safety activities. Will expand to other field programs by EOY 2007.	Completed
			Implement new strategic plan architecture into FY 08 management activities and day-to-day operations.	Action taken, but not completed
			Establish executive leads to provide senior leadership for each of the 3 mission areas in the new Strategic Plan.	Completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Establish executive leads to provide senior leadership for each of the 3 mission areas in the new Strategic Plan.	Action taken, but not completed
			Brief staff on new Strategic Plan in order to incorporate stronger alignment between Strategic Plan individual Performance Agreement and Recognition System (PARS) agreements.	Action taken, but not completed
			Executive leads working toward the development and refinement of meaningful outcome oriented measures for each of the three mission areas in the new Strategic Plan	Action taken, but not completed
10004301	Drinking Water Protection Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Developing a long-term outcome performance measure to assess the public health impacts of improvements in drinking water compliance.	Action taken, but not completed
			Revising the current drinking water small system affordability methodology to address negative distributional impacts.	Action taken, but not completed
			Implementing data quality review recommendations to improve the overall quality of the data in EPA's drinking water compliance reporting system.	Action taken, but not completed
			The program is developing an efficiency measure that is more useful and meaningful for tracking annual programmatic efficiency.	Action taken, but not completed
10004302	Chesapeake Bay Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Investigating potential methods to more transparently characterize the uncertainty of the watershed and water quality models, ideally leading to implementation of a method, if feasible.	Action taken, but not completed
			Developing a comprehensive implementation strategy that is coordinated between program partners and accurately accounts for available resources.	Action taken, but not completed
			Promoting and tracking implementation of the most cost effective restoration activities to maximize water quality improvements.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
10004303	Underground Storage Tank Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Underground Storage Tanks Improvement Plan	Action taken, but not completed
10004304	Pollution Prevention Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Evaluate Science Advisory Board Report recommendations for improving performance measures to better demonstrate P2 results.	Action taken, but not completed
			Identifying and reducing barriers associated with core EPA activities that limit implementation of pollution prevention practices by industry.	Action taken, but not completed
			Developing additional P2 Program efficiency measures to expand the portion of the program's resources that are addressed.	Action taken, but not completed
			Fully implement Grant Trak and P2 State Reporting System. Obtain consistent 2007 results from Regions.	Action taken, but not completed
10004305	Land Protection and Restoration Research	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Finalize ambitious, long-term outcome performance measures that assess the utility of the program's research products and services with respect to the outcome goals of its clients.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop and implement a protocol for more frequent review and use of financial and performance tracking data to improve budget-performance integration.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop a new efficiency measure that captures the cost effectiveness of research activities.	Action taken, but not completed
10004306	Water Quality Research	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Finalize ambitious long-term outcome performance measures, which assess the utility of the program's research products and services with respect to the outcome goals of its clients.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Developing and implementing a protocol for more frequent review and use of financial and performance tracking data to improve budget and performance integration.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop a new outcome efficiency measure that captures the cost effectiveness of research activities.	Action taken, but not completed
			Improve the collection of partner performance information to more clearly link to programmatic goals so managers can take appropriate actions to improve overall program performance.	Action taken, but not completed
10004307	Global Change Research	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Finalize ambitious long-term outcome measures that assess the utility of the program's research products and services with respect to the outcome goals of its clients.	Action taken, but not completed
			More clearly define the program's framework and mission to help focus assessment efforts and provide structure for setting priorities.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop an efficiency measure that captures the cost effectiveness of research activities.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop and implement a protocol for more frequent review and use of financial and performance tracking data to improve budget-performance integration.	Action taken, but not completed
10004308	Human Health Risk Assessment Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Expand efficiency measure to include all major work products.	Action taken, but not completed
			Implement new IRIS review process.	Action taken, but not completed



## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Implement regular, independent evaluations that assess the program's effectiveness specifically related to its influence on key risk management decisions made by the Agency's environmental media offices.	Action taken, but not completed
			Investigate alternative approaches for measuring progress related to providing timely, high quality scientific assessments.	Action taken, but not completed
10004370	Ocean, Coastal, and Estuary Protection	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Develop an annual performance measure for the Ocean Dumping Program.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop an additional performance measure for non-estuary program activities.	Action taken, but not completed
			Developing more ambitious targets for the National Estuary Program's annual and long term measures on habitat acres protected and restored.	Action taken, but not completed
10004371	Drinking Water Research	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Develop baselines and targets for all long term and annual performance measures. These will allow the program to set quantitative goals and assess progress through time.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop a performance measure which tracks the efficiency with which the program delivers its services to its primary client, the EPA Office of Water.	Completed
			Improve oversight of non-grant partners and require non-grant partners to work towards the annual and long term goals of the program.	Action taken, but not completed
			Assess the current efficiency measure, and revise it, if necessary, to best capture the cost effectiveness of research activities.	Action taken, but not completed
10004372	EPA Support for Cleanup of Federal	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
	Facilities		Work with other Federal agencies to support attainment of long-term environmental and human health goals.	Completed
			Conduct one evaluation on an aspect of the program to identify areas and means for program improvements.	Completed
			Explore with DOE and DOD the development of cross-program revitalization measures.	Action taken, but not completed
			Work with Fed. Fac. to evaluate their progress toward achieving environmental goals.	Action taken, but not completed
			Improve program management	Action taken, but not completed
10004373	EPA Human Health Research	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Improve ability to link budget resources to annual and long-term performance targets by requesting and reporting Human Health research and Ecosystem research funding as separate program-projects.	Completed
			Develop ambitious long-term performance targets that clearly define what outcomes would represent a successful program.	Completed
			Implement follow up recommendations resulting from external expert review by the Human Health Subcommittee of the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC). Follow up actions are those actions committed to in the Human Health Research program's formal response to the BOSC in September 2005.	Completed
			Implement follow-up recommendations resulting from the Human Health Subcommittee Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) mid-cycle review. Follow up actions are those actions committed to in the Human Health Research program's formal response to the BOSC.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Establish formal baselines for the program's BOSC-informed long-term measures at the next comprehensive BOSC review.	Action taken, but not completed
			Increase the transparency of budget, program, and performance information in budget documents.	No action taken
10004374	EPA Indoor Air Quality	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Link budget requests more explicitly to accomplishment of performance goals, specifically by stipulating how adjustments to resource levels would impact performance.	Action taken, but not completed
			Improve transparency by making State radon grantee performance data available to the public via a website or other easily accessible means.	Action taken, but not completed
			Use efficiency measures to demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals.	Action taken, but not completed
10004375	EPA Lead-Based Paint Risk Reduction Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Develop and implement a method of measuring the impacts of the program's outreach and education efforts.	Action taken, but not completed
			Improve the consistency of grantee and regional office accountability mechanisms and develop a system that ensures all relevant performance data from grantees and the Regional offices is being collected for the purposes of focusing program actions.	Completed
			Improve the linkage between program funding and the associated contributions towards progress in achieving program goals, especially for program grant and contractor funding.	Completed
			Refine/Improve measures used in State Grant Reporting Template to improve accountability of program partners for achievement of program goals.	Action taken, but not completed
			Further improve results reporting from program partners.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
10004376	National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Regional Haze Programs	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Implement improvements within current statutory limitations that address deficiencies in design and implementation and identify and evaluate needed improvements that are beyond current statutory authority.	Action taken, but not completed
			Improve the linkage between program funding and the associated contributions towards progress in achieving program goals.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop at least one efficiency measure that adequately reflects program efficiency.	Action taken, but not completed
10004377	Air Quality Grants and Permitting	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Develop at least one efficiency measure that adequately reflects program efficiency.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop a measure that assesses the State permitting programs' quality, efficiency, and compliance.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop policy and criteria for transitioning the fine particulate matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) monitoring program from Clean Air Act Section 103 grant funding to Clean Air Act Section 105 grant funding.	Action taken, but not completed
			Review and update current grant allocation processes to ensure resources are properly targeted.	Action taken, but not completed
10004378	EPA Oil Spill Control	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Develop a second long-term outcome measure and at least one annual outcome measure.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Develop stronger strategic planning procedures to ensure continuous improvement in the program, including regular procedures that will track and document key decisions and work products.	Action taken, but not completed
			Evaluate the data quality of key data sources used by the program to improve the accuracy and reliability of performance information.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop a forum for sharing and implementing best practices among regional offices that will improve the program's overall performance and efficiency.	Action taken, but not completed
10004379	Water Pollution Control Grants	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Target additional program funding to States implementing probabilistic monitoring activities in support of the national probabilistic monitoring survey.	Action taken, but not completed
			Require that State workplans and performance data are formatted and reported consistently and directly support specific goals in EPA's strategic plan.	Completed
			Provide incentives for States to implement or improve their permit fee programs, increasing the resources available for water quality programs.	Action taken, but not completed
10004380	Surface Water Protection	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Require that 106 State workplans and performance data are formatted and reported consistently and directly support specific goals in EPA's strategic plan.	Action taken, but not completed
			Working with States and other partners, EPA will assess 100% of rivers, lakes, and streams in the lower 48 states using statistically-valid surveys by 2010.	Action taken, but not completed
			Working with States and other partners, EPA will issue water quality reports based on the statistically-valid surveys in the lower 48 states by 2011.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
10009010	EPA Great Lakes Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			By the end of September, the program will present an analysis of major radiological monitoring activities at EPA and other federal agencies, exploring complementary efficiencies and potential redundancies.	No action taken
10009011	EPA Radiation Protection Program	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			By the end of September, the program will present an analysis of major radiological monitoring activity at EPA and other Federal agencies, exploring complementary efficiencies and potential redundancies.	No action taken
10009012	EPA Pesticides and Toxics Research	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Develop a formal response to the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) independent expert review report, address action items, and make progress toward long-term and annual targets.	No action taken
			Assess the current efficiency measure and revise it, if necessary, to best capture the cost effectiveness of research activities.	Action taken, but not completed
			Develop a system to utilize quarterly performance measurement reporting to improve program performance rather than solely revising annual and long-term plans.	No action taken
			Develop a system to utilize quarterly performance measurement reporting to improve program performance rather than solely revising annual and long-term plans.	No action taken
10009064	EPA Chemical Risk Review and Reduction	2007 SPR	<b>Improvement Plan</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
			Program will develop a biomonitoring performance measure with NHANES data from the Center for Disease Control or other biomonitoring data (NATA) for chemicals of concern.	No action taken
			Risk Screening Environmental Model will be updated annually to reflect updated TRI data to ensure performance measures are updated within 2 years that rely on TRI data.	Action taken, but not completed

## PART Improvement Plans- Spring Update Report

PART Code	PART Title	Year of Assessment	Improvement Plans	
			Develop long-term and annual performance measures to reflect risk-based recommendations for HPV Chemicals	Action taken, but not completed

## SUPPLEMENTAL PART INFORMATION

PART Measures	Year Data Available
<b>Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change</b>	
<b><i>Long-Term Performance Measure</i></b>	
Elimination of U.S. consumption of Class II Ozone Depleting substances measured in tons/yr. of Ozone Depleting Potential (ODP).	FY 2010
Estimated future premature lung cancer deaths prevented annually through lowered radon exposure.	FY 2012
Million metric tons of carbon equivalent (mmcte) of greenhouse gas in the building sector.	FY 2012
Million metric tons of carbon equivalent (mmtce) of greenhouse gas in the industry sector.	FY 2012
Million metric tons of carbon equivalent (mmtce) of greenhouse gas reductions in the transportation sector.	FY 2012
Millions of tons of nitrogen oxides (NOX) reduced since 2000 from mobile sources.	FY 2010
Millions of tons of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) reduced since 2000 from mobile sources.	FY 2010
Percent improvement in visibility on 20% worst days, on average for all eastern Class I areas.	FY 2018
Percent of change in number of chronically acidic waterbodies in acid sensitive regions.	FY 2030
Percent reduction in population-weighted ambient concentration of fine particulate matter (PM 2.5) in all monitored counties from 2003 baseline.	FY 2015
Percent reduction in population-weighted ambient concentration of ozone in all monitored counties from 2003 baseline.	FY 2015
Percentage of ORD-developed outputs appearing in the Office of Air and Radiation National Ambient Air Quality Standard Staff Paper (SP)	None
Percentage reduction in tons toxicity-weighted cancer risk emissions from 1993 baseline.	FY 2010
Percentage reduction in tons toxicity-weighted of non-cancer risk emissions from 1993 baseline.	FY 2010
Progress in assessing the linkage between health impacts and air pollutant sources and reducing the uncertainties that impede the	UD



## SUPPLEMENTAL PART INFORMATION

<b>PART Measures</b>	<b>Year Data Available</b>
understanding and usefulness of these linkages.	
Progress toward reducing uncertainty in the science that supports standard setting and air quality management decisions.	UD
Reductions in melanoma and non-melanoma skin cancers, measured by millions of skin cancer cases avoided (melanoma and nonmelanoma).	FY 2010
Tons of fine particulate matter (PM 2.5) since 2000 from mobile sources.	FY 2010
Tons of sulfur dioxide emissions reduced from electric power generating sources.	FY 2010
<b><i>Annual Performance Measure</i></b>	
Percent progress toward completion of a hierarchy of air pollutant sources based on the risk they pose to human health.	70
<b><i>Efficiency Performance Measure</i></b>	
Percent reduction in time (days) per certificate approval for large engines (nonroad Compression Ignition , Heavy duty gas and diesel engines)	FY 2012
Tons of pollutants (VOC, NOX, PM, CO) reduced per total emission reduction dollars spent.	UD
Tons of toxicity-weighted (for cancer and noncancer risk) emissions reduced per total cost (\$).	UD
<b>Goal 2: Clean and Safe Water</b>	
<b><i>Long-Term Performance Measure</i></b>	
100% percent of serviceable rural Alaska homes will have access to drinking water supply and wastewater disposal.	FY 2011
CWSRF Long-Term Revolving Level (\$billions/yr)	FY 2011
DWSRF Long-Term Revolving Level (\$billions/yr)	FY 2018
Indep. Exp. Rev. Panel summary score on tool designed to measure the use of ORD data, tools, and technologies for key decisions leading to scientifically-sound 6 Year Review Decisions made by OW	UD
Indep. Exp. Rev. Panel summary score on tool designed to measure the use of ORD data, tools, and technologies for key decisions leading to scientifically-sound CCL decisions made by the OW	UD
National Coastal Condition Report (NCCR) score for overall aquatic ecosystem health of coastal waters nationally (1-5 scale).	FY2011

## SUPPLEMENTAL PART INFORMATION

<b>PART Measures</b>	<b>Year Data Available</b>
Number of baseline monitoring stations showing improved water quality in tribal waters.	FY 2012
Number of waterbodies identified by States (in 2000 or subsequent years) as being primarily NPS-impaired that are partially or fully restored.	FY2012
Number of waterbody segments identified in 2002 as not attaining standards, where water quality standards are now fully attained.	FY 2012
Percent of Alaska population served by public water systems in compliance with Safe Drinking Water Act regulatory requirements.	FY 2011
Percent of community water systems for which minimized risk to public health through source water protection is achieved.	FY 2011
Percent of homes on tribal lands lacking access to basic sanitation.	FY 2011
Percent of homes on tribal lands lacking access to safe drinking water.	FY 2011
Percentage of WQRP publications in high impact journals.	None
Percentage of WQRP publications rated as highly cited publications.	None
Section 319 funds (\$ million) expended per partially or fully restored waterbody.	FY2012
<b><i>Annual Performance Measure</i></b>	
Percent of data for violations of health-based standards at public water systems that is accurate and complete in SDWIS/FED for all MCL and TT rules.	FY 2011
Percentage of research products used by the Office of Water as the basis of or in support of Contaminant Candidate List Decisions.	UD
Percentage of research products used by the Office of Water as the basis of or in support of Six Year Review Decisions.	UD
<b><i>Efficiency Performance Measure</i></b>	
Average funding (millions of dollars) per project initiating operations	FY 2012
Dollars per well to move Class V wells back into compliance	FY2011
Number of waterbodies protected per million dollars of CWSRF assistance provided (under development)	FY2011
Number of waterbodies restored or improved per million dollars of CWSRF assistance provided (under development)	FY2011
People receiving drinking water that meets all applicable health-based standards per million dollars spent to manage the national drinking water program.	FY 2011

## SUPPLEMENTAL PART INFORMATION

<b>PART Measures</b>	<b>Year Data Available</b>
<b>Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration</b>	
<b><i>Long-Term Performance Measure</i></b>	
Acres of land ready for re-use at Superfund sites.	FY 2010
Federal Facility Superfund sites with contaminated groundwater under control (exposure pathways eliminated or potential exposures under health-based levels for current use of land/water resources).	FY 2011
Federal Facility Superfund sites with human exposures under control (exposure pathways are eliminated or potential exposures are under health-based levels for current use of land or water resources).	FY 2011
Gallons of oil spilled to navigable waters by facilities subject to the Facility Response Plan (FRP) regulations.	FY 2011
Increase the number of cleanups that meet state risk-based standards for human exposure and groundwater migration on Indian County.	FY 2011
Percent of all FRP facilities inspected (and presumed then to be in compliance).	FY 2011
Percentage of Land publications in high impact journals.	None
Percentage of Land publications rated as highly cited publications.	None
Total Superfund-lead removal actions completed.	FY 2011
Total voluntary removal actions, overseen by EPA, completed.	FY 2011
<b><i>Efficiency Performance Measure</i></b>	
Cleanups complete (3-year rolling average) per total cleanup dollars.	UD
Number of annual confirmed UST releases per federal, state and territorial costs.	UD
<b>Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems</b>	
<b><i>Long-Term Performance Measure</i></b>	
% of peer-reviewed EPA RAs where ORD methods, models or data for assessing risk to susceptible subpops is cited as supporting a decision to move away from or apply default risk assessment assumptions	3.5
% of peer-reviewed EPA risk assessments in which ORD's characterization of aggregate/cumulative risk is cited as supporting a decision to move away from or to apply default risk assessment assumptions	5.5

## SUPPLEMENTAL PART INFORMATION

<b>PART Measures</b>	<b>Year Data Available</b>
Acres protected or restored in NEP study areas. (incremental)	FY2011
Assessed or cleaned Brownfields properties redeveloped.	UD
Average cost and average time to produce or update an Endangered Species Bulletin	FY2011
By 2012, provide safe drinking water to 25% of homes in the U.S. Mexico border area that lacked access to safe drinking water in 2003.	FY 2011
By 2012, provide wastewater sanitation to 25% of homes in the U.S. Mexico border area that lacked access to wastewater sanitation in 2003.	FY 2011
Cumulative number of chemicals for which proposed values for Acute Exposure Guidelines Levels (AEGL) have been developed.	FY2011
Cumulative reduction in the production adjusted risk based score of releases and transfers of toxic chemicals from manufacturing facilities.	FY2011
Cumulative reduction in the production-adjusted risk-based score of releases and transfers of High Production Volume (HPV) chemicals from manufacturing facilities.	FY2011
Determination of the extent of the impact of endocrine disruptors on humans, wildlife, and the environment to better inform the federal and scientific communities.	UD
Improve the overall ecosystem health of the Great Lakes by preventing water pollution and protecting aquatic systems.	FY2011
Number of Areas of Concern in the Great Lakes Basin which are restored and de-listed.	FY2011
Number of Beneficial Use Impairments removed within Areas of Concern.	FY2011
Number of cases of children (aged 1-5 years) with elevated blood lead levels (>10ug/dl)	FY2010
Percent difference in the geometric mean blood level in low-income children 1-5 years old as compared to the geometric mean for non-low income children 1-5 years old.	FY2012
Percent of Dissolved Oxygen goal of 100% standards attainment achieved, based on annual monitoring from the previous calendar year and the preceding 2 years.	FY 2011
Percent of agricultural watersheds that exceeds EPA aquatic life benchmarks for two key pesticides of concern.	FY2011
Percent of new chemicals or organisms introduced into commerce that do not pose unreasonable risks to workers, consumers, or the	FY2011

## SUPPLEMENTAL PART INFORMATION

<b>PART Measures</b>	<b>Year Data Available</b>
environment.	
Percent of submerged Aquatic Vegetation goal of 185,000 acres achieved, based on annual monitoring from previous goal.	FY 2011
Percentage of Global publications in high impact journals.	24.6
Percentage of Global publications rated as highly cited publications.	23
Percentage of peer-reviewed EPA risk assessments in which ORD's mechanistic information is cited as supporting a decision to move away from or to apply default risk assessment assumptions.	16.5
Percentage of regulatory decisions in which decision-makers used HHRA peer-reviewed health assessments.	None
Reduce the number of currently exceeded water quality standards met in shared and transboundary surface waters.	FY 2012
Reduced cost per pesticide occupational incident avoided	FY2011
Reduction in PFOA, PFOA precursors, and related higher homologue chemicals in facility emissions by PFOA Stewardship program participants.	FY2010
Reduction in uncertainty regarding the effects, exposure, assessment, and management of endocrine disruptors so that EPA has a sound scientific foundation for environmental decision-making	UD
States use a common monitoring design and appropriate indicators to determine the status and trends of ecological resources and the effectiveness of programs and policies.	None
Usefulness of HHRA's Air Quality Criteria Documents (AQCDs), represented by the number of days between the completion of AQCD peer review and publication of the EPA staff document that relies on AQCD	>60
Utility of ORD's causal diagnosis tools and methods for States, tribes, and relevant EPA offices to determine causes of ecological degradation and achieve positive environmental outcomes.	Exceeds Exp
Utility of ORD's environmental forecasting tools and methods for States, tribes, and relevant EPA offices to forecast the ecological impacts of various actions and achieve environmental outcomes.	Exceeds Exp
Utility of ORD's environmental restoration and services tools and methods for States, tribes, and relevant EPA offices to protect and restore ecological condition and services.	Exceeds Exp
Utility of ORD's methods and models for risk assessors and risk	None

## SUPPLEMENTAL PART INFORMATION

<b>PART Measures</b>	<b>Year Data Available</b>
managers to evaluate the effectiveness of public health outcomes.	
Utility of ORD's methods, model, and data for risk assessors/risk managers to characterize aggregate and cumulative risk in order to manage risk of humans exposed to multiple environmental stressors.	None
Utility of ORD's methods, models, and data for OPPTS and other organizations to make decisions related to products of biotechnology.	None
Utility of ORD's methods, models, and data for OPPTS and other organizations to make probabilistic risk assessments to protect natural populations of birds, fish, other wildlife, and non-target plants	None
Utility of ORD's methods, models, and data for risk assessors and risk managers to characterize and provide adequate protection for susceptible subpopulations.	None
Utility of ORD's methods, models, and data for risk assessors and risk managers to use mechanistic (mode of action) information to reduce uncertainty in risk assessment .	None
Utility of ORD's methods, models, and data under SP2's long-term goal one for OPPTS and other organizations.	None
<b><i>Efficiency Performance Measure</i></b>	
Acres of brownfields made ready for reuse per million dollars.	UD
 <b>Goal 5: Compliance and Environmental Stewardship</b>	
<b><i>Long-Term Performance Measure</i></b>	
Change in behavior to use Improved management practices. (criminal enf)	FY 2007
Cumulative business, institutional and government costs reduced by P2 program participants	FY2011
Cumulative pounds of hazardous materials reduced by P2 program participants	FY2011
Number of states adopting or aligning Guidelines for Learning curricula and standards to state academic standards or number of states developing new env edu standards based on Guidelines for Learning.	FY 2008
Percent of all students and teachers targeted demonstrate increased environmental knowledge, as measured by Guidelines for Learning K-12, developed by North American Assoc for Environmental Education.	FY 2008
Pounds of pollution reduced, treated, or eliminated. (civil enf)	FY 2007

## SUPPLEMENTAL PART INFORMATION

<b>PART Measures</b>	<b>Year Data Available</b>
Pounds of pollution reduced, treated, or eliminated. (criminal enf)	FY 2007
Reduction in recidivism. (criminal enf)	FY 2007
<b><i>Annual Performance Measure</i></b>	
Number of NNEMS fellows who pursue environmental careers.	FY 2007
Change in behavior to use Improved Management practices. (criminal enf)	FY 2007
Percent of compliance actions taken as a result of inspection/enforcement. (pest. enf)	FY 2007
Percent of violators committing subsequent violations. (pest. enf)	FY 2007
Pollutant impact.	FY2008
Pounds of pollution reduced, treated or eliminated. (criminal enf)	FY 2007
Reduction in recidivism (criminal enf).	FY 2007
<b><i>Efficiency Performance Measure</i></b>	
Increase the efficiency of reducing, treating, or eliminating pollutants and generating enforcement outcomes through the effective allocation and utilization of resources.	2009
Number of enforcement actions taken (Federal + State) per million dollars of cost (Federal + State). (pest enf)	FY 2007
Pounds of pollutant reduction per FTE. (criminal enf)	FY 2007
Pounds of pollutants reduced, treated, or eliminated per FTE. (civil enf)	FY 2007
Ratio of number of students/teachers that have improved environmental knowledge per total dollars expended.	FY 2008

## GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Protect and improve the air so it is healthy to breathe and risks to human health and the environment are reduced. Reduce greenhouse gas intensity by enhancing partnerships with businesses and other sectors.

### OBJECTIVE: HEALTHIER OUTDOOR AIR

Through 2011, working with partners, protect human health and the environment by attaining and maintaining health-based air-quality standards and reducing the risk from toxic air pollutants.

#### Air Quality Index

*In 2009 Cumulative percent reduction in the number of days with Air Quality Index (AQI) values over 100 since 2003, weighted by population and AQI value.*

*In 2008 Cumulative percent reduction in the number of days with Air Quality Index (AQI) values over 100 since 2003, weighted by population and AQI value.*

*In 2007 Cumulative percent reduction in the number of days with Air Quality Index (AQI) values over 100 since 2003, weighted by population and AQI value.*

*In 2006 Cumulative percent reduction in the number of days with Air Quality Index (AQI) values over 100 since 2003, weighted by population and AQI value.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Cumulative percent reduction in the number of days with Air Quality Index (AQI) values over 100 since 2003, weighted by population and AQI value.	17	39	21	Data Avail 2008	26	29	Percentage

Background: Baseline was zero in 2003.

#### Reduce Exposure to Unhealthy PM Levels - PM-10

*In 2009 Tons of particulate matter (PM-10) reduced since 2000 from mobile sources.*

*In 2008 Tons of particulate matter (PM-10) reduced since 2000 from mobile sources.*

*In 2007 Tons of particulate matter (PM-10) reduced since 2000 from mobile sources.*

## GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE



*In 2006 The number of people living in areas with monitored ambient PM concentrations below the NAAQS for the PM-10 standard will increase by 4% (relative to 2005) for a cumulative total of 11% (relative to 1992).*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Tons of PM-10 Reduced since 2000 from Mobile Sources	74,594	74,594	87,026	Data Avail 2008	99,458	110,190	Tons

Background: In FY 2005, the 2000 Mobile6 inventory is used as the baseline for mobile source emissions. The 2000 baseline for PM-10 from mobile source is 613,000 tons.

### Reduce Exposure to Unhealthy Ozone Levels - 8 Hour

*In 2009 Cumulative percent reduction in population-weighted ambient concentration of ozone in all monitored counties from 2003 baseline.*

*In 2008 Cumulative percent reduction in population-weighted ambient concentration of ozone in all monitored counties from 2003 baseline.*

*In 2007 The number of people living in areas with monitored ambient ozone concentrations below the NAAQS for the 8-hour ozone standard.*

*In 2006 The number of people living in areas with monitored ambient ozone concentrations below the NAAQS for the 8-hour ozone standard will increase by 1% (relative to 2005) for a cumulative total of 8% (relative to 2001).*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Cumulative percent reduction in population-weighted ambient concentration of ozone in monitored counties from 2003 baseline.	5	7	6	Data Avail 2008	8	10	Percentage
Limit the increase of CO emissions (in tons) from mobile sources compared to a 2000 baseline.	1.01 M	1.01 M	1.18M	Data Avail 2008	1.35M	1.52M	Tons
Millions of Tons of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) Reduced since 2000 from Mobile Sources	1.03 M	1.03 M	1.20M	Data Avail 2008	1.37M	1.54M	Tons
Millions of Tons of Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) Reduced since 2000 Reduced from Mobile Sources	2.03 M	2.03	2.37M	Data Avail 2008	2.71M	3.05M	Tons

Background: The ozone concentration measure reflects improvements (reductions) in ambient ozone concentrations across all monitored counties, weighted by the populations in those areas. To calculate the weighting, pollutant concentrations in monitored counties are multiplied by the associated county populations. The units for this measure are therefore, "million people parts per billion. The 2003 baseline is 15,972 million people-ppb. In FY 2005,

### GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

the Mobile6 inventory is used as the baseline year for mobile source emissions. The 2000 baseline was 7.7M tons for mobile source VOC emissions, and 11.8M tons for mobile source NOx emissions. In FY 2005, the 2000 Mobile6 inventory is used as the baseline for mobile source emission. The 2000 baseline was 79.2M tons for mobile source CO emissions. While on-road CO emissions continue to decrease, there is an overall increase in mobile source CO emissions due to a growth in nonroad CO.

### Reduce Exposure to Unhealthy PM Levels - PM- 2.5

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Cumulative percent reduction in population-weighted ambient concentration of fine particulate matter (PM-2.5) in all monitored counties from 2003 baseline.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Cumulative percent reduction in population-weighted ambient concentration of fine particulate matter (PM-2.5) in all monitored counties from 2003 baseline.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>The number of people living in areas with monitored ambient PM concentrations below the NAAQS for the PM-2.5 standard.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>The number of people living in areas with monitored ambient PM concentrations below the NAAQS for the PM-2.5 standard will increase by 1% (relative to 2005) for a cumulative total of less than 1% (relative to 2001).</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual		Actual	Target	Target	
Cumulative percent reduction in population-weighted ambient concentration of fine particulate matter (PM-2.5) in all monitored counties from 2003 baseline.	2	7 Target	3	Data Avail 2008	4	5	Percentage
Tons of PM-2.5 Reduced since 2000 from Mobile Sources	73,460	73,460	85,704	Data Avail 2008	97,947	110,890	Tons
Background:	The PM 2.5 concentration reduction annual measure reflects improvements (reductions) in the ambient concentration of fine particulate matter PM2.5 pollution across all monitored counties, weighted by the populations in those areas. To calculate this weighting, pollutant concentrations in monitored counties are multiplied by the associated county populations. Therefore, the units for this measure are "million people micrograms per meter cubed: (million people ug/mg3. The 2003 baseline is 2,581 baseline is 2,581 million people-ug/mg3. In FY 2005, the 2000 Mobile6 inventory is used as the baseline for mobile source emissions. The 2000 baseline for PM 2.5 from mobile sources is 613,000 tons.						

### Acid Rain

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Keep annual emissions below level authorized by allowance holdings and make progress towards achieving the year 2010 SO2 emissions cap for utilities. Annual emissions reduction target is 7.5million tons from the 1980 baseline.</i>
----------------	---

## GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Reduce total annual average nitrogen deposition and total ambient nitrate concentrations 10% from baseline. Baseline for annual targets up through 2010 is 1990 monitored levels.</i>
<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Reduce total annual average sulfur deposition and total ambient sulfate concentrations 10% from baseline. Baseline for annual targets up through 2010 is 1990 monitored levels.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Keep annual emissions below level authorized by allowance holdings and make progress towards achieving the year 2010 SO<sub>2</sub> emissions cap for utilities. Annual emissions reduction target is 7.5million tons from the 1980 baseline.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Reduce total annual average nitrogen deposition and total ambient nitrate concentrations 10% from baseline. Baseline for annual targets up through 2010 is 1990 monitored levels.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Reduce total annual average sulfur deposition and ambient sulfate concentrations 29% from baseline.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Reduce total annual average nitrogen deposition and total ambient nitrate concentrations 10% from baseline. Baseline for annual targets up through 2010 is 1990 monitored levels.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Reduce total annual average sulfur deposition and ambient sulfate concentrations 29% from baseline.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Reduce total annual average nitrogen deposition and ambient nitrate concentrations 5% from baseline. Baseline for annual targets up through 2010 is 1990 monitored levels.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Reduce total annual average sulfur deposition and ambient sulfate concentrations 27% from baseline. Baseline for annual targets up through 2010 is 1990 monitored levels.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Tons of sulfur dioxide emissions from electric power generation sources	7,000,000	8,000,000	7,500,000	Data Avail 2008	8,000,000	8,000,000	Tons Reduced
Percent change in average nitrogen deposition and mean total ambient nitrate concentrations.	No Target Established	No Target Established	10	Data Avail 2009	No Target Established	No Target Established	Percentage
Percent change in average sulfur deposition and mean ambient sulfate concentrations.	No Target Established	No Target Established	29	Data Avail 2009	No Target Established	No Target Established	Percentage

Background: The baseline year is 1980. The 1980 SO<sub>2</sub> emissions inventory totals 17.4 million tons for electric utility sources. This inventory was developed by National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program (NAPAP) and is used as the basis for reductions in Title IV of the Clean Air Act Amendments. This data is also contained in EPA's National Air Pollutant Emissions Trends Report. Statutory SO<sub>2</sub> emissions cap for year 2010 and later is at 8.95 million

#### GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

tons, approximately 8.5 million tons below 1980 emissions level. "Allowable SO<sub>2</sub> emission level" consists of allowance allocations granted to sources each year under several provisions of the Act and additional allowances carried over, or banked, from previous years. Sulfur and nitrogen deposition contribute to acidification of lakes and streams, making them unable to support fish and other aquatic life. Reductions in sulfur and nitrogen deposition are critical to reducing the number of chronically acidic water bodies. Ambient sulfate and ambient nitrate ("acid rain" particulate") contribute to unhealthy air and respiratory problems in humans, especially children and other sensitive populations. The baseline is established from monitored site levels based on consolidated map of 1989-1991 showing a three year of deposition levels produced from the CASTNET sites (<http://www.epa.gov/castnet/sites.html>).

### Air Toxicity-Weighted

*In 2009 Cumulative reduction in tons of toxicity-weighted for non-cancer emissions of air toxics from 1993 baseline.*

*In 2009 Cumulative reduction in tons of toxicity-weighted for cancer emissions of air toxics from 1993 baseline.*

*In 2008 Cumulative reduction in tons of toxicity-weighted for non-cancer emissions of air toxics from 1993 baseline.*

*In 2008 Cumulative reduction in tons of toxicity-weighted for cancer emissions of air toxics from 1993 baseline.*

*In 2007 Reduction in tons of toxicity-weighted for cancer and non-cancer emissions of air toxics from 1993 baseline.*

*In 2006 Reduction in tons of toxicity-weighted for cancer and non-cancer emissions of air toxics from 1993 baseline.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Cumulative percentage reduction in tons of toxicity-weighted (for cancer risk) emissions of air toxics from 1993 baseline.	34	Data Avail 2009	35	Data Avail 2009	35	36	Percentage
Cumulative percentage reduction in tons of toxicity-weighted (for noncancer risk) emissions of air toxics from 1993 baseline.	58	Data Avail 2009	58	Data Avail 2009	59	59	Percentage

**Background:** The toxicity-weighted emission inventory will also utilize the NEI for air toxics along with the Agency's compendium of cancer and noncancer health risk criteria to develop a risk metric that can be tabulated and tracked on an annual basis. the baseline is based on emission inventory data from 1990-1993. The baseline is in 1993. Air toxics emissions data are revised every three years to generate inventories for the National Emissions Inventory (NEI), which replaced the National Toxics Inventory (NTI). In intervening years between updates of the NEI, the model EMS-HAP (Emissions Modeling System for Hazardous Air Pollutants) is used to estimate and project annual emissions of air toxics. As new inventories are completed and improved inventory data is added, the baseline (or total tons of air toxics) is adjusted. The toxicity-weighted emission inventory will also utilize the NEI for air toxics along with the Agency's compendium of cancer and noncancer health risk criteria to develop a risk metric that can be tabulated and tracked

### GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

on an annual basis. the baseline is based on emission inventory data from 1990-1993. The 2002 NEI was completed in fall of 2006 so there is a 4yr. lag. 2005 NEI will be an improvement so we should have actuals in early 2009.

### New Source Review

*In 2009 Percent of major NSR permits issued within one year of receiving a complete permit application.*

*In 2008 Percent of major NSR permits issued within one year of receiving a complete permit application.*

*In 2007 Percent of major NSR permits issued within one year of receiving a complete permit application.*

*In 2006 Percent of major NSR permits issued within one year of receiving a complete permit application.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percent of major NSR permits issued within one year of receiving a complete permit application.	70	70	75	Data Avail 2008	78	78	Percentage

Background: The baseline for NSR permits issued within one year of receiving a complete permit application is 61% in 2004.

### Title V

*In 2009 Percent of significant and new Title V operating permit revisions issued within 18 months of receiving a complete permit application.*

*In 2008 Percent of significant and new Title V operating permit revisions issued within 18 months of receiving a complete permit application.*

*In 2007 Percent of significant and new Title V operating permit revisions issued within 18 months of receiving a complete permit application.*

*In 2006 Percent of significant and new Title V operating permit revisions issued within 18 months of receiving a complete permit application.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percent of significant Title V operating permit revisions issued within 18 months of receiving a complete permit application.	91	91	94	Data Avail 2008	97	100	Percentage
Percent of new Title V operating permits issued within 18	83	83	87	Data Avail 2008	91	95	Percentage

### GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	

months of receiving a complete permit application.

Background: The 2004 baseline for significant title V operating permit revisions issued within 18 months of receiving a complete permit application is 100% and the baseline for new title V operating permits issued within 18 months of receiving a complete permit application is 95%.

## OBJECTIVE: HEALTHIER INDOOR AIR

Through 2012, working with partners, reduce human health risks by reducing exposure to indoor air contaminants through the promotion of voluntary actions by the public.

### Healthier Residential Indoor Air

*In 2009 Additional people will be living in homes with healthier indoor air.*

*In 2008 Additional people will be living in homes with healthier indoor air.*

*In 2007 Additional people will be living in homes with healthier indoor air.*

*In 2006 850,000 additional people will be living in homes with healthier indoor air.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Number of additional homes (new and existing) with radon reducing features	180,000	Data Avail 2008	190,000	Data Avail 2008	225,000	265,000	Homes
Number of people taking all essential actions to reduce exposure to indoor environmental asthma triggers.	4,100,000	Data Avail 2008	No Target Established		No Target Established	5,300,000	Number
Percent of public that is aware of the asthma program's media campaign.	>20	33	>20	Data Avail 2008	>20	>20	Percentage
Additional health care professionals trained annually by EPA and its partner on the environmental management of asthma triggers.	2000	3,582	2000	Data Avail 2008	2000	2000	Number

Background: This performance measure includes EPA radon, and asthma work. By 2008, number of people living in homes built (new or existing) with radon reducing features will be 225,000. The baseline for the performance measure was 1996 (107,000 homes). Annual Surveys are conducted by our

### GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

partners to gather information such as types of houses built, lot sizes, foundation designs, types of lumber used, types of doors and windows used. End-of-year performance for the asthma program is a best professional estimate using all data sources (including annual measures on partner performance and advertising awareness outlined below). The survey provides statistically sound results every three years for one period of time. Also, the surveys gather information on the use of radon-resistant design features in new houses. Each year, the survey of building practices is typically mailed out to home builders. The survey responses are analyzed, with respect to State market areas and Census Division in the U.S., to assess the percentage and number of homes built each year that incorporate radon-reducing features. The data are also used to assess the percentage and number of homes built with radon-reducing features in high radon potential areas in the United States (high risk areas). Other analyses include radon-reducing features as a function of housing type, foundation type, and different techniques for radon-resistant new home construction.

### Healthier Indoor Air in Schools

*In 2009 Estimated annual number of schools establishing indoor air quality programs based on EPA's Tools for Schools guidance.*

*In 2008 Students, faculty and staff will experience improved indoor air quality in their schools.*

*In 2007 Students, faculty and staff will experience improved indoor air quality in their schools.*

*In 2006 630,000 students, faculty and staff will experience improved indoor air quality in their schools.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Estimated annual number of schools establishing indoor air quality programs based on EPA's Tools for Schools guidance.	1200	1200	1100	Data Avail 2008	1100	1000	Number

**Background:** The nation has approximately 118,000 (updated to include new construction)\* schools. Each school has an average of 525 students, faculty, and staff for a total estimated population of 62,000,000. The IAQ "Tools for Schools" Guidance implementation began in 1997. Results from a 2002 IAQ practices in schools survey suggest that approximately 20-22% of U.S. schools report an adequate effective IAQ management plan that is in accordance with EPA guidelines.

### OBJECTIVE: PROTECT THE OZONE LAYER

By 2030, through worldwide action, ozone concentrations in the stratosphere will have stopped declining and slowly begun the process of recovery, and overexposure to ultraviolet radiation, particularly among susceptible subpopulations, such as children, will be reduced.

### GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

**Restrict Domestic Consumption of Class II HCFCs**

*In 2009 Remaining US consumption of class II HCFCs below 9,900 ODP-weighted metric tonnes (ODP MTs).*

*In 2008 Remaining US consumption of class II HCFCs below 9,900 ODP-weighted metric tonnes (ODP MTs).*

*In 2007 Remaining US consumption of class II HCFCs below 9,900 ODP-weighted metric tonnes (ODP MTs).*

*In 2006 Restrict domestic annual consumption of class II HCFCs below 9,906 ODP-weighted metric tonnes (ODP MTs) and restrict domestic exempted production and import of newly produced class I CFCs and halons below 10,000 ODP MTs.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Remaining US Consumption of HCFCs in tons of Ozone Depleting Potential (ODP).	<9,900	Data Avail 2008	<9,900	Data Avail 2008	<9,900	<9,900	ODP MTs

Background: The base of comparison for assessing progress on the 2005 annual performance goal is the domestic consumption cap of class II HCFCs as set by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. Each Ozone Depleting Substance (ODS) is weighted based on the damage it does to the stratospheric ozone - this is its ozone-depletion potential (ODP). Beginning on January 1, 1996, the cap was set at the sum of 2.8 percent of the domestic ODP-weighted consumption of CFCs in 1989 plus the ODP-weighted level of HCFCs in 1989. Consumption equals production plus import minus export.

**OBJECTIVE: RADIATION**

Through 2011, working with partners, minimize unnecessary releases of radiation and be prepared to minimize impacts to human health and the environment should unwanted releases occur.

**Radiation**

*In 2009 Percentage of most populous US cities with a radiation air monitoring system, which will provide data to assist in protective action determinations.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percentage of most populous US cities with a RadNet ambient radiation air monitoring system, which will provide data to assist in protective action determinations.	65	67	80	87	85	90	Percentage
Level of readiness of radiation program personnel and assets to support federal radiological emergency response	75	78	80	83	85	90	Percentage

**GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE**

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

78



Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
and recovery operations.							
Average time of availability of quality assured ambient radiation air monitoring data during an emergency.	1.9	1.9	1.3	1.3	1	.8	Days
Time to approve site changes affecting waste characterization at DOE waste generator sites to ensure safe disposal of transuranic radioactive waste at WIPP.	30	33	40	43	46	53	Percentage
Level of readiness of national environmental radiological laboratory capacity (measured as percentage of laboratories adhering to EPA quality criteria for emergency response and recovery decisions.	7	7	20	21	35	50	Percentage

Background: The baseline is 55%.

## OBJECTIVE: REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS INTENSITY

By 2012, 160 million metric tons of carbon equivalent (MMTCE) of emissions will be reduced through EPA's voluntary climate protection programs.

### Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Million metric tons of carbon equivalent (mmtce) of greenhouse gas reductions in the building, industrial, and transportation sectors.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Million metric tons of carbon equivalent (mmtce) of greenhouse gas reductions in the building, industrial, and transportation sectors.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Greenhouse gas emissions will be reduced from projected levels by approximately 96.2 MMTCE per year through EPA partnerships with businesses, schools, state and local governments, and other organizations.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Greenhouse gas emissions will be reduced from projected levels by approximately 102 MMTCE per year through EPA partnerships with businesses, schools, state and local governments, and other organizations.</i>

## GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Million metric tons of carbon equivalent (mmtce) of greenhouse gas reductions in the buildings sector.	26.5	31.10	29.4	Data Avail 2008	32.4	35.5	MMTCE
Million metric tons of carbon equivalent (mmtce) of greenhouse gas reductions in the transportation sector.	0.6	0.6	0.9	Data Avail 2008	1.5	2.6	MMTCE
Million metric tons of carbon equivalent (mmtce) of greenhouse gas reductions in the industry sector.	57.5	69.0	62.6	Data Avail 2008	67.7	72.9	MMCTE

**Background:** The baseline for evaluating program performance is a projection of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions in the absence of the U.S. climate change programs. The baseline was developed as part of an interagency evaluation of the U.S. climate change programs in 2002, which built on similar baseline forecasts developed in 1997 and 1993. Baseline data for carbon emissions related to energy use is based on data from the Energy Information Agency (EIA) and from EPA's Integrated Planning Model of the U.S. electric power sector. Baseline data for non-carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, including nitrous oxide and other high global warming potential gases are maintained by EPA. Baseline information is discussed at length in the U.S. Climate Action Report 2002 (<http://yosemite.epa.gov/oar/GlobalWarming.nsf/content/ResourceCenterPublicationsUSClimateActionReport.html>), which provides a discussion of differences in assumptions between the 1997 baseline and the 2002 update, including which portion of energy efficiency programs are included in the estimates. EPA develops the non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions baselines and projections using information from partners and other sources. EPA continues to develop annual inventories as well as update methodologies as new information becomes available.

## OBJECTIVE: ENHANCE SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

Through 2012, provide sound science to support EPA's goal of clean air by conducting leading-edge research and developing a better understanding and characterization of human health and environmental outcomes.

### Research

#### Clean Air Research

*In 2009 Increased use of clean air research program products.*

*In 2008 Increased use of clean air research program products*

*In 2007 Increased use of particulate matter research program products*

## GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

*In 2006 BY 2006, develop and report on new data on the effects of different PM sizes or components to improve understanding of the health risks associated with short-term exposure to PM in healthy and select susceptible populations so that, by 2010, OAR has improved assessments of health risks to develop PM standards that maximize protection of human health, as determined by independent expert review.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Integrated report on the health effects of different particle sizes or particle components in healthy and select susceptible subgroups. (Research)</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Report</i>					<i>Report</i>
Percentage of NAAQS program publications rated as highly cited papers (Research)			35.7	32.9	No Target Established	33.9	Percent
Percent progress toward completion of a hierarchy of air pollutant sources based on the risk they pose to human health. (Research)	10	10	30	No Target Established	50	70	Percent
Percent planned actions accomplished toward the long-term goal of reducing uncertainty in the science that support standard setting and air quality management decisions. (Research)	100	94	100	100	100	100	Percent

Background: The program aims to make measurable progress in 1) assessing the linkage between health impacts and air pollutant sources and reducing the uncertainties that impede the understanding and usefulness of these linkages, and 2) reducing uncertainty in the science that supports standard setting and air quality management decisions. EPA's Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) rates the program on its progress periodically, and the program responds to BOSC suggestions to ensure continued improvement. Additionally, the program aims to increase 1) the number of planned outputs completed on time (a measure of timeliness); 2) the number of its papers deemed "highly cited" in bibliometric analyses (a measure of the quality and use of ORD's research); and 3) the percentage of ORD-developed outputs appearing in the Office of Air and Radiation National Ambient Air Quality Standard Staff Paper (a measure of the utility and use of ORD's research). The program is also working toward completion of a hierarchy of air pollutant sources based on the risk they pose to human health.

#### GOAL 1: CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

## GOAL 2: CLEAN AND SAFE WATER

Ensure drinking water is safe. Restore and maintain oceans, watersheds, and their aquatic ecosystems to protect human health, support economic and recreational activities, and provide healthy habitat for fish, plants, and wildlife.

### OBJECTIVE: PROTECT HUMAN HEALTH

Protect human health by reducing exposure to contaminants in drinking water (including protecting source waters), in fish and shellfish, and in recreational waters.

#### Safe Drinking Water

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Increase the population served by community water systems that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through approaches including effective treatment and source water protection.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>90 % of the population served by community water systems that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through approaches including effective treatment and source water protection.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>94% of the population will be served by community water systems in compliance with health-based drinking water standards.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>90% of the population served by community water systems in Indian country will receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>93% of the population served by community water systems will receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through effective treatment and source water protection.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Percent of the population in Indian country served by community water systems that receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards (4: Ambient Conditions)</i>	90	86.6	87	87	87	87	<i>Percent Population</i>
Percent of population served by CWSs that will receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water standards through approaches incl. effective treatment & source water protection. (4:	93	89.4	94	91.5	90	90	Percent Population

### GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Ambient Conditions)							
Fund utilization rate for the DWSRF. (1B: Service Delivery)	83.3	86.9	85	88	86	89	Rate
Number of additional projects initiating operations. (0: Indeterminate)	425	399	433	438	440	445	Projects
Percent of community water systems that have undergone a sanitary survey within the past three years (five years for outstanding performance.) (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)	95	94	95	92	95	95	Percent CWS
Percentage of identified Class V motor vehicle waste disposal wells closed or permitted. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)					90	75	Wells
Percentage of Class I, II, and III wells that maintain mechanical integrity without a failure that releases contaminants to underground sources of drinking water. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)					98	98	Wells
Percentage of prohibited Class IV and high-priority, identified, potentially endangering Class V wells closed or permitted in ground-water based source water areas. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)					96	86	Wells
Percent of community water systems that meet all applicable health-based standards through approaches that include effective treatment and source water protection. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)	93.5	89.3	89	89	89.5	90	Percent Systems
Percent of person months during which community water systems provide drinking water that meets all applicable health-based standards. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)					95	95	Percent CWS
Background:	In 1998, 85% of the population that was served by community water systems and 96% of the population served by non-community, non-transient drinking water systems received drinking water for which no violations of Federally enforceable health standards had occurred during the year. Year-to-year performance is expected to change as new standards take effect. Covered standards include: Stage 1 disinfection by-products/interim enhanced surface water treatment rule/long-term enhanced surface water treatment rule/arsenic.						

## GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

**River/Lake Assessments for Fish Consumption**

*In 2009 Improve the quality of recreation waters.*

*In 2008 Improve the quality of recreation waters.*

*In 2008 Reduce public health risk and allow increased consumption of fish and shellfish.*

*In 2007 Coastal and Great Lakes beaches monitored by State beach safety programs will be open and safe for swimming in over 95% of the days of the beach season.*

*In 2006 Coastal and Great Lakes beaches monitored by State beach safety programs will be open and safe for swimming in over 94% of the days of the beach season.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Percentage of women of childbearing age having mercury levels in blood above the level of concern. (5: Exposure or Body Burden)</i>					5.5	5.2	<i>Percent of Women</i>
<i>Percent of state-monitored shellfish-growing acres impacted by anthropogenic sources that are approved or conditionally approved for use. (4: Ambient Conditions)</i>					65-85	65-85	<i>Percent Areas</i>
<i>Number of waterborne disease outbreaks attributable to swimming in or other recreational contact with coastal and Great Lakes waters measured as a 5-year average. (5: Exposure or Body Burden)</i>					2	2	<i>Outbreaks</i>
<i>Percent of days of beach season that coastal and Great Lakes beaches monitored by State beach safety programs are open and safe for swimming. (4: Ambient Conditions)</i>	94	97	92.6	95.2	92.6	93	<i>Percent Days/Season</i>

Background: For shellfish consumption, 77% of assessed estuary square miles met this designated use. For days of beach season monitoring, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas were included for the first time in 2006. These territories have a higher percentage of beach season day closures resulting in a lower percentage of days at the regional and national levels.

**GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION**

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

**OBJECTIVE: PROTECT WATER QUALITY**

Protect the quality of rivers, lakes, and streams on a watershed basis and protect coastal and ocean waters.

**Watershed Protection**

- In 2009 Use pollution prevention and restoration approaches to protect the quality of rivers, lakes, and streams on a watershed basis.*
- In 2008 Use pollution prevention and restoration approaches to protect the quality of rivers, lakes, and streams on a watershed basis.*
- In 2007 Water quality standards are fully attained in over 25% of miles/acres of waters by 2012, with an interim milestone of restoring 8.0% of these waters - identified in 2000 as not attaining standards - by 2005.*
- In 2006 Water quality standards are fully attained in over 25% of miles/acres of waters by 2012, with an interim milestone of restoring 5% of these waters - identified in 2000 as not attaining standards - by 2005.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Number of waterbody segments identified by States in 2002 as not attaining standards, where water quality standards are now fully attained (cumulative). (4: Ambient Conditions)		924	1,166	1,409	1,550	1,660	Number of Segments
Fund utilization rate for the CWSRF. (1B: Service Delivery)	93.3	94.7	93.4	96.7	93.5	93.7	Percent Rate
Percentage of all major publicly-owned treatment works (POTWs) that comply with their permitted wastewater discharge standards (4: Ambient Conditions)					86	86	Percent POTWs
Reduction in phosphorus loadings (millions of pounds). (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	4.5	11.8	4.5	Data Avail Mid-2008	4.5	4.5	Lbs in Millions
Additional pounds (in millions) of reduction to total nitrogen loadings. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	8.5	14.50	8.5	Data Avail Mid-2008	8.5	8.5	Lbs in Millions
Additional tons of reduction to total sediment loadings. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	700,000	1,200,000	700,000	Data Avail Mid-2008	700,000	700,000	Tons
Number of TMDLs that are established by States and approved by EPA on schedule consistent with national	15,428	17,682	20,232	21,685	28,527	31,587	TMDLs

**GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION**

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
policy (cumulative).							
(1B: Service Delivery)							
Percentage of high priority state NPDES permits that are scheduled to be reissued. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)	95	96.4	95	112	95	95	Percent Permits
Percentage of major dischargers in Significant Noncompliance (SNC) at any time during the fiscal year. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	22.5	20.2	22.5	Data Avail 2008	22.5	22.5	Percent Dischargers
Percentage of submissions of new or revised water quality standards from States and Territories that are approved by EPA. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)	90.9	89.1	85	85.6	87	83	Percent Submissions
Number of TMDLs that are established or approved by EPA on a schedule consistent with national policy (cumulative). (1B: Service Delivery)	20,275	22,648	25,274	26,844	33,828	36,941	TMDLs
Percentage of waters assessed using statistically valid surveys. (1B: Service Delivery)	54	54	54	54	65	65	Percent Waters
Percent of high priority EPA and state NPDES permits that are reissued on schedule. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)	95	98.5	95	104	95	95	Percent Permits
% of States & Terr. that, within the preceding 3-yr. period, submitted new or revised wq criteria acceptable to EPA that reflect new scientific info from EPA or sources not considered in prev stnds. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)	66	66.1	67	66.1	68	68	Percent States/Terr.
<i>Remove the specific causes of waterbody impairment identified by states in 2002 (cumulative). (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>						5,075	<i>Causes</i>
<i>Improve water quality conditions in impaired watersheds nationwide using the watershed approach (cumulative). (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>						64	<i>Watersheds</i>

Background: As of 2002 state reports 453 watersheds had met the criteria that greater than 80% of assessed waters met all water quality standards. For a watershed to be counted toward this goal, at least 25% of the segments in the watershed must be assessed within the past 4 years consistent with assessment

### GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)



guidelines developed pursuant to section 305(b) of the Clean Water Act. In 2002, 0% of the 255,408 miles/and 6,803,419 acres of waters identified on 1998/2000 lists of impaired waters developed by States and approved by EPA under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act.

### Coastal and Ocean Waters

*In 2009 Improve National Coastal Condition Report (NCCR) score for overall aquatic ecosystem health of coastal waters nationally*

*In 2008 Improve National Coastal Condition Report (NCCR) score for overall aquatic ecosystem health of coastal waters nationally (1-5 scale.)*

*In 2006 Improve ratings reported on the national "good/fair/poor" scale of the National Coastal Condition Report for: coastal wetlands loss by at least 0.2 point; contamination of sediments in coastal waters by at least 0.7 point; benthic quality by at least 0.5 point; & eutrophic condition by at least 1.2 point*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Percent of active dredged material ocean dumping sites that will have achieved environmentally acceptable conditions (as reflected in each site's management plan). (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					95	95	<i>Percent Sites</i>

Background: National rating of "fair/poor" or 2.4 where the rating is based on a 5-point system where 1 is poor and 5 is good and is expressed as an aerially weighted mean of regional scores using the National Coastal Condition Report indicators [i.e., water clarity, dissolved oxygen, coastal wetlands loss, eutrophic conditions, sediment contamination, benthic health, and fish tissue contamination]. The 2002 National Coastal Condition Report indicated 4.3 for water clarity and 4.5 for dissolved oxygen, 1.4 for coastal wetlands loss; 1.3 for contamination of sediments in coastal waters; 1.4 for benthic quality; & 1.7 for eutrophic condition.

### Alaska Native Villages

*In 2009 Percent serviceable rural Alaska homes with access to drinking water supply and wastewater disposal.*

*In 2008 Percent serviceable rural Alaska homes with access to drinking water supply and wastewater disposal.*

*In 2007 Percent serviceable rural Alaska homes with access to drinking water supply and wastewater disposal.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percent of serviceable rural Alaska homes with access to drinking water supply and wastewater disposal. (3:			92	Data Avail Late 2008	94	96	Percent Homes

### GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	

## Pollution Reduction/Prevention)

Background: In 2003, 77% of serviceable rural Alaska homes had access to drinking water supply and wastewater disposal.

**OBJECTIVE: ENHANCE SCIENCE AND RESEARCH**

By 2011, conduct leading-edge, sound scientific research to support the protection of human health through the reduction of human exposure to contaminants in drinking water, fish and shellfish, and recreational waters and to support the protection of aquatic ecosystems-specifically, the quality of rivers, lakes, and streams, and coastal and ocean waters.

**Research****Drinking Water Research**

*In 2009 Increased use of drinking water research products.*

*In 2008 Increased use of drinking water research products*

*In 2007 Increased use of drinking water research products*

*In 2006 By 2006, provide results of full-scale treatment demonstration projects and evaluations of other approaches for managing arsenic in drinking water, so that by 2010, the Office of Water, states, local authorities and utilities have scientifically sound data and approaches to manage risks to human health posed by exposure to arsenic, as determined by independent expert review.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of Six Year Review decisions. (Research)	100	94	100	100	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of Contaminate Candidate List Decisions. (Research)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Percent

Background: The program aims to make measurable progress in 1) developing data, tools, and technologies to support scientifically sound Six Year Review decisions; and 2) developing data, tools, and technologies to support scientifically sound Contaminant Candidate List (CCL) decisions. EPA's Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) rates the program on its progress periodically, and the program responds to BOSC suggestions to ensure continued improvement. Additionally, the program aims to increase 1) the number of planned outputs completed on time (a measure of timeliness); and 2) the

**GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION**

number of its papers actually used by EPA's Office of Water in Six Year Review and CCL decisions (a measure of the quality and use of ORD's research).

### Water Quality Research

*In 2009 Increased use of water quality research products.*

*In 2008 Increased use of water quality research products*

*In 2007 Increased use of water quality research products*

*In 2006 By 2006, provide demonstrations of bioassessment methods for Mid-Western U.S. rivers, so that, by 2010, the Office of Water, states, and tribes have approaches and methods to develop and apply criteria for habitat alteration, nutrients, suspended and bedded sediments, pathogens, and toxic chemicals that will support designated uses for aquatic ecosystems, as determined by independent expert review.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percentage of planned outputs (in support of WQRP long-term goal #1) delivered (Research)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs (in support of WQRP long-term goal #2) delivered (Research)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs (in support of WQRP long-term goal #3) delivered (Research)	100	92	100	100	100	100	Percent

Background: The program aims to make measurable progress in 1) supporting water quality criteria development; 2) developing diagnostic tools that aid in establishing causal relationships between pollution and water quality impairments; and 3) providing information that supports sustainable watershed management practices through the demonstration of technologies, the application of decision tools and for forecasting restoration and benefits of management practices. Research under these three rubrics is designed to lead to the promulgation of protective standards, the identification of contaminant contributions to impaired waters, and the tools needed to restore and protect the nation's waters. EPA's Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) rates the program on its progress periodically, and the program responds to BOSC suggestions to ensure continued improvement. Additionally, the program aims to increase 1) the number of planned outputs completed on time (a measure of timeliness); and 2) the number of its papers deemed "highly cited" and of "high impact" in bibliometric analyses (a measure of the quality and use of ORD's research).

### GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

### GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

Preserve and restore the land by using innovative waste management practices and cleaning up contaminated properties to reduce risks posed by releases of harmful substances.

#### OBJECTIVE: PRESERVE LAND

By 2011, reduce adverse effects to land by reducing waste generation, increasing recycling, and ensuring proper management of waste and petroleum products at facilities in ways that prevent releases.

#### Municipal Solid Waste Source Reduction

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Increase the number of tribes covered by an adequate and recently-approved integrated solid waste management plan, and close, clean up, or upgrade open dumps in Indian Country and on other tribal lands.</i>
<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Increase use of coal combustion ash rather than disposing of it.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Divert 35% (87.3 million tons) of municipal solid waste from land filling and combustion, and maintain per capita generation of RCRA municipal solid waste at 4.5 pounds per day.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Increase the number of tribes covered by an adequate and recently-approved integrated solid waste management plan, and close, clean up, or upgrade open dumps in Indian Country and on other tribal lands.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Increase use of coal combustion ash rather than disposing of it.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Divert 34.2% (85.2 million tons) of municipal solid waste from land filling and combustion, and maintain per capita generation of RCRA municipal solid waste at 4.5 pounds per day.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Increase the number of tribes covered by an adequate and recently-approved integrated solid waste management plan, and close, clean up, or upgrade open dumps in Indian Country and on other tribal lands.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Increase use of coal combustion ash rather than disposing of it.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Divert 33.4% (83.1 million tons) of municipal solid waste from land filling and combustion, and maintain per capita generation of RCRA municipal solid waste at 4.5 pounds per day.</i>

### GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

*In 2006 Divert 33.4% (83.1 million tons) of municipal solid waste from land filling and combustion, and maintain per capita generation of RCRA municipal solid waste at 4.5 pounds per day.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Percentage of coal combustion ash that is used instead of disposed. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>			1.8	<i>Data Avail 2009</i>	1.8	1.8	<i>percent</i>
Daily per capita generation of municipal solid waste. (0: Indeterminate)	4.5	4.6	4.5	<i>Data Avail 2009</i>	4.5	4.5	lbs. MSW
<i>Number of closed, cleaned up, or upgraded open dumps in Indian Country or on other tribal lands. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>			30	107	30	27	<i>open dumps</i>
<i>Number of tribes covered by an integrated solid waste management plan. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>			27	28	26	16	<i>tribes</i>

Background: An analysis conducted at the end of FY 2006 shows approximately 4.6 lbs of MSW per person daily generation. For coal combustion ash, approximately 125 millions tons are generated annually, and in 2001, 32% was used rather than landfilled. The annual increase in use is targeted although associated increases in generation are also expected annually. There is a one-year data lag in reporting these data. With respect to the tribal data, targets are established relative to 2006 when new criteria for reporting were identified.

### Waste and Petroleum Management Controls

*In 2009 Reduce releases to the environment by managing hazardous wastes and petroleum products properly.*

*In 2008 Reduce releases to the environment by managing hazardous wastes and petroleum products properly.*

*In 2007 Reduce releases to the environment by managing hazardous wastes and petroleum products properly.*

*In 2006 Reduce releases to the environment by managing hazardous wastes and petroleum products properly.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Number of hazardous waste facilities with new controls or updated controls. (2: Regulated Party Activities)						100	facilities
<i>No more than 10,000 confirmed releases per year. (0: Indeterminate)</i>	<10,000	8,361	<10,000	7,570	<10,000	<10,000	<i>UST releases</i>

### GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
	66	62	67	63	68	69	percent

*Increase the rate of significant operational compliance by 1% over the previous year's target. (2: Regulated Party Activities)*

**Background:** Since FY 2004, states and regional offices have reported the percentage of UST facilities that are in significant operational compliance with both release detection and release prevention (spill, overfill, and corrosion protection) requirements, out of a total estimated universe of approximately 256,000 facilities. At the end of FY 2006, 62 percent of USTs were in significant operational compliance with both release detection and release prevention requirements. Given the inspection requirements of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, some states are now targeting previously un-inspected facilities, and these are more likely to be out-of-compliance. Between FY 1999 and FY 2006, confirmed UST releases averaged 10,534. By 2011, 500 RCRA hazardous waste facilities will have initial approved controls or upgraded controls. Although the universe of facilities requiring these controls will be reassessed in 2009, this number is currently estimated at 820.

## OBJECTIVE: RESTORE LAND

By 2011, control the risks to human health and the environment by mitigating the impact of accidental or intentional releases and by cleaning up and restoring contaminated sites or properties to appropriate levels.

### Superfund Cost Recovery

*In 2009 Ensure trust fund stewardship by getting PRPs to initiate or fund the work and recover costs from PRPs when EPA expends trust fund monies. Address cost recovery at all NPL and non-NPL sites with a statute of limitations (SOL) on total past costs equal to or greater than \$200,000.*

*In 2008 Ensure trust fund stewardship by getting PRPs to initiate or fund the work and recover costs from PRPs when EPA expends trust fund monies. Address cost recovery at all NPL and non-NPL sites with a statute of limitations (SOL) on total past costs equal to or greater than \$200,000.*

*In 2007 Ensure trust fund stewardship by getting PRPs to initiate or fund the work and recover costs from PRPs when EPA expends trust fund monies. Address cost recovery at all NPL and non-NPL sites with a statute of limitations (SOL) on total past costs equal to or greater than \$200,000.*

*In 2006 Ensure trust fund stewardship by getting PRPs to initiate or fund the work and recover costs from PRPs when EPA expends trust fund monies. Address cost recovery at all NPL and non-NPL sites with a statute of limitations (SOL) on total past costs equal to or greater than \$200,000.*

FY 2006

FY 2007

FY 2008

FY 2009

## GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

Performance Measures	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	Unit
<i>Refer to DOJ, settle, or write off 100% of Statute of Limitations (SOLs) cases for SF sites with total unaddressed past costs equal to or greater than \$200,000 and report value of costs recovered. (2: Regulated Party Activities)</i>	100	100	100	98	100	100	Percent

Background: In FY 98 the Agency will have addressed 100% of Cost Recovery at all NPL & non-NPL sites with total past costs equal or greater than \$200,000.

### Superfund Potentially Responsible Party Participat

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Reach a settlement or take an enforcement action by the time of the Remedial Action start at 95 percent of non-Federal Superfund sites that have viable, liable parties.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Reach a settlement or take an enforcement action by the time of the Remedial Action start at 95 percent of non-Federal Superfund sites that have viable, liable parties.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Reach a settlement or take an enforcement action by the time of the Remedial Action start at 95 percent of non-Federal Superfund sites that have viable, liable parties.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Reach a settlement or take an enforcement action by the time of the Remedial Action start at 90 percent of non-Federal Superfund sites that have viable, liable parties.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Percentage of Superfund sites at which settlement or enforcement action taken before the start of RA. (2: Regulated Party Activities)</i>	90	100	95	98	95	95	Percent

Background: In FY 98 approximately 70% of new remedial work at NPL sites (excluding Federal facilities) was initiated by private parties. In FY2003, a settlement was reached or an enforcement action was taken with non-Federal PRPs before the start of the remedial action at approximately 90 percent of Superfund sites.

### Assess and Cleanup Contaminated Land

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Control the risks to human health and the environment at contaminated properties or sites through cleanup, stabilization, or other action, and make land available for reuse.</i>
----------------	--

## GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

*In 2008 Control the risks to human health and the environment at contaminated properties or sites through cleanup, stabilization, or other action, and make land available for reuse.*

*In 2007 Control the risks to human health and the environment at contaminated properties or sites through cleanup, stabilization, or other action, and make land available for reuse.*

*In 2006 Control the risks to human health and the environment at contaminated properties or sites through cleanup, stabilization, or other action, and make land available for reuse.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual		Actual	Target	Target	
Number of cleanups completed that meet state risk-based standards for human exposure and groundwater migration. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	13,600	14,493	13,000	13,862	13,000	13,000	cleanups
		Target					
Number of cleanups completed that meet risk-based standards for human exposure and groundwater migration in Indian Country. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	30	43	30	54	30	30	cleanups
Superfund final site assessment decisions completed. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	419	518	350	395	400	400	assessments
Annual number of Superfund sites with remedy construction completed. (0: Indeterminate)	40	40	24	24	30	35	completions
<i>Number of Superfund sites with human exposures under control. (0: Indeterminate)</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>sites</i>
<i>Superfund sites with contaminated groundwater migration under control. (0: Indeterminate)</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>sites</i>
Number of Federal Facility Superfund sites where all remedies have completed construction. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	51	55	56	59	60	64	sites
Number of Federal Facility Superfund sites where the final remedial decision for contaminants at the site has been determined. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	61	70	76	71	81	85	remedies
Number of RCRA facilities with final remedies constructed. (2: Regulated Party Activities)						100	facilities
Number of RCRA facilities with human exposures under control. (2: Regulated Party Activities)						60	facilities

## GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)



Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Number of RCRA facilities with migration of contaminated groundwater under control. (2: Regulated Party Activities)						60	facilities
<i>Number of Superfund sites ready for anticipated use site-wide. (4: Ambient Conditions)</i>			30	64	30	30	sites

**Background:** Through the end of FY 2005, a total of 38,770 final assessment decisions had been made out of a universe of 44,700 potentially hazardous waste sites evaluated by EPA. Additionally, Superfund controlled human exposures at 1,266 of 1,543 eligible NPL sites and controlled groundwater migration at 937 of 1,381 eligible NPL sites, completed construction at 966 of 1,498 eligible NPL sites, and selected final remedies at 1,042 of 1,498 of the eligible NPL sites. Of the 1,714 RCRA Corrective Action highest-priority facilities, 96% (1,649) had human exposures controlled and 78% (1,342) had groundwater migration controlled through the end of FY 2005, reflecting the strong EPA/state partnership in this program. The new measures for RCRA Corrective Action reflect a universe of 3,746 of the high National Corrective Action Prioritization System-ranked facilities, which was recently set. Through FY2006, EPA has completed more than 75% (or 350,818) leaking underground storage tank cleanups. The Agency has worked with state partners to evaluate multi-year cleanup goals in light of new pressures that have slowed the pace of cleanup in recent years. The result of this process has been a reduction of multi-year goals to a target number that better reflects the current challenges.

### Prepare/Respond to Accidental/Intentional Release

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Reduce and control the risks posed by accidental and intentional releases of harmful substances by improving our Nation's capability to prepare for and respond more effectively to these emergencies.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Reduce and control the risks posed by accidental and intentional releases of harmful substances by improving our Nation's capability to prepare for and respond more effectively to these emergencies.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Reduce and control the risks posed by accidental and intentional releases of harmful substances by improving our Nation's capability to prepare for and respond more effectively to these emergencies.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Reduce and control the risks posed by accidental and intentional releases of harmful substances by improving our Nation's capability to prepare for and respond more effectively to these emergencies.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Superfund-lead removal actions completed annually. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	195	157	195	200	195	195	removals
Voluntary removal actions, overseen by EPA, completed.	115	93	120	151	125	130	removals

### GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)* 95

Performance Measures	FY 2006 Target	FY 2006 Actual	FY 2007 Target	FY 2007 Actual	FY 2008 Target	FY 2009 Target	Unit
(2: Regulated Party Activities)							
<i>Number of inspections and exercises conducted at oil storage facilities that are required to have Facility Response Plans. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>345</i>	<i>200</i>	<i>335</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>inspections/ exercises</i>
Percentage of inspected facilities subject to Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) regulations found to be in compliance. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	100	50	53	40	55	58	percent
Percentage of inspected facilities subject to Facility Response Plan (FRP) regulations found to be in compliance. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	100	71	75	67	78	82	percent
<i>Score in annual Core Emergency Response assessment. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>			<i>55</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>percent</i>

Background: Between 2000 and 2005 EPA completed an average 209 Superfund removal response actions and an average 97 removal actions were completed by responsible parties voluntarily (i.e., undertaken without EPA enforcement action). In FY 2004, the compliance rate of all facilities subject to FRP regulations (estimated number of facilities is 4,200) was 50% and the compliance rate of inspected facilities subject to SPCC regulations was approximately 75%. Beginning in FY 2007, EPA regional, HQ, and Special Teams scores were determined according to a set of readiness criteria to enhance and strengthen the core emergency response program.

## OBJECTIVE: ENHANCE SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

Through 2011, provide and apply sound science for protecting and restoring land by conducting leading-edge research, which through collaboration, leads to preferred environmental outcomes

### Research

#### Land Protection and Restoration Research

*In 2009 Increased use of land protection and restoration research products.*

*In 2008 Increased use of land protection and restoration research products*

*In 2007 Increased use of land protection and restoration research products*

## GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

*In 2006 Document the performance, including cost savings, of innovative characterization and remediation options, so that newer approaches with cost or performance advantages are applied for Superfund and other cleanup projects.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of the manage material streams, conserve resources and appropriately manage waste long-term goal. (Research)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of the mitigation, management and long-term stewardship of contaminated sites long-term goal. (Research)	100	96	100	100	100	100	Percent

Background: The program aims to make measurable progress in providing timely, cutting edge, problem-driven research products to support sound science decisions by EPA offices engaged in activities to preserve land quality and remediate contaminated land for beneficial reuse. EPA's Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) rates the program on its progress periodically, and the program responds to BOSC suggestions to ensure continued improvement. Additionally, the program aims to increase 1) the number of planned outputs completed on time (a measure of timeliness); and 2) the number of its papers deemed "highly cited" and of "high impact" in bibliometric analyses (a measure of the quality and use of ORD's research).

### GOAL 3: LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

## GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

Protect, sustain, or restore the health of people, communities, and ecosystems using integrated and comprehensive approaches and partnerships.

### OBJECTIVE: CHEMICAL AND PESTICIDE RISKS

By 2011, prevent and reduce pesticide and industrial chemical risks to humans, communities, and ecosystems.

#### Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Protect human health by implementation our statutes and taking regulatory actions to ensure pesticides continue to be safe and available when used with the label.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Decrease cost per pesticide occupational incident avoided.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Ensure new pesticide registration actions (including new active ingredients, new uses) meet new health standards and are environmentally safe.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Improve the health of those who work in or around pesticides by reaching a 50% reduction in moderate to severe incidents for six acutely toxic agricultural pesticides with the highest incident rate.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Percentage of acre treatments that will use applications of reduced-risk pesticides.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Protect those occupationally exposed to pesticides by improving or maintaining a rate of 3.5 or less incidents per 100,000 potential risk events.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Reduce concentration of pesticides detected in general population.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Reduce decision times for registration of reduced risk chemicals.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Register reduced risk pesticides, including biopesticides.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Decrease cost per pesticide occupational incident avoided.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Ensure new pesticide registration actions (including new active ingredients, new uses) meet new health standards and are environmentally safe.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Improve the health of those who work in or around pesticides by reducing moderate to severe incidents for six acutely toxic agricultural pesticides with the highest incident rate.</i>

## GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Percentage of acre treatments that will use applications of reduced-risk pesticides.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Reduce concentration of pesticides detected in general population.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Reduce decision times for registration of reduced risk chemicals.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Register reduced risk pesticides, including biopesticides.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Ensure new pesticide registration actions (including new active ingredients, new uses) meet new health standards and are environmentally safe.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Percentage of acre treatments that will use applications of reduced-risk pesticides</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Reduce decision times for registration of reduced risk chemicals.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Register reduced risk pesticides, including biopesticides.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual		Actual	Target	Target	
Register reduced risk pesticides, including biopesticides. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)	14	15	14	14	10	11	Registrations
		Target					
New Chemicals (Active Ingredients) (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)	8	19	8	16	12	12	Registrations
New Uses (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)	200	235	200	233	250	200	Actions
Percentage of agricultural acres treated with reduced-risk pesticides. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	17	18	18	Data Avail 2008	18.5	19	Percent Acre-Treatments
Incidents per 100,000 potential risk events in population occupationally exposed to pesticides. (6: Ultimate Ecological/Health Impacts)					<= 3.5/100,000	<= 3.5/100,000	Incidents/100,000
Percent reduction in concentrations of pesticides detected in general population. (5: Exposure or Body Burden)			10	Data Avail 2008	No Target Established	30	Percent Cum. Reduction
Percent reduction in moderate to severe incidents for six acutely toxic agricultural pesticides with the highest incident rate. (6: Ultimate Ecological/Health Impacts)					20	30	Percent Cum. Reduction
Background:	There were 1,388 incidents out of 39,850,000 potential risk events for those occupationally exposed to pesticides in FY 2003. According to NHANES data for FY 1999-2002 the concentration of pesticides residues detected in blood samples from the general population are: Dimethylphosphaste = 0.41						

## GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

ug/L; Dimethylthiophosphate = 1.06 ug/L; Dimethyldithiophosphate = 0.07 ug/L; Diethylphosphate = 0.78 ug/L; Diethylthiophosphate = 0.5 ug/L; Diethyldithiophosphate = 0.07 ug/L; and 3,5,6-Trichloro-2-pyridinol = 1.9 ug/L. The rates for moderate to severe incidents for exposure to agricultural pesticides with the highest incident rates base on FY 1999 - 2003 data were: Chlorpyrifos, 67 incidents; diazinon, 51 incidents; malathion, 36 incidents; pyrethrins, 29 incidents; 2, 4-D, 27 incidents; carbofuran, 24 incidents, based on data from Poison Control Centers' Toxic Exposure Surveillance System (TESS), and NIOSH's Sentinel Event Notification System for Occupational Risk (SENSOR). The baseline for acres-treated is 3.6% of total acreage in 1998, when the reduced-risk pesticide acre treatments was 30,332,499 and total (all pesticides) was 843,063,644 acre-treatments. Zero reduced risk pesticides (including biopesticides) are registered in FY 1996; Cumulative total in FY 2007 is 200 registrations. Zero new chemicals (active ingredients) is registered in FY 1996; Cumulative total in FY 2007 is 117 new chemicals (AI). Zero new use actions in FY 1996; Cumulative total in FY 2007 is 3,774 new use actions.

### Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Protect the environment by implementing our statutes and taking regulatory actions to ensure pesticides continue to be safe and available when used with the label.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Ensure that through ongoing data reviews, pesticide active ingredients, and products that contain them are reviewed to assure adequate protection for human health and the environment, taking into consideration exposure scenarios such as subsistence lifestyles of the Native Americans</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Reduce the average cost and average time to produce or update an Endangered Species Bulletin.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Reduce the percent of urban watersheds sampled that exceeds EPA aquatic life benchmarks for three key pesticides of concern (diazinon, chlorpyrifos, malathion).</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Ensure that through ongoing data reviews, pesticide active ingredients, and products that contain them are reviewed to assure adequate protection for human health and the environment, taking into consideration exposure scenarios such as subsistence lifestyles of the Native Americans</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Reduce the average cost and average time to produce or update an Endangered Species Bulletin.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Ensure that through ongoing data reviews, pesticide active ingredients, and products that contain them are reviewed to assure adequate protection for human health and the environment, taking into consideration exposure scenarios such as subsistence lifestyles of the Native Americans</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Product Reregistration (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>	<i>545</i>	<i>545</i>	<i>545</i>	<i>962</i>	<i>1075</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>Actions</i>
Percent of urban watersheds that exceeds EPA aquatic life benchmarks for three key pesticides of concern. (4: Ambient Conditions)					25, 25, 30	20, 20, 25	Percent Reduction

### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

Background: The 1992-2001 baselines as a percentage of urban watersheds sampled that exceeded benchmarks are: diazinon, 40 percent; chlorpyrifos, 37 percent; and malathion, 30 percent. Zero product reregistraion in 200X; A total of 8,320 product reregistrations were completed in 2007.

### Endocrine Disruptors

*In 2009 Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program will continue its progress toward completing the validation of endocrine test methods.*

*In 2008 Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program will continue its progress toward completing the validation of endocrine test methods.*

*In 2007 Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program will continue its progress toward completing the validation of endocrine test methods.*

*In 2006 Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program will continue its progress toward completing the validation of endocrine test methods.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Cumulative number of assays that have been validated. (Research)	11/20	2/21	8/20	3/20	13/20	14/19	Assays

Background: Zero assays were validated in FY 2005.

### Realize the Value from Pesticide Availability

*In 2009 Ensure the public health and socio-economic benefits of pesticide availability and use are achieved.*

*In 2008 Annually avoid \$900M in termite structural damage by ensuring safe and effective pesticides are registered/reregistered and available for termite treatment.*

*In 2008 Avoid \$1.5 billion of crop loss by ensuring that effective pesticides are available to address pest infestations.*

*In 2008 Maintain timeliness of S18 decisions.*

*In 2008 Number of acres using reduced risk pest management practices compared to the grant and/or contract funds expended on environmental stewardship.*

*In 2007 Maintain timeliness of S18 decisions.*

*In 2006 Maintain timeliness of S18 decisions.*

## GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Maintain timeliness of S18 decisions (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>	45	48	45	36.6	45	45	<i>Days</i>
Millions of dollars in termite structural damage avoided annually by ensuring safe and effective pesticides are registered/re-registered and available for termite treatment. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)					900 M	900 M	Dollars/loss avoided
Billions of dollars in crop loss avoided by ensuring that effective pesticides are available to address pest infestations. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)					1.5 B	1.5 B	Dollars/loss avoided
Background:	Based on U.S Census housing data, industry data, and academic studies on damage valuation, EPA calculates that in FY 2003 there were \$900 million in annual savings from structural damage avoided due to availability of registered termiticides. According to EPA and USDA data for the years FY 2000-2005, emergency exemptions issued by EPA resulted in \$1.5 billion in avoided crop loss. Baseline for S18 decisions is 45 days in 2005						

### Lead Gasoline Phase-Out

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Eliminate use of lead in gasoline in remaining countries that still use lead as an additive, affecting more than 700 million people.</i>
<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Increase access to low-sulfur fuels in developing countries.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Eliminate use of lead in gasoline in remaining countries that still use lead as an additive, affecting more than 700 million people.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Increase access to low-sulfur fuels in developing countries.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Number of countries completing phase out of leaded gasoline. (incremental) (2: Regulated Party Activities)</i>					7	4	<i>Countries</i>
<i>Number of countries introducing low sulfur in fuels. (incremental) (2: Regulated Party Activities)</i>					2	3	<i>Countries</i>
Background:	As of June 2005, 122 countries have phased out the use of lead in gasoline. As of 2005, United States, Japan, Canada, and the European Community have introduced low-sulfur fuels.						

### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS



**Lead-Based Paint Risk Reduction Program**

*In 2009 Reduce exposure to and health effects from lead.*

*In 2008 Reduce exposure to and health effects from priority industrial/commercial chemicals*

*In 2007 Reduce exposure to and health effects from priority industrial/commercial chemicals*

*In 2006 Reduce exposure to and health effects from priority industrial/commercial chemicals*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percent difference in the geometric mean blood level in low-income children 1-5 years old as compared to the geometric mean for non-low income children 1-5 years old. (5: Exposure or Body Burden)	29	Data Lag	No Target Established	No Target Established	29	No Target Established	Percent
Number of cases of children (aged 1-5 years) with elevated blood lead levels (>10ug/dl). (5: Exposure or Body Burden)	216,000	Data Lag	No Target Established	No Target Established	90,000	No Target Established	Children
Background:	Data released by CDC from the National Health and Nutritional Evaluation Survey (NHANES) in May of 2005 estimated a population of 310,000 children aged 1 - 5 with lead poisoning (blood lead levels of 10 ug/dl or greater). Baseline for percent difference in the geometric mean blood level in low-income children 1-5 years old as compared to the geometric mean for non-low income children 1-5 years old is 37% in 1991-1994.						

**Chemical Risk Review and Reduction**

*In 2009 Identify, restrict, and reduce risks associated with industrial/commercial chemicals.*

*In 2008 Identify, restrict, and reduce risks associated with industrial/commercial chemicals.*

*In 2007 Identify, restrict, and reduce risks associated with industrial/commercial chemicals.*

*In 2006 Identify, restrict, and reduce risks associated with industrial/commercial chemicals.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Annual number of chemicals with proposed values for	24	23	24	33	24	18	Chemicals

**GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS**

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Acute Exposure Guidelines Levels (AEGL) (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)							
<i>Percent of new chemicals or organisms introduced into commerce that do not pose unreasonable risks to workers, consumers, or the environment. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Reduction in the current year production-adjusted risk-based score of releases and transfers of toxic chemicals from manufacturing facilities. (6: Ultimate Ecological/Health Impacts)	4.5	Data Lag	4.0	Data Lag	3.5	3.2	Percent RSEI Rel risk
Cumulative number of High Production Volume (HPV) chemicals with Risk Based Decisions Completed. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)					150	490	HPV Chemicals
Cumulative number of High Production Volume (HPV) chemicals with Screening Level Hazard Characterization Reports completed. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)			889	931	1260	1585	HPV Chemicals
Annual reduction in the production-adjusted risk-based score of releases and transfers of High Production Volume (HPV) chemicals from manufacturing facilities. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	3	Data Lag	2.6	Data Avail 2009	2.5	2.4	Percent Reduction

Background: The baseline for percent of new chemicals or organisms introduced into commerce that do not pose unreasonable risks to workers, consumers, or the environment was developed from a 2 year analysis from 2004-2005 comparing 8(e) reports to New Chemical submissions and is 100%. The baseline for the number of proposed AEGL values was developed for 2002 because after September 11, 2001, EPA received a substantial increase in funding for this activity. EPA developed Proposed AEGL values for 78 chemicals through 2002. In 2007, a total of 218 chemicals with proposed AEGL Values were reported for the AEGL Program (cumulative count). Baseline for the Risk Screening Environmental Indicators Model Program in 2001 was zero percent. 2001 was selected as the baseline year because of changing TRI reporting thresholds for persistent, bioaccumulative, toxic chemicals that took effect in 2001. These changes significantly affect the RSEI model, making comparisons with years prior to 2001 inappropriate. A consistent set of chemicals can be used from 2001 forward. Cumulative reduction reported through 2005 is 29.3%. The baseline for the number of chemicals with Screening Level Hazard Characterization Reports was developed using data from internationally sponsored HPV chemicals through 2006. EPA assisted with the development and finalization of reports for these 630 chemicals. The cumulative count of HPV chemicals with reports completed through FY 2007 is 931. The baseline for the percent reduction in the risk based score for HPV chemicals is zero percent in 1998, which was the year the HPV program began. A cumulative 30.3% reduction has been observed between 1998 and 2005. The baseline for the number of HPV chemicals with risk based decisions completed in 2007 is zero.

#### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

**Chemical Facility Risk Reduction**

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Protect human health, communities, and ecosystems from chemical risks and releases through facility risk reduction efforts and building community infrastructures.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Protect human health, communities, and ecosystems from chemical risks and releases through facility risk reduction efforts and building community infrastructures.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Protect human health, communities, and ecosystems from chemical risks and releases through facility risk reduction efforts and building community infrastructures.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Protect human health, communities, and ecosystems from chemical risks and releases through facility risk reduction efforts and building community infrastructures.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual		Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Number of risk management plan audits and inspections completed. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>628</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>Audits</i>
		Target					

Background: 3224 Risk Management Plan audits were completed between FY 2000 and FY 2006.

**OBJECTIVE: COMMUNITIES**

Sustain, clean up, and restore communities and the ecological systems that support them.

**U.S.- Mexico Border Water/Wastewater Infrastructure**

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Sustain and restore the environmental health along the United States-Mexico Border through implementation of the "Border 2012" plan.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Sustain and restore the environmental health along the United States-Mexico Border through implementation of the "Border 2012" plan.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Number of additional homes provided safe drinking water in the Mexican border area that lacked access to drinking water in 2003. (4: Ambient Conditions)					2,500	2,500	More Homes

**GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS**

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Actual	Actual	Target	Target	
Number of additional homes provided adequate wastewater sanitation in the Mexican border area that lacked access to wastewater sanitation in 2003. (4: Ambient Conditions)		Target			15,000	15,000	More Homes
Background:	The US-Mexico border region extends more than 3,100 kilometers (2,000 miles) from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean, and 62.5 miles on each side of the international border. More than 11.8 million people reside along the border and this figure is expected to increase to 19.4 million by 2020. Ninety percent of the population reside in the 14 impaired, interdependent sister cities. Rapid population growth in urban areas has resulted in unplanned development, greater demand for land and energy, increased traffic congestion, increased waste generation, overburdened or unavailable waste treatment and disposal facilities, and more frequent chemical emergencies. Rural areas suffer from exposure to airborne dust, pesticide use, and inadequate water supply and treatment facilities. EPA, other US Federal agencies, and the Government of Mexico have partnered to address these environmental problems.						

### Environmental Justice

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>In FY 08, four communities with potential environmental justice concerns will achieve significant measurable environmental or public health improvement through collaborative problem-solving strategies.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>In FY 08, four communities with potential environmental justice concerns will achieve significant measurable environmental or public health improvement through collaborative problem-solving strategies.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Communities with Environmental Justice Concerns (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					4	4	<i>Communities</i>
Background:	The Agency works to address issues affecting disproportionately exposed and under-represented populations from adverse health or environmental effects. EPA identifies problem areas through: public comments received during the National Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (NEJAC) meetings; reviewing Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) filed under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in which environmental justice (EJ) indicators occur; concern from communities about new or renewals of permits under RCRA, CWA, CAA, etc.; and complaints filed under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. EPA also works to address these issues through the Federal Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice and by awarding grants to communities for addressing environmental problems.						

### Revitalize Properties

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Assess, clean up and promote the reuse of Brownfields properties, and leverage jobs and cleanup/redevelopment funding.</i>
----------------	---

## GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

*In 2008 Assess, clean up and promote the reuse of Brownfields properties, and leverage jobs and cleanup/redevelopment funding.*

*In 2007 Assess, clean up and promote the reuse of Brownfields properties, and leverage jobs and cleanup/redevelopment funding.*

*In 2006 Assess, clean up and promote the reuse of Brownfields properties, and leverage jobs and cleanup/redevelopment funding.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Brownfield properties assessed. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	1,000	2,139	1,000	Data Avail 2008	1,000	1000	Properties
		Target					
<i>Number of properties cleaned up using Brownfields funding. (2: Regulated Party Activities)</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>88</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>Data Avail 2008</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>Properties</i>
Acres of Brownfields properties made ready for reuse. (2: Regulated Party Activities)					225	225	Acres
<i>Jobs leveraged from Brownfields activities. (0: Indeterminate)</i>	<i>5,000</i>	<i>5,504</i>	<i>5,000</i>	<i>Data Avail 2008</i>	<i>5,000</i>	<i>5000</i>	<i>Jobs</i>
Billions of dollars of cleanup and redevelopment funds leveraged at Brownfields sites. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	1	1.4	0.9	Data Avail 2008	0.9	0.9	Billions of Dollars
Background:	By the end of FY 2005, the Brownfields program assessed 1,381 properties, cleaned up 93 properties, leveraged 6,128 jobs, and leveraged \$1.0B in cleanup and redevelopment funding.						

### Pacific Island Territories

*In 2009 Sustain and restore the environmental health of the U.S. Pacific Island Territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI).*

*In 2008 Sustain and restore the environmental health of the U.S. Pacific Island Territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI).*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Percent of population in each of U.S. Pacific Island Territories served by CWS will receive drinking water that meets all applicable health-based drinking water</i>					72	72	<i>Percent Population</i>

### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>standards throughout the year. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>							
<i>Percent of the time that the sewage treatment plants in the U.S. Pacific Island Territories will comply with permit limits for biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and total suspended solids (TSS). (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					67	64	<i>Percent of Time</i>
<i>Percent of days of the beach season that beaches in each of the U.S. Pacific Island Territories monitored under the Beach Safety Program will be open and safe for swimming. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					70	86	<i>Percent Days</i>

Background: In 2005, 95% of the population in American Samoa, 10% in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) and 80% of Guam served by CWS received drinking water that meets all applicable health-based standards. The sewage treatment plants in the Pacific Island Territories compiled 59% of the time with BOD & TSS permit limits. Beaches were open and safe 64% of the beach season in American Samoa, 97% in the CNMI & 76% in Guam.

## OBJECTIVE: RESTORE AND PROTECT CRITICAL ECOSYSTEMS

Protect, sustain, and restore the health of critical natural habitats and ecosystems.

### Protecting and Enhancing Estuaries

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Working with partners, protect or restore additional (i.e., measuring from 2008 forward) acres of habitat within the study area for the 28 estuaries that are part of the National Estuary Program.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Working with partners, protect or restore additional (i.e., measuring from 2008 forward) acres of habitat within the study area for the 28 estuaries that are part of the National Estuary Program.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Working with NEP partners, protect or restore an additional 25,000 acres of habitat within the study areas for the 28 estuaries that are part of the National Estuary Program (NEP).</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Working with NEP partners, protect or restore an additional 25,000 acres of habitat within the study areas for the 28 estuaries that are part of the National Estuary Program (NEP).</i>

## GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Acres protected or restored in NEP study areas. (4: Ambient Conditions)	25,000	140,033	50,000	102,462	50,000	75,000	Acres

Background: 2005 Baseline: 449,242 acres of habitat protected or restored; cumulative from 2002.

### Gulf of Mexico

*In 2009 Improve the overall health of coastal waters of the Gulf of Mexico on the "good/fair/poor" scale of the National Coastal Condition Report.*

*In 2008 Improve the overall health of coastal waters of the Gulf of Mexico on the "good/fair/poor" scale of the National Coastal Condition Report.*

*In 2007 Prevent water pollution and protect aquatic species in order to improve the health of the Gulf of Mexico.*

*In 2006 Prevent water pollution and protect aquatic species in order to improve the health of the Gulf of Mexico.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Improve the overall health of coastal waters of the Gulf of Mexico on the "good/fair/poor" scale of the National Coastal Condition Report. (4: Ambient Conditions)</i>	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	Scale
<i>Restore water and habitat quality to meet water quality standards in impaired segments in 13 priority coastal areas (cumulative starting in FY 07). (6: Ultimate Ecological/Health Impacts)</i>					64	96	Impaired Segments
<i>Restore, enhance, or protect a cumulative number of acres of important coastal and marine habitats. (6: Ultimate Ecological/Health Impacts)</i>					18,200	20,600	Acres

Background: In 2004, the Gulf of Mexico rating of fair/poor was 2.4 where the rating is based on a 5-point system in which 1 is poor and 5 is good and is expressed as an aerielly weighted mean of regional scores using the National Coastal Condition Report II indicators: water quality index, sediment quality index, benthic index, coastal habitat index, and fish tissue contaminants.

The hypoxia running average size for 1996-2000 = 14,128 km<sup>2</sup>. The 2002-2006 running average size = 14,944 km<sup>2</sup>. No annual targets are set for 2007 and 2008 because hypoxia varies annually, depending on the timing and extent of spring and summer stratification, weather patterns, temperature, and precipitation in the Gulf and drainage basin.

### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

In 2002, 812 impaired segments identified in Section 303(d) listings. In 2005, 16,000 acres restored, enhanced, or protected; Gulf of Mexico coastal wetlands habitats include 3,769,370 acres.

### Great Lakes Implementation Actions

*In 2009 Prevent water pollution and protect aquatic systems so that overall ecosystem health of the Great Lakes is improved.*

*In 2008 Prevent water pollution and protect aquatic systems so that overall ecosystem health of the Great Lakes is improved.*

*In 2007 Prevent water pollution and protect aquatic systems so that overall ecosystem health of the Great Lakes is improved.*

*In 2006 Prevent water pollution and protect aquatic systems so that overall ecosystem health of the Great Lakes is improved.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Improve the overall ecosystem health of the Great Lakes by preventing water pollution and protecting aquatic systems. (4: Ambient Conditions)</i>	21	21.1	21	22.7	22	No Target Established	Scale
Cubic yards of contaminated sediment remediated (cumulative) in the Great Lakes. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	4.5	4.1	4.5	4.5	5.5	5.5	Million Cubic Yards
Average annual percentage decline for the long-term trend in concentrations of PCBs in whole lake trout and walleye samples. (5: Exposure or Body Burden)	5	6	5	6	5	5	Percent Annual Decrease
Average annual percentage decline for the long-term trend in concentrations of PCBs in the air in the Great Lakes Basin. (4: Ambient Conditions)	7	8	7	8	7	7	Percent Annual Decrease
<i>Number of Areas of Concern in the Great Lakes Basin which are restored and de-listed. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>	2	1	1	1	3	No Target Established	Cum. Areas of Concern
Number of Beneficial Use Impairments removed within Areas of Concern. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)			No Target Established	9	16	21	Cum. Number of BUI Removed

Background: Great Lakes rating of 20.9 reported in 2003, based on most current data available, generally from 2001) on a 40 point scale where the rating uses select Great Lakes State of the Lakes Ecosystem indicators based on a 1 to 5 rating system for each indicator, where 1 is poor and 5 is good. (ii) 2.1 million

### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS



cubic yards of contaminated sediments were remediated from 1997 through 2001 of the 40 million requiring remediation. (iii) On average, total PCB concentrations in whole Great Lakes top predator fish have recently declined 5 percent annually - average concentrations at Lake sites from 2002 were: L Superior-9ug/g; L Michigan- 1.6ug/g; L Huron- .8ug/g L Erie- 1.8ug/g; and L Ontario- 1.2ug/g. 9iv) Average concentrations of toxic chemicals in the air (PCBs) from 2002 were; L Superior- 60 pg/m2; L Michigan- 87 pg/m2; L Huron-19 pg/m2; L Erie- 183 pg/m2; and L Ontario- 36 pg/m2. (v) In 2002, no Areas of Concern had been delisted.

### Wetland and River Corridor Projects

*In 2009 Working with partners, achieve a net increase in wetlands acres with additional focus on assessment of wetland condition.*

*In 2008 Working with partners, achieve a net increase in wetlands acres with additional focus on assessment of wetland condition.*

*In 2007 Working with partners, achieve no net loss of wetlands.*

*In 2006 Working with partners, achieve no net loss of wetlands.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Actual	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>In partnership with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, states, and tribes, achieve no net loss of wetlands each year under the Clean Water Act Section 404 regulatory program (4: Ambient Conditions)</i>	<i>No Net Loss</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>No Net Loss</i>	<i>Data Lag</i>	<i>No Net Loss</i>	<i>No Net Loss</i>	<i>Acres</i>
<i>Working with partners, achieve a net increase of acres of wetlands per year with additional focus on biological and functional measures and assessment of wetland conditions. (cumulative) (4: Ambient Conditions)</i>	<i>200,000</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>100,000</i>	<i>Data Lag</i>	<i>100,000</i>	<i>100,000</i>	<i>Acres/year</i>

Background: Annual net wetland loss of an estimated 58,500 acres as measured by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and reported in Status and Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous United States, 1986-1997. The United States achieved a net cumulative increase of 32,000 acres per year of wetlands over a 6-year period, from 1998 through 2004, as measured by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and reported in Status and Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous United States, 1998 to 2004. (Dahl, T.E. 2006. Status and Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous United States, 1998 to 2004. U.S. Department of the Interior; Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 112 pp.)

### Chesapeake Bay Habitat

*In 2009 Prevent water pollution and protect aquatic systems so that the overall aquatic system health of the Chesapeake Bay is improved.*

## GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

- In 2008 Prevent water pollution and protect aquatic systems so that the overall aquatic system health of the Chesapeake Bay is improved.*
- In 2007 Prevent water pollution and protect aquatic systems so that overall aquatic system health of the Chesapeake Bay is improved enough so that there are 100,000 acres of submerged aquatic vegetation. (cumulative)*
- In 2007 Reduce nitrogen loads by 80 million pounds per year; phosphorus loads by 9.0 million pounds per year, and sediment loads by 1.16 million tons per year from entering the Chesapeake Bay, from 1985 levels.*
- In 2006 Prevent water pollution and protect aquatic systems so that overall aquatic system health of the Chesapeake Bay is improved enough so that there are 100,000 acres of submerged aquatic vegetation. (cumulative)*
- In 2006 Reduce nitrogen loads by 80 million pounds per year; phosphorus loads by 9.0 million pounds per year, and sediment loads by 1.16 million tons per year from entering the Chesapeake Bay, from 1985 levels.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Reduction, from 1985 levels, of nitrogen (M/lbs), phosphorus (M/lbs), and sediment loads (tons) entering Chesapeake Bay. (cumulative) (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>	<i>74/8.7/1.1</i>	<i>72.3/8.7/1.</i>	<i>80/9.0/1.16</i>				<i>Percent</i>
Percent of point source nitrogen reduction goal of 49.9 million pounds achieved. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	65	68	70	69	74	79	Percent Goal Achieved
Percent of point source phosphorus reduction goal of 6.16 million pounds achieved. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	82	84	84	87	85	87	Percent Goal Achieved
Percent of forest buffer planting goal of 10,000 miles achieved. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	46	46	53	53	60	68	Percent Goal Achieved
<i>Acres of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) present in the Chesapeake Bay. (cumulative) (4: Ambient Conditions)</i>	<i>90,000</i>	<i>78,259</i>	<i>90,000</i>	<i>59,090</i>			<i>Acres</i>
Percent of goal achieved for implementation of nitrogen reduction practices (expressed as progress meeting the nitrogen reduction goal of 162.5 million pounds). (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	44	44	47	46	50	53	Percent Goal Achieved
Percent of goal achieved for implementation of	61	61	64	62	66	69	Percent Goal

## GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
phosphorus reduction practices (expressed as progress meeting the phosphorus reduction goal of 14.36 million pounds). (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)							Achieved
Percent of goal achieved for implementation of sediment reduction practices (expressed as progress meeting the sediment reduction goal of 1.69 million pounds). (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	57	57	61	62	64	67	Percent Goal Achieved

Background: In 1984, there were 38,230 acres of submerged aquatic vegetation in the Chesapeake Bay. In 2002, baseline for nitrogen load reductions was 53 million pounds per year; phosphorus load reductions was 8.0 million pounds per year; and sediment load reductions was 0.8 million tons per year. \*Fiscal year data in this table reflects prior calendar year performance data.

In 2006, there were 32.68 million lbs of point source nitrogen reduced, 65% towards the goal. There were 5.07 million lbs of point source phosphorus reduced, 82% towards the goal. Four thousand six hundred six miles of forest buffer were planted, 46% towards the goal.

### Long Island Sound

*In 2009 Prevent water pollution, improve water quality, protect aquatic systems, and restore the habitat of Long Island Sound by working through the Long Island Sound Management Study Conference Partnership.*

*In 2008 Prevent water pollution, improve water quality, protect aquatic systems, and restore the habitat of Long Island Sound by working through the Long Island Sound Management Study Conference Partnership.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Reduce point source nitrogen discharges to Long Island Sound as measured by the Long Island Sound Nitrogen Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					37,323	34,898	<i>Pounds per Day</i>
<i>Restore or protect acres of coastal habitat, including tidal wetlands, dunes, riparian buffers, and freshwater wetlands. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					862	912	<i>Acres</i>
<i>Reopen miles of river and stream corridor to anadromous fish passage through removal of dams and barriers or installation of by-pass structures such as fishways. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>					105.9	114	<i>Miles</i>

### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

Background: In 2000, TMDL baseline is 213,151 pounds/day. In 2005, 562 acres restored (cumulative) and 150 acres protected (cumulative). Eighty-one miles of river and stream corridor re-opened.

### South Florida Ecosystem

*In 2009 Protect and maintain the South Florida Ecosystem, including the Everglades and coral reef ecosystems.*

*In 2008 Protect and maintain the South Florida Ecosystem, including the Everglades and coral reef ecosystems.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Achieve "no net loss" of stony coral cover in FL Keys Nat'l Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS) and in the coastal waters of Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties, FL working with all stakeholders. (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>					6.7/5.9	No Net Loss	Mean Percent of Area
<i>Annually maintain the overall health and functionality of sea grass beds in the Florida Keys Nat'l Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS) as measured by the long-term sea grass monitoring project. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>						Maintain	Sea Grass Health
<i>Maintain the overall water quality of the near shore and coastal waters of the Florida Keys Nat'l Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS). (4: Ambient Conditions)</i>					Maintain	Maintain	Water Quality
<i>Improve the water quality of the Everglades ecosystem as measured by total phosphorus, including meeting the 10 ppb total phosphorus criterion throughout the Everglades Protection Area marsh. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					Maintain	Maintain	Parts per Billion

Background: In 2005, the mean percent of stony coral cover is was 6.8% in FKNMS and 5.9% in Southeast Florida. Total water quality was at chl < 0.2 ug/l, light attenuation < 0.13/meter, DIN < 0.75 micromolar, and TP < 0.2 micromolar. Florida Keys seagrasses were at 8.28 for N:P of Thalassia and 0.48 for relative abundance of Thalassia. The average annual geometric mean phosphorus concentrations were 5 ppb in the Everglades National Park, 10 ppb in Water Conservation 3A, 13 ppb in the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, and 18 ppb in Water Conservation Area 2A; annual average flow-weighted from total phosphorus discharges from storm water treatment areas ranged from 13 ppb for area 3/4 and 98 ppb for area 1W. Effluent limits will be established for all discharges, including storm water treatment areas.

### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

**Puget Sound Basin**

*In 2009 Improve water and air quality, and minimize the adverse impacts of rapid development in the Puget Sound Basin.*

*In 2008 Improve water and air quality, and minimize the adverse impacts of rapid development in the Puget Sound Basin.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Improve water quality and enable the lifting of harvest restrictions in acres of shellfish bed growing areas impacted by degrading or declining water quality. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>						600	<i>Acres</i>
<i>Remediate acres of prioritized contaminated sediments. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>						125	<i>Acres</i>
<i>Restore the acres of tidally and seasonally influenced estuarine wetlands. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>						3,000	<i>Acres</i>

Background: In 2006, 100 acres of shellfish-bed growing areas improved water quality and lifted harvest restrictions. Additionally, 750 acres of tidally- and seasonally-influenced estuarine wetlands were restored. In 2007, 120 acres of prioritized contaminated sediments were remediated.

**Columbia River Basin**

*In 2009 Prevent water pollution and improve and protect water quality and ecosystems in the Columbia River Basin to reduce risks to human health and the environment.*

*In 2008 Prevent water pollution and improve and protect water quality and ecosystems in the Columbia River Basin to reduce risks to human health and the environment.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Protect, enhance, or restore acres of wetland habitat and acres of upland habitat in the Lower Columbia River watershed (cumulative starting FY 06). (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					3000	10,000	<i>Acres</i>
<i>Clean up acres of known contaminated sediments (cumulative starting FY 06). (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)</i>							<i>Acres</i>

**GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS**

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

Background: In 2005, 96,770 acres of wetland and upland habitat available for protection, enhancement, or restoration. In 2008, 3,000 additional acres are expected to be protected, enhanced, or restored. In FY 2009, 2,000 additional acres are expected to be protected, enhanced, or restored, towards a cumulative 10,000 acres.

## OBJECTIVE: ENHANCE SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

Through 2011, identify and synthesize the best available scientific information, models, methods, and analyses to support Agency guidance and policy decisions related to the health of people, communities, and ecosystems. Focus research on pesticides and chemical toxicology; global change; and comprehensive, cross-cutting studies of human, community, and ecosystem health.

### Research

#### Research on Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals

*In 2009 Increased use of endocrine disruptors research program products.*

*In 2008 Increased use of endocrine disruptors research program products*

*In 2007 By 2007, develop improved protocols for screening and testing for the Agency's Endocrine Disruptors Screening Program and reduce scientific uncertainty on effects, exposure, and risk management issues*

*In 2006 By 2006, develop and transfer standardized protocols for screening chemicals for their potential effects on the endocrine system, so that EPA's Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances has the necessary protocols to validate for use in the Agency's Endocrine Disruptors Screening Program, mandated by the Food Quality Protection Act, as determined by independent expert review.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Improved protocols for screening and testing (Research)	1	1	6	3	1	0	Reports
Effects and exposure milestones met (Research)	9	9	4	5	3	9	Reports
Assessment milestones met (Research)	1	0	0	0	0	0	Reports
Risk management milestones met (Research)	3	3	3	2	2	1	Reports

Background: The program aims to make measurable progress in 1) determining the extent of the impact of endocrine disruptors on humans, wildlife, and the environment to better inform the federal and scientific communities; and 2) reducing the uncertainty regarding the effects, exposure, assessment, and

## GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

management of endocrine disruptors so that EPA has a sound scientific foundation for environmental decision-making. EPA's Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) rates the program on its progress periodically, and the program responds to BOSC suggestions to ensure continued improvement. Additionally, the program aims to complete on time each year its 1) improved protocols for screening and testing; 2) effects and exposure milestones; 3) assessment milestones; and 4) risk management milestones.

### Homeland Security Research

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Enhance public health and safety and mitigate adverse effects of the purposeful introduction of hazardous chemical, biological, or radiological materials into the environment.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Enhance public health and safety and mitigate adverse effects of the purposeful introduction of hazardous chemical, biological, or radiological materials into the environment.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Enhance public health and safety and mitigate adverse effects of the purposeful introduction of hazardous chemical, biological, or radiological materials into the environment.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Provide methods, guidance documents, technologies and tools to first responders and decision-makers to enhance safety and to mitigate adverse effects of the purposeful introduction of hazardous chemical or biological materials into the environment.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of efficient and effective clean-ups and safe disposal of contamination wastes. (Research)</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of water security initiatives. (Research)</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>% of planned outputs delivered in support of support risk assessors and decision-makers in the rapid assessment of risk and the determination of cleanup goals and procedures following contamination (Research)</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of establishment of the environmental National Laboratory Response Network (Research)</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>Percent</i>

Background: EPA's homeland security research provides appropriate, effective, and rapid risk assessment guidelines and technologies to help decision-makers prepare for, detect, contain, and decontaminate building and water treatment systems against which chemical and/or biological attacks have been directed. The Agency intends to expand the state of the knowledge of potential threats, as well as its response capabilities, by assembling and evaluating private sector tools and capabilities so that preferred response approaches can be identified, promoted, and evaluated for future use by first responders,

### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

decision-makers, and the public. These products will enable first responders to better deal with threats to the public and the environment posed by the intentional release of toxic or infectious materials.

### Human Health Research

*In 2009 Increased use of human health research products.*

*In 2009 Reduce average time to process research grant proposals while maintaining a credible and efficient merit review system.*

*In 2008 HH (Human Health)*

*In 2007 Increased use of human health research products*

*In 2006 HH (Human Health)*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of public health outcomes long-term goal. (Research)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of mechanistic data long-term goal. (Research)	100	92	100	100	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of aggregate and cumulative risk long-term goal. (Research)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of the susceptible subpopulations long-term goal. (Research)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Percent

Background: The program aims to make measurable progress in reducing uncertainty in the science underlying human health risk assessment. The program also conducts research into methods of measuring public health outcomes resulting from risk management practices. EPA's Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) rates the program on its progress periodically, and the program responds to BOSC suggestions to ensure continued improvement. Additionally, the program aims to increase 1) the number of planned outputs completed on time (a measure of timeliness); 2) the number of its papers deemed "highly cited" (a measure of the quality and use of ORD's research); and 3) the percentage of peer-reviewed EPA risk assessments in which ORD research is cited in support of a decision.

### Global Change Research

*In 2009 Increased use of global change research products.*

*In 2008 Increased use of global change research products*

## GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS



*In 2006 Increased use of global change research products*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percent progress toward completion of a framework linking global change to air quality. (Research)	60	65	75	75	85	95	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered. (Research)			No Target Established	100	100	100	Percent

**Background:** The program aims to make measurable progress in enhancing the understanding of potential impacts of climate variability and change on the environment. Accordingly, the program provides stakeholders and policy makers with information to help support decision-making. EPA's Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) rates the program on its progress periodically, and the program responds to BOSC suggestions to ensure continued improvement. Additionally, the program aims to increase 1) the number of planned outputs completed on time (a measure of timeliness); 2) the number of its papers deemed "highly cited" and of "high impact" in bibliometric analyses (a measure of the quality and use of ORD's research). The program is also measuring its progress toward completing a framework linking global change to air quality.

#### **Human Health Risk Assessment**

*In 2009 Increased use of human health risk assessment program products.*

*In 2008 Increased use of human health risk assessment program products*

*In 2007 Increased use of human health risk assessment program products*

*In 2006 By 2006, deliver at least 20 dose-response assessments, provisional values, or pathogen risk assessments so that by 2010, at least 100 assessments have been made available through the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) database and other communications to EPA program offices, regions, states and Tribes providing the necessary information to predict risk and make risk management decisions that protect public health.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of Air Quality Criteria/Science Assessment documents. (Research)	No Target Established	100	90	100	90	90	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of HHRA health assessments. (Research)	100	100	90	100	90	90	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of HHRA Technical Support Documents. (Research)	No Target Established	81	90	100	90	90	Percent

#### **GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS**

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Usefulness of HHRA's Air Quality Criteria Documents (AQCDs), represented by the number of days between the completion of AQCD peer review and publication of the EPA staff document that relies on AQCD (Research)	No Target Established	158	106	68	90	90	Days

**Background:** The program aims to make measurable progress in providing timely, peer-reviewed health assessments of priority environmental contaminants to support science-based decision-making in EPA's regulatory and cleanup programs. EPA's Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) rates the program on its progress periodically, and the program responds to BOSC suggestions to ensure continued improvement. Additionally, the program aims to increase 1) the number of planned outputs completed on time (a measure of timeliness); 2) the percentage of regulatory decisions in which decision-makers used HHRA peer-reviewed health assessments; and 3) the usefulness of HHRA's Integrated Science Assessment (ISA) documents as represented by the number of days between the completion of ISA peer review and publication of the EPA staff document that relies on the ISAs.

#### Safe Pesticides/Safe Products Research

*In 2009 Increased use of Pesticides and Toxics research products.*

*In 2008 Increased use of Pesticides and Toxics research products.*

*In 2007 Increased use of safe pesticides/safe products*

*In 2006 Increased use of pesticides and toxics research products*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of the SP2 program's long-term goal one. (Research)	100	80	100	86	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of the SP2 program's long-term goal two. (Research)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of the SP2 program's long-term goal three. (Research)	100	100	100	80	100	100	Percent

**Background:** The program aims to make measurable progress in prioritizing testing requirements and enhancing interpretation of data; conducting spatially explicit probabilistic ecological risk assessments; and supporting decisionmaking related to products of biotechnology and specific high priority individual/classes of pesticides and toxic substances. EPA's Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) rates the program on its progress periodically, and the program responds to BOSC suggestions to ensure continued improvement. Additionally, the program aims to increase 1) the percentage of planned

#### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

outputs completed on time; and 2) the percentage of program papers rated as "highly cited" and of "high impact" in its bibliometric analysis (a measure of quality and the use of ORDs research).

### Ecosystems Research

*In 2009 Increased use of ecosystems research products.*

*In 2008 Increased use of ecosystems research products*

*In 2006 Increased use of ecosystems research products*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Number of states using a common monitoring design and appropriate indicators to determine the status and trends of ecological resources and the effectiveness of programs and policies. (Research)	25	25	30	30	35	40	States
Percentage of Ecological Research publications rated as highly-cited publications. (Research)	No Target Established	No Target Established	20.4	21.1	No Target Established	21.4	Percent
Percentage of Ecological research publications in "high-impact" journals. (Research)	No Target Established	No Target Established	20.3	20.8	No Target Established	21.3	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of State, tribe, and relevant EPA office needs for causal diagnosis tools and methods to determine causes of ecological degradation. (Research)	100	86	100	100	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of State, tribe, and relevant EPA office needs for environmental forecasting tools and methods to forecast the ecological impacts of various actions. (Research)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Percent
Percentage of planned outputs delivered in support of State, tribe, and EPA office needs for environmental restoration and services tools and methods to protect and restore ecological condition and services. (Research)	100	100	100	100	100	100	Percent

Background: The program aims to make measurable progress in providing the scientific understanding to measure, model, maintain, and/or restore, at multiple scales, the integrity and sustainability of highly valued ecosystems now and in the future. EPA's Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC) rates the program on

### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

its progress periodically, and the program responds to BOSC suggestions to ensure continued improvement. Additionally, the program aims to increase 1) the number of planned outputs completed on time (a measure of timeliness); 2) the number of its papers deemed "highly cited" and of "high impact" in bibliometric analyses (a measure of the quality and use of ORD's research); and 3) the number of states using a common monitoring design and appropriate indicators to determine the status and trends of ecological resources and the effectiveness of programs and policies.

#### GOAL 4: HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

## GOAL 5: COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

Protect human health and the environment through ensuring compliance with environmental requirements by enforcing environmental statutes, preventing pollution, and promoting environmental stewardship. Encourage innovation and provide incentives for governments, businesses, and the public that promote environmental stewardship and long-term sustainable outcomes.

### OBJECTIVE: ACHIEVE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION THROUGH IMPROVED COMPLIANCE

By 2011, maximize compliance to protect human health and the environment through enforcement and other compliance assurance activities by achieving a 5 percent increase in the pounds of pollution reduced, treated, or eliminated by regulated entities, including those in Indian country. (Baseline: 3-year rolling average FYs 2003-2005: 900,000,000 pounds.)

#### Monitoring and Enforcement

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Through monitoring and enforcement actions, EPA will increase complying actions, pollutant reduction or treatment, and improve environmental management practices.</i>						
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Through monitoring and enforcement actions, EPA will increase complying actions, pollutant reduction or treatment, and improve environmental management practices.</i>						
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Through monitoring and enforcement actions, EPA will increase complying actions, pollutant reduction or treatment, and improve environmental management practices.</i>						
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Through monitoring and enforcement actions, EPA will increase complying actions, pollutant reduction or treatment, and improve environmental management practices.</i>						

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Pounds of pollution estimated to be reduced, treated, or eliminated as a result of concluded enforcement actions. (civil enf) (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	450	890	500	890	890	890	Million pounds
Percentage of concluded enforcement cases requiring that pollution be reduced, treated, or eliminated. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	30	Data Avail FY 2008	30	27	30	30	Percentage
Percentage of concluded enforcement cases requiring	65	82	70	70	70	70	Percentage

#### GOAL 5: COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
implementation of improved environmental management practices. (2: Regulated Party Activities)							
<i>Percentage of regulated entities taking complying actions as a result of on-site compliance inspections and evaluations. (2: Regulated Party Activities)</i>	25	16	30	18	30	25	Percentage
<i>Dollars invested in improved environmental performance or improved environmental management practices as a result of concluded enforcement actions (i.e., injunctive relief and SEPs) (2: Regulated Party Activities)</i>	4.1	5.0	4.2	10.6	4.3	4.4	Billion dollars

Background: The FY 2005-2007 rolling average baseline for pounds of pollution estimated to be reduced, treated, or eliminated is 960,000,000 pounds of pollutants. The FY 2007 baseline for the percentage of concluded enforcement cases requiring that pollutants estimated to be reduced, treated, or eliminated is the FY2007 result which is 27 percent. The reason for using the FY2005 result as the FY2006 baseline is due to the data lag in the FY2006 result. The FY 2007 baseline for the percentage of concluded enforcement cases requiring implementation of improved environmental management practices is 70 percent. The FY 2006 baseline for the percentage of regulated entities taking complying actions as a result of on-site compliance inspections and evaluations is 18 percent. The FY 2005-2007 rolling average baseline for dollars invested in improved environmental performance or improved environmental management practices is \$8,500,000,000.

### Compliance Incentives

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Identify and correct noncompliance and reduce environmental risks through an increase in the percent of facilities that use EPA incentive policies to conduct environmental audits or other actions that reduce, treat, or eliminate pollution or improve environmental management practices.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Identify and correct noncompliance and reduce environmental risks through an increase in the percent of facilities that use EPA incentive policies to conduct environmental audits or other actions that reduce, treat, or eliminate pollution or improve environmental management practices.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Identify and correct noncompliance and reduce environmental risks through an increase in the percent of facilities that use EPA incentive policies to conduct environmental audits or other actions that reduce, treat, or eliminate pollution or improve environmental management practices.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Through self-disclosure policies, EPA will increase the percentage of audits or other actions reducing pollutants or improving EMP.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Pounds of pollutants estimated to be reduced, treated, or eliminated, as a result of audit agreements. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	0.4	0.05	0.4	1.20	0.4	0.4	Million pounds

### GOAL 5: COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

Background: The FY2007 baseline for pounds of pollutants estimated to be reduced, treated, or eliminated as a result of audit agreements is 1.2 million pounds of pollutants.

### Compliance Assistance

*In 2009 Prevent noncompliance or reduce environmental risks through EPA compliance assistance by achieving: an increase in the percent of regulated entities that improve their understanding of environmental requirements; an increase in the number of regulated entities that improve environmental management practices; and an increase in the percentage of regulated entities that reduce, treat, or eliminate pollution.*

*In 2008 Prevent noncompliance or reduce environmental risks through EPA compliance assistance by achieving: an increase in the percent of regulated entities that improve their understanding of environmental requirements; an increase in the number of regulated entities that improve environmental management practices; and an increase in the percentage of regulated entities that reduce, treat, or eliminate pollution.*

*In 2007 Prevent noncompliance or reduce environmental risks through EPA compliance assistance by achieving: an increase in the percent of regulated entities that improve their understanding of environmental requirements; an increase in the number of regulated entities that improve environmental management practices; and an increase in the percentage of regulated entities that reduce, treat, or eliminate pollution.*

*In 2006 Through compliance assistance, EPA will increase the understanding of regulated entities, improve Environmental Management Practices, and reduce pollutants.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Percentage of regulated entities receiving direct compliance assistance from EPA reporting that they improved environmental management practices as a result of EPA assistance. (2: Regulated Party Activities)</i>	50	74	50	91	50	60	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Percentage of regulated entities receiving direct assistance from EPA reporting that they reduced, treated, or eliminated pollution, as a result of EPA assistance. (2: Regulated Party Activities)</i>	15	28	15	50	15	20	<i>Percentage</i>

Background: The FY2007 baseline for the percentage of regulated entities receiving direct compliance assistance from EPA reporting that they improved EMP as a result of EPA assistance is 91%. The FY2007 baseline for the percentage of regulated entities receiving direct compliance assistance from EPA reporting that they reduced, treated, or eliminated pollution as a result of EPA compliance assistance is 50%. These measures are not calculated from a representative sample of the regulated entity universe. The percentages are based, in part, on the number of regulated entities that answered affirmatively to these questions on voluntary surveys. The percentages do not account for the number of regulated entities who chose not to answer these questions or the majority of entities who chose not to answer the surveys.

## GOAL 5: COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

## OBJECTIVE: IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE THROUGH POLLUTION PREVENTION AND OTHER STEWARDSHIP PRACTICES

By 2011, enhance public health and environmental protection and increase conservation of natural resources by promoting pollution prevention and the adoption of other stewardship practices by companies, communities, governmental organizations, and individuals.

### Reducing PBTs in Hazardous Waste Streams

*In 2009 Reduce pollution in business operations.*

*In 2008 Reduce pollution in business operations.*

*In 2007 Reduce pollution in business operations.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Number of pounds (in millions) of priority chemicals reduced, as measured by National Partnership for Environmental Priorities members. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)			0.5 M	1.3 M	1.0 M	1.0 M	Pounds

**Background:** The performance measure reflects the fact that the National Partnership for Environmental Priorities (NPEP) has quadrupled its members and now has over 100 partners, who have removed more than one million pounds of priority chemicals from the environment. As of August 2006, the NPEP program had also obtained industry commitments for 2.1 million pounds of priority chemical reductions through the year 2011. Reductions will be achieved primarily through source reduction made possible by safer chemical substitutes.

### Innovation Activities

*In 2008 75% of innovation projects completed under the State Innovation Grant (SIG) Program and through other piloting mechanisms will achieve, on average, an 8% or greater improvement in environmental results from a project initiation baseline measure for the sectors and facilities involved (e.g., reductions in air or water discharges, improvements in ambient water or air quality, or improvements in compliance rates), or a 5% or greater improvement in cost-effectiveness and efficiency.*

*In 2008 Performance Track facilities collectively will meet 3 of the 5 annual performance improvement targets for reducing, on a normalized basis, water use, hazardous materials use, production of greenhouse gases, toxic discharges to water and combined NOx, SOx, VOC and PM emissions.*

## GOAL 5: COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP



*In 2007 Performance Track facilities collectively will meet 4 of the 6 annual performance improvement targets for 3.7 billion gallons of water use, 16.3 million MMBTUs of energy use, 1,050 tons materials use, 460,000 tons of non-hazardous solid waste, 66,000 tons of air releases, and 12,400 tons of discharges to water.*

*In 2006 Performance Track members collectively will achieve an annual reduction of: 600 million gallons in water use; 2.5 million MMBTUs in energy use; 15,000 tons of solid waste; 20,000 tons materials reduced; 6,000 tons of air releases; and 10,000 tons in water discharges, compared with 2001 results.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>Specific annual reductions in six media/resource areas: water use, energy use, solid waste, air releases, water discharges, &amp; materials use. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>	6	3					<i>Media reduction</i>
<i>Reduce 3.7 billion gallons of water use; 16.3 million MMBTUs of energy use; 1,050 tons of materials use; 460,000 tons of solid waste; 66,000 tons of air releases; &amp; 12,400 tons of water discharges. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>			4	3			<i>Media reduction</i>
<i>Reduce water use at Performance Track facilities. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					3,900,000,000	3,900,000,000	<i>Gallons</i>
<i>Reduce hazardous materials use at Performance Track facilities. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					10,000	10,000	<i>Tons</i>
<i>Reduce production of greenhouse gases at Performance Track facilities. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					175,000	175,000	<i>MTCO2E</i>
<i>Reduce toxic releases to water at Performance Track facilities. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					220	220	<i>Tons</i>
<i>Reduce combined NOx, SOx, VOC and PM emissions at Performance Track facilities. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					4,000	4,000	<i>Tons</i>
<i>75% of innov. proj. completed under the SIG prog. will achieve, on average, 8% or greater imp. in envtl results for sectors and facilities involved, or 5% or greater imp. in cost-effectiveness &amp; effc (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>					75	75	<i>Percentage</i>

#### GOAL 5: COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

**Background:** For Performance Track, the baseline year is 2001 for FY 2005, 2006, and 2007. Performance will be measured against the 2001 baseline annual reduction of 475 M gallons of water conserved, 0.24 million MMBTUs of energy conserved, 150,000 tons of solid waste reduced, 1,113 tons of air emissions reduced, 6,870 tons of water discharged, and -2,154 tons of materials reduced. For FY 2008, the baseline year is 2005. The 2005 baseline annual normalized reductions are: 3,387,333,545 gallons of water reduced, 8,794 tons of hazardous materials reduced, 151,129 MTCO<sub>2</sub>Es of greenhouse gas emissions reduced, 186 tons of toxic discharges to water reduced, and 3,533 tons of NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, VOCs and PM emissions reduced.

EPA's State Innovation Grant program promotes the testing of innovative approaches in State environmental permitting programs. Individual projects are designed to test innovation that improves compliance rates, often within an entire business sector or across an entire permitting program, or improves the efficiency of permitting programs for either the regulated sector or the state environmental agency. Because each grant-supported project is unique, results can only be reported on a project-by project basis. EPA does not report program-wide results (e.g., total tons of air or water pollutants removed or prevented in a year) because not every project selected in a competition year focuses on a single environmental medium or pollutant. Rather, the EPA-funded projects help states test approaches that improve results, often in ways that address multi-media concerns. Similarly, these projects are demonstrations, or pilot tests of new approaches and the projects take 2-4 years to complete. Therefore, results for individual projects are reported at the end of each project. Results are usually described in terms such as an improvement in overall compliance rates at the end of a project above a baseline condition measured at the beginning of the project.

### Reduction of Industrial / Commercial Chemicals

*In 2009 Prevent, reduce the need to recycle, treat, or dispose of hazardous industrial/commercial chemicals and enhance environmental stewardship and sustainability.*

*In 2008 Prevent, reduce and recycle hazardous industrial/commercial chemicals and improve environmental stewardship practices.*

*In 2007 Prevent, reduce and recycle hazardous industrial/commercial chemicals and municipal solid wastes.*

*In 2006 Prevent, reduce and recycle hazardous industrial/commercial chemicals and improve environmental stewardship practices.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
<i>BTUs of energy reduced, conserved or offset by P2 program participants. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>	<i>906.7B</i>	<i>4,442 B</i>	<i>1,106.8B</i>	<i>Data Avail 2008</i>	<i>1,217.4 B</i>	<i>1,580.9B</i>	<i>BTUs</i>
<i>Gallons of water reduced by P2 program participants. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>	<i>329M</i>	<i>2,272 M</i>	<i>1,790M</i>	<i>Data Avail 2008</i>	<i>1,640 M</i>	<i>1,791M</i>	<i>Gallons</i>
<i>Business, institutional and government costs reduced by P2 program participants. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)</i>	<i>38.2 M</i>	<i>86.8 M</i>	<i>44.3 M</i>	<i>Data Avail 2008</i>	<i>45.9 M</i>	<i>67.8 M</i>	<i>Dollars saved</i>

### GOAL 5: COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Pounds of hazardous materials reduced by P2 program participants. (3: Pollution Reduction/Prevention)	401 M	394 M	414	419 M	429 M	494 M	Pounds

**Background:** The baseline for the Pollution Prevention Program BTUs is 0 in FY 2002. Data currently available indicate that the P2 program has reduced, conserved, or offset 8 Billion BTUs since 2002. The baseline for the Pollution Prevention Program gallons of water was 220 millions gallons in FY 2000. Data currently available indicate that the P2 program has reduced 9.4 billion gallons of water since 2000. The baseline for the Pollution Prevention Program cost savings is 0 dollar in FY 2002. Data currently available indicate that the P2 program has saved \$178 million in business, government, and institutional costs since 2002. The baseline for the Pollution Prevention Program hazardous material reduced is 0.044 billion pounds in FY 2000. Data currently available indicate 2 billion pounds of hazardous materials have been reduced since FY 2000.

## **OBJECTIVE: IMPROVE HUMAN HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN INDIAN COUNTRY**

Protect human health and the environment on tribal lands by assisting federally-recognized tribes to build environmental management capacity, assess environmental conditions and measure results, and implement environmental programs in Indian country.

### **Tribal Environmental Baseline/Environmental Priori**

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>Protect human health and the environment on tribal lands by assisting federally recognized tribes to: build environmental capacity; assess environmental conditions and measure results; and implement environmental programs in Indian country.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>Protect human health and the environment on tribal lands by assisting federally recognized tribes to: build environmental capacity; assess environmental conditions and measure results; and implement environmental programs in Indian country.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>Assist federally recognized tribes in assessing the condition of their environment, help in building their capacity to implement environmental programs where needed to improve tribal health and environments, and implement programs in Indian country where needed to address environmental issues.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>Assist federally recognized tribes in assessing the condition of their environment, help in building their capacity to implement environmental programs where needed to improve tribal health and environments, and implement programs in Indian country where needed to address environmental issues.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percent of Tribes implementing federal regulatory environmental programs in Indian country (cumulative). (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)					6	7	Percent Tribes

## **GOAL 5: COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP**

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Target	
Percent of Tribes conducting EPA approved environmental monitoring and assessment activities in Indian country (cumulative.) (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)					21	23	Percent Tribes
Percent of Tribes with an environmental program (cumulative). (1C: Fed/State/Tribal Gov. Activities)					57	60	Percent Tribes
Percent of tribes with EPA-approved multimedia workplans. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	39	42	42	59			Percent Tribes
Percent of tribes with delegated and non-delegated programs (cumulative). (2: Regulated Party Activities)	48	57	49	73			Percent Tribes
Percent of Tribes with EPA-reviewed monitoring and assessment occurring. (2: Regulated Party Activities)	30	30.8	31	43			Percent Tribes

Background: There are 572 tribal entities that are eligible for GAP program funding. These entities are the ones for which environmental assessments of their lands will be conducted.

### **OBJECTIVE: ENHANCE SOCIETIES CAPACITY FOR SUSTAINABILITY THROUGH SCIENCE AND RESEARCH**

Conduct leading-edge, sound scientific research on pollution prevention, new technology development, socioeconomic, sustainable systems, and decision-making tools. By 2011, the products of this research will be independently recognized as providing critical and key evidence in informing Agency policies and decisions and solving problems for the Agency and its partners and stakeholders.

#### **GOAL 5: COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP**

*(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)*

## ANNUAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND MEASURES

### Enabling Support Programs

#### NPM: OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

##### Energy Consumption Reduction

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>As required by Executive Order 13423: Strengthening Federal Environment, Energy, and Transportation Management, EPA will achieve a 12% reduction in energy consumption from the Agency's 2003 baseline.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>As required by Executive Order 13423: Strengthening Federal Environment, Energy, and Transportation Management, EPA will achieve a 9% reduction in energy consumption from the Agency's 2003 baseline.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>As required by Executive Order 13423: Strengthening Federal Environment, Energy, and Transportation Management, EPA will achieve a 6% reduction in energy consumption from the Agency's 2003 baseline.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>As required by the Energy Policy Act of 2005, EPA will achieve a 2% reduction in energy consumption from the Agency's 2003 baseline.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual			
<i>Cumulative percentage reduction in energy consumption.</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Background:	On January 24, 2007, the President signed Executive Order: Strengthening Federal Environment, Energy, and Transportation Management, requiring all Federal Agencies to reduce its Green House Gas intensity and its energy use by 3% annually through FY 2015. For the Agency's 29 reporting facilities, the FY 2003 energy consumption of British Thermal Units (BTUs) per square foot is 346,518 BTUs per square foot.						

##### Human Capital

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>EPA will develop workforce planning strategies that link current and future Human Capital needs to mission accomplishments which will result in significant reductions in skill gaps for Mission Critical Occupations (MCOs). In addition, EPA's recruitment strategy will focus on hiring needs that will encourage the use of hiring flexibilities, build on centralized and local recruitment approaches, and focus on attracting applicants who are talented, diverse, and committed to EPA's mission.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>EPA will develop workforce planning strategies that link current and future Human Capital needs to mission accomplishments which will result in significant reductions in skill gaps for Mission Critical Occupations. In addition, EPA's recruitment strategy will focus on hiring needs that will</i>

NPM: OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

(non-Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) measures are italicized)

*encourage the use of hiring flexibilities, build on centralized and local recruitment approaches, and focus on attracting applicants who are talented, diverse, and committed to EPA's mission.*

*In 2007 EPA will develop workforce planning strategies that link current and future Human Capital needs to mission accomplishments which will result in significant reductions in skill gaps for Mission Critical Occupations. In addition, EPA's recruitment strategy will focus on hiring needs that will encourage the use of hiring flexibilities, build on centralized and local recruitment approaches, and focus on attracting applicants who are talented, diverse, and committed to EPA's mission.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual			
<i>Average time to hire non-SES positions from date vacancy closes to date offer is extended, expressed in working days</i>			45	28	45	45	<i>Days</i>
<i>For SES positions, the average time from date vacancy closes to date offer is extended, expressed in working days</i>			90	66	73	68	<i>Days</i>
<i>Agency Manager's satisfaction with the initial stages of the human resources hiring process, as measured by the average score across 4 questions in the OPM Management Hiring Satisfaction Survey.</i>						90	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Maintenance and improvement of MCO employee competencies, as measured by proficiency levels of competencies in MCO's re-assessed in 2009.</i>						80	<i>Percent</i>

Background: Baselines for the new measures will be established in FY2007/08. For the average time to hire, these human capital performance measures and targets were selected from EPA's President's Management Agenda.

## NPM: OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

### Information Exchange Network

*In 2009      Improve the quality, comparability, and availability of environmental data for sound environmental decision-making through the Central Data Exchange (CDX).*

*In 2008      Improve the quality, comparability, and availability of environmental data for sound environmental decision-making through the Central Data Exchange (CDX).*

*In 2007      Improve the quality, comparability, and availability of environmental data for sound environmental decision-making through the Central Data Exchange (CDX).*

*In 2006      Improve the quality, comparability, and availability of environmental data for sound environmental decision-making through the Central Data Exchange (CDX).*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual			
<i>Number of major EPA environmental systems that use the CDX electronic requirements enabling faster receipt, processing, and quality checking of data.</i>	29	32	36	37	45	60	<i>Systems</i>
<i>States, tribes and territories will be able to exchange data with CDX through nodes in real time, using standards and automated data-quality checking.</i>					55	55	<i>Users</i>
<i>Number of users from states, tribes, laboratories, and others that choose CDX to report environmental data electronically to EPA.</i>	47,000	62,000	55,000	88,516	100,000	110,000	<i>Users</i>

Background:      The Central Data Exchange program began in FY 2001.

### Information Security

*In 2009      OMB reports that all EPA information systems meet/exceed established standards for security.*

*In 2008      OMB reports that all EPA information systems meet/exceed established standards for security.*

*In 2007      OMB reports that all EPA information systems meet/exceed established standards for security.*

*In 2006 OMB reports that all EPA information systems meet/exceed established standards for security.*

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual			
<i>Percent of Federal Information Security Management Act reportable systems that are certified and accredited.</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>Percent</i>

Background: In FY 2002, the Agency started planning an effort to expand and strengthen its information security infrastructure.



**NPM: OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL****Fraud Detection and Deterrence**

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>In 2009, the OIG will improve public confidence and integrity in EPA program operations by detecting and preventing fraud, abuse and breaches of security.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>In 2008, the OIG will improve public confidence and integrity in EPA program operations by detecting and preventing fraud, abuse and breaches of security.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>In 2007, OIG will improve public confidence and integrity in EPA program operations by detecting and preventing fraud, abuse and breaches of security.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>In 2006, the OIG will improve public confidence and integrity in EPA program operations by detecting and preventing fraud, abuse and breaches of security.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual			
<i>Criminal, civil, administrative, and fraud prevention actions.</i>	80	121	80	103	80	80	<i>Actions</i>

Background: In FY 2005, the OIG established a baseline of 83 criminal, civil, administrative, and fraud prevention actions.

**Audit and Advisory Services**

<i>In 2009</i>	<i>In 2009, the OIG will contribute to human health and environmental quality through audits, evaluations, advisory services, inspections, and investigations for improved Agency business practices, accountability, and performance.</i>
<i>In 2008</i>	<i>In 2008, the OIG will contribute to human health and environmental quality through audits, evaluations, advisory services, inspections, and investigations for improved Agency business practices, accountability, and performance.</i>
<i>In 2007</i>	<i>In 2007, the OIG will contribute to human health and environmental quality through audits, evaluations, advisory services, inspections, and investigations for improved Agency business practices, accountability, and performance.</i>
<i>In 2006</i>	<i>In 2006, the OIG will contribute to human health and environmental quality through audits, evaluations, advisory services, inspections, and investigations for improved Agency business practices, accountability, and performance.</i>

Performance Measures	FY 2006		FY 2007		FY 2008	FY 2009	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual			
<i>Environmental and business actions taken for improved performance or risk reduction.</i>	303	407	318	464	334	318	<i>Actions</i>
<i>Environmental and business recommendations or risks identified for corrective action.</i>	925	1,024	925	949	971	903	<i>Recommendations</i>
<i>Return on the annual dollar investment, as a percentage of the OIG budget, from audits and investigations.</i>	150	1,100	150	189	120	120	<i>Percentage</i>

Background: In FY 2005, the OIG established a revised baseline of 564 environmental and business actions taken for improved performance or risk reduction; 885 environmental and business risks or recommendations identified for corrective action; and 150% in potential dollar return on investment as a percentage of OIG budget, from savings, questioned costs, fines, recoveries, and settlements. The baselines increased because the OIG began including the non-monetary results of "Single Audits" and audits performed for the OIG in its targets and results by acknowledging the increasing number and significance of actionable recommendations in these audits to improve the management of assistance agreements.

## COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

### Environmental Programs

#### **Goal 1- Clean Air and Global Climate Change**

##### ***Objective: Healthier Outdoor Air***

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) cooperates with other Federal, state, Tribal, and local agencies in achieving goals related to ground level ozone and particulate matter (PM). EPA continues to work closely with the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service in developing its burning policy and reviewing practices that can reduce emissions. EPA, the Department of Transportation (DOT), and the Army Corps of Engineers (COE) work with state and local agencies to integrate transportation and air quality plans, reduce traffic congestion, and promote livable communities. EPA continues to work with the Department of the Interior (DOI), National Park Service (NPS), in developing its regional haze program and deploying the Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments (IMPROVE) visibility monitoring network. The operation and analysis of data produced by the particulate matter (PM) monitoring system is an example of the close coordination of effort between the EPA and state and Tribal governments.

For pollution assessments and transport, EPA is working with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) on technology transfer using satellite imagery. EPA will be working to further distribute NASA satellite products to and NOAA air quality forecast products to Regions, states, local agencies, and Tribes to provide better understanding of air quality on a day-to-day basis and to assist with PM forecasting. EPA will also work with NASA to develop a better understanding of

PM formation using satellite data. EPA works with the Department of the Army, Department of Defense (DoD) on advancing emission measurement technology and with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce for meteorological support for our modeling and monitoring efforts.

To better understand the magnitude, sources, and causes of mobile source pollution, EPA works with the Departments of Energy (DOE) and DOT to fund research projects. A program to characterize the exhaust emissions from light-duty gasoline vehicles is being co-funded by DOE and DOT. Other DOT mobile source projects include TRANSIMS (TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS and SIMULATION System) and other transportation modeling projects; DOE is funding these projects through the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. EPA also works closely with DOE on refinery cost modeling analyses and the development of clean fuel programs. For mobile sources program outreach, the Agency is participating in a collaborative effort with DOT's Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) designed to educate the public about the impacts of transportation choices on traffic congestion, air quality, and human health. This community-based public education initiative also includes the Centers for Disease Control (CDC). In addition, EPA is working with DOE to identify opportunities in the Clean Cities program. EPA also works with other Federal agencies such as the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) on air emission issues. Other programs targeted to reduce air toxics from mobile sources are

coordinated with DOT. These partnerships can involve policy assessments and toxic emission reduction strategies in different regions of the country. EPA is also working with the National Highway Transportation Administration and the Department of Agriculture on the greenhouse gas transportation rules.

To develop new continuous source monitoring technology for toxic metals emitted from smokestacks, EPA has partnered with the DoD. This partnership will provide a new source monitoring tool that will streamline source monitoring requirements that a number of DoD incinerators are required to meet and improve the operation of DoD incinerators with real-time emissions information resulting in reduced releases of air toxics to the environment. In time, this technology is expected to be available for use at non-DoD facilities.

To reduce air toxic emissions that do not inadvertently increase worker exposures, EPA is continuing to work closely with the Department of Labor's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to coordinate the development of EPA and OSHA standards. EPA also works closely with other health agencies such as the CDC, the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health on health risk characterization. To assess atmospheric deposition and characterize ecological effects, EPA works with NOAA and the Department of the Interior's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

The Agency has worked extensively with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) on the National Health and Nutritional Evaluation Study to identify mercury accumulations in humans. EPA also has worked with DOE on the 'Fate of

Mercury' study to characterize mercury transport and traceability in Lake Superior.

To determine the extent to which agricultural activities contribute to air pollution, EPA will continue to work closely with the USDA through the joint USDA/EPA Agricultural Air Quality Task Force (AAQTF). The AAQTF is a workgroup set up by Congress to oversee agricultural air quality-related issues and to develop cost-effective ways in which the agricultural community can improve air quality. In addition, the AAQTF coordinates research on agricultural air quality issues to avoid duplication and ensure data quality and sound interpretation of data.

In developing regional and international air quality programs and projects and working on regional agreements, EPA works primarily with the Department of State, the Agency for International Development (USAID), and the DOE as well as with regional organizations. EPA's international air quality management program will complement EPA's programs on children's health, Trade and the Environment, and trans-boundary air pollution. In addition, EPA will partner with others worldwide, including international organizations such as the United Nations Environment Programme, the European Union, the Organization for Economic Development and Co-operation (OECD), the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC), the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and our colleagues in Canada, Mexico, Europe, and Japan. EPA is working with DOE and USTR under the CEC to promote renewable energy markets in North America.

### ***Objective: Healthier Indoor Air***

EPA works closely through a variety of

mechanisms with a broad range of Federal, state, Tribal, and local government agencies, industry, non-profit organizations, and individuals, as well as other nations, to promote more effective approaches to identifying and solving indoor air quality problems. At the Federal level, EPA works closely with several departments or agencies:

- Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to develop and conduction programs aimed at reducing children's exposure to known indoor triggers of asthma, including secondhand smoke;
- Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on home health and safety issues, especially those affecting children;
- Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) to identify and mitigate the health hazards of consumer products designed for indoor use;
- Department of Education (DoEd) to encourage construction and operation of schools with good indoor air quality; and
- Department of Agriculture (USDA) to encourage USDA Extension Agents to conduct local projects designed to reduce risks from indoor air quality. EPA plays a leadership role on the President's Task Force on Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children, particularly with respect to asthma and school environmental health issues.

As Co-chair of the interagency Committee on Indoor Air Quality (CIAQ), EPA works with the CPSC, DOE, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, and OSHA to review EPA draft publications, arrange the distribution of EPA publications,

and coordinate the efforts of Federal agencies with those of state and local agencies concerned with indoor air issues.

### ***Objective: Protect the Ozone Layer***

In an effort to curb the illegal importation of ozone depleting substances (ODSs), an interagency task force was formed consisting of representatives from EPA, the Departments of Justice (DOJ), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Department of State, Department of Commerce, and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Venting of illegally imported chemicals has the potential to prevent the United States from meeting the goals of the Montreal Protocol to restore the ozone layer.

EPA works very closely with the Department of State and other Federal agencies as appropriate in international negotiations among Parties to the Protocol. EPA works with the Office of the United States Trade Representative to analyze potential trade implications in stratospheric protection regulations that affect imports and exports.

EPA is working with USDA and the Department of State to facilitate research and development of alternatives to methyl bromide. EPA collaborates with these agencies to prepare U.S. requests for emergency and critical use exemptions of methyl bromide. EPA is providing input to USDA on rulemakings for methyl bromide-related programs.

EPA consults with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) on the potential for domestic methyl bromide needs. EPA also coordinates closely with FDA to ensure that sufficient supplies of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are available for the production of life-saving metered-dose inhalers for the treatment of asthma and other lung diseases.

This partnership between EPA and FDA combines the critical goals of protecting public health and limiting damage to the stratospheric ozone layer.

EPA works with the CDC and the National Weather Service (NWS) to coordinate the Ultraviolet Radiation (UV) Index and the health messages that accompany index reports. EPA is a member of the Federal Council on Skin Cancer Prevention, which educates and protects all Federal employees from the risks of overexposure to UV radiation.

In addition to collecting its own UV data, EPA coordinates with NASA and NOAA to monitor the state of the stratospheric ozone layer. EPA works with NASA on assessing essential uses and other exemptions for critical shuttle and rocket needs, as well as effects of direct emissions of high-speed aircraft flying in the stratosphere.

EPA coordinates with the Small Business Administration (SBA) to ensure that proposed rules are developed in accordance with the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Act.

***Objective: Radiation***

The Radiation Program coordinates with Federal and state partners through the use of the Interagency Steering Committee on Radiation Standards (ISCORS); its members include NRC, DOE, DOD, HHS, DOL, DOT, and DHS and their goal is to improve consistency in Federal radiation protection programs. EPA continues to work with other Federal agencies including Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), DOE, and DHS to prevent metals and finished products suspected of having radioactive contamination from entering the country. EPA also works with the DOT on initiatives to promote use of non-nuclear density gauges for highway paving, and with the

DOE and NRC to develop state-of-the-art tracking systems for radioactive sources in U.S. commerce. In addition, the program collaborates with state and local officials to maintain and operate the national network of radiation air monitors and continues to improve the sharing of information with DHS, DOE, other federal agencies, and the states to improve EPA's ability to contribute to interagency emergency response and environmental characterization during radiological emergencies.

***Objective: Reduce Greenhouse Gas Intensity***

Voluntary climate protection programs government-wide stimulate the development and use of renewable energy technologies and energy efficient products that will help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The effort is led by EPA and DOE with significant involvement from USDA, HUD and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

Agencies throughout the government make significant contributions to the climate protection programs. For example, DOE will pursue actions such as promoting the research, development, and deployment of advanced technologies (for example, renewable energy sources). The Treasury Department will administer proposed tax incentives for specific investments that will reduce emissions. EPA is working with DOE to demonstrate technologies that oxidize ventilation air methane from coal mines. EPA is broadening its public information transportation choices campaign as a joint effort with DOT. EPA coordinates with each of the above-mentioned agencies to ensure that our programs are complementary and in no way duplicative.

This coordination is evident in work recently completed by an interagency task force,

including representatives from the Department of State, EPA, DOE, USDA, DOT, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Department of Commerce, USGCRP, NOAA, NASA, and the DoD, to prepare the Third National Communication to the Secretariat as required under the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC). The FCCC was ratified by the United States Senate in 1992. A portion of the Third National Communication describes policies and measures (such as ENERGY STAR and EPA's Clean Automotive Technology initiative) undertaken by the U.S. to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, implementation status of the policies and measures, and their actual and projected benefits. One result of this interagency review process has been a refinement of future goals for these policies and measures which were communicated to the Secretariat of the FCCC in 2002. The "U.S. Climate Action Report 2002: Third National Communication of the United States of America under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change" is available at: <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/usnc3.pdf>

EPA works primarily with the Department of State, USAID and DOE as well as with regional organizations in implementing climate-related programs and projects. In addition, EPA partners with others worldwide, including international

organizations such as the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Development Programme, the International Energy Agency, the OECD, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and our colleagues in Canada, Mexico, Europe and Japan.

***Objective: Enhance Science and Research:***

EPA coordinates its air quality research with other Federal agencies through the Subcommittee on Air Quality Research of the NSTC Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR). The Agency and NIEHS co-chaired the subcommittee's Particulate Matter Research Coordination Working Group, which produced a strategic plan for Federal research on the health and environmental effects, exposures, atmospheric processes, source characterization and control of fine airborne particulate matter. The Agency is also a charter member of NARSTO, an international public-private partnership established in 1995 to improve management of air quality across North America. EPA coordinates specific research projects with other Federal agencies where appropriate and supports air-related research at universities and nonprofit organizations through its Science to Achieve Results (STAR) research grants program.

## **Goal 2- Clean and Safe Water**

### ***Objective: Protect Human Health***

The 1996 SDWA amendments include a provision that mandates joint EPA/CDC study of waterborne diseases and occurrence studies in public water supplies. CDC is involved in assisting EPA in training health care providers (doctors, nurses, public health officials, etc.) on public health issues related to drinking water contamination and there is close CDC/EPA coordination on research on microbial contaminants in drinking water. EPA has in place a MOU and an Interagency Agreement (IAG) with the CDC to implement this provision.

In implementing its source water assessment and protection efforts, the Agency coordinates many of its activities with other Federal agencies. There are three major areas of relationships with other agencies concerning source water assessments and protection.

#### ***Public Water Systems (PWS)***

Some Federal agencies, (i.e., USDA (Forest Service), DoD, DOE, DOI/NPS, and USPS), own and operate public water systems. EPA's coordination with these agencies focuses primarily on ensuring that they cooperate with the states in which their systems are located, and that they are accounted for in the states' source water assessment programs as mandated in the 1996 amendments to the SDWA.

#### ***Data Availability, Outreach and Technical Assistance***

EPA coordinates with USGS, USDA (Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES), Rural Utilities Service); DOT, DoD, DOE, DOI (NPS and Bureau of Indian

Affairs (BIA), Land Management, and Reclamation); HHS (Indian Health Service) and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).

#### ***Tribal Access Coordination***

EPA will continue to work with other Federal agencies to develop a coordinated approach to improving Tribal access to safe drinking water. In response to commitments made during the 2002 World Summit in Johannesburg, the EPA committed to the goal of coordinating with other Federal agencies to reduce by half the number of households on Tribal lands lacking access to safe drinking water by 2015. United Nations. 2002. *Report of the World Summit on Sustainable Development: Johannesburg, South Africa, 26 August – 4 September, 2002*. New York, NY: United Nations.

#### ***Collaboration with USGS***

EPA and USGS have identified the need to engage in joint, collaborative field activities, research and testing, data exchange, and analyses, in areas such as the occurrence of unregulated contaminants, the environmental relationships affecting contaminant occurrence, evaluation of currently regulated contaminants, improved protection area delineation methods, laboratory methods, and test methods evaluation. EPA has an IAG with USGS to accomplish such activities. This collaborative effort has improved the quality of information to support risk management decision-making at all levels of government, generated valuable new data, and eliminated potential redundancies.

#### ***Collaboration with Public and Private Partners on Critical Water Infrastructure Protection***



EPA coordinates with other Federal agencies, primarily DHS, CDC, FDA and DoD on biological, chemical, and radiological contaminants, and how to respond to their presence in drinking water and wastewater systems. A close linkage with the FBI, particularly with respect to ensuring the effectiveness of the ISAC, will be continued. The Agency is strengthening its working relationships with the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, the Water Environment Research Federation and other research institutions to increase our knowledge on technologies to detect contaminants, monitoring protocols and techniques, and treatment effectiveness.

#### *Collaboration with FDA*

EPA and FDA have issued joint national fish consumption advisories to protect the public from exposure to mercury in commercially and recreationally caught fish, as well as fish caught for subsistence. EPA's advisory covers the recreational and subsistence fisheries in fresh waters where states and Tribes have not assessed the waters for the need for an advisory. *ibid.* <http://map1.epa.gov/html/federaladv> FDA's advisory covers commercially caught fish, and fish caught in marine waters. *Ibid.* <http://map1.epa.gov/html/federaladv> EPA works closely with FDA to distribute the advisory to the public. In addition, EPA works with FDA to investigate the need for advisories for other contaminants and to ensure that these federal advisories support and augment advisories issued by states and Tribes.

#### *Beach Monitoring and Public Notification*

The BEACH Act requires that all Federal agencies with jurisdiction over coastal and Great Lakes recreation waters adjacent to beaches used by the public implement beach

monitoring and public notification programs. These programs must be consistent with guidance published by EPA. *ibid.* "National Beach Guidance and Required Performance Criteria for Grants." EPA will continue to work with the USGS and other Federal agencies to ensure that their beach water quality monitoring and notification programs are technically sound and consistent with program performance criteria published by EPA.

#### ***Objective: Protect Water Quality***

##### *Watersheds*

Protecting and restoring watersheds will depend largely on the direct involvement of many Federal agencies and state, Tribal and local governments who manage the multitude of programs necessary to address water quality on a watershed basis. Federal agency involvement will include USDA (Natural Resources Conservation Service, Forest Service, Agriculture Research Service), DOI (Bureau of Land Management, Office of Surface Mining, USGS, USFWS, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs), NOAA, DOT, and DoD (Navy and COE). At the state level, agencies involved in watershed management typically include departments of natural resources or the environment, public health agencies, and forestry and recreation agencies. Locally, numerous agencies are involved, including Regional planning entities such as councils of governments, as well as local departments of environment, health and recreation who frequently have strong interests in watershed projects.

#### *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program (NPDES)*

Since inception of the NPDES program under Section 402 of the CWA, EPA and the authorized states have developed expanded

relationships with various Federal agencies to implement pollution controls for point sources. EPA works closely with USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service on consultation for protection of endangered species through a Memorandum of Agreement. EPA works with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on National Historic Preservation Act implementation. EPA and the states rely on monitoring data from USGS to help confirm pollution control decisions. The Agency also works closely with SBA and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to ensure that regulatory programs are fair and reasonable. The Agency coordinates with the NOAA on efforts to ensure that NPDES programs support coastal and national estuary efforts; and with the DOI on mining issues.

#### *Joint Strategy for Animal Feeding Operations*

The Agency is working closely with the USDA to implement the Unified National Strategy for Animal Feeding Operations finalized on March 9, 1999. The Strategy sets forth a framework of actions that USDA and EPA will take to minimize water quality and public health impacts from improperly managed animal wastes in a manner designed to preserve and enhance the long-term sustainability of livestock production. EPA's recent revisions to the CAFO Regulations (effluent guidelines and NPDES permit regulations) will be a key element of EPA and USDA's plan to address water pollution from CAFOs. EPA and USDA senior management meet routinely to ensure effective coordination across the two agencies.

#### *Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF)*

Representatives from EPA's SRF program, HUD's Community Development Block

Grant program, and USDA's Rural Utility Service have signed a MOU committing to assisting state or Federal implementers in: (1) coordination of the funding cycles of the three Federal agencies; (2) consolidation of plans of action (operating plans, intended use plans, strategic plans, etc.); and (3) preparation of one environmental review document, when possible, to satisfy the requirements of all participating Federal agencies. A coordination group at the Federal level has been formed to further these efforts and maintain lines of communication. In many states, coordination committees have been established with representatives from the three programs.

In implementation of the Indian set-aside grant program under Title VI of the CWA, EPA works closely with the Indian Health Service to administer grant funds to the various Indian Tribes, including determination of the priority ranking system for the various wastewater needs in Indian Country. In 1998, EPA and the Rural Utilities Service of the USDA formalized a partnership between the two agencies to provide coordinated financial and technical assistance to Tribes.

#### *Nonpoint Sources*

EPA will continue to work closely with its Federal partners to achieve our goals for reducing pollutant discharges from nonpoint sources, including reduction targets for sediments, nitrogen and phosphorous. Most significantly, EPA will continue to work with the USDA, which has a key role in reducing sediment loadings through its continued implementation of the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, Conservation Reserve Program, and other conservation programs. USDA also plays a major role in reducing nutrient discharges through these same programs and through

activities related to the AFO Strategy. EPA will also continue to work closely with the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management especially on the vast public lands that comprise 29 percent of all land in the United States. EPA will work with these agencies, USGS, and the states to document improvements in land management and water quality.

EPA will also work with other Federal agencies to advance a watershed approach to Federal land and resource management to help ensure that Federal land management agencies serve as a model for water quality stewardship in the prevention of water pollution and the restoration of degraded water resources. Implementation of a watershed approach will require coordination among Federal agencies at a watershed scale and collaboration with states, Tribes and other interested stakeholders.

### **Vessel Discharges**

Regarding vessel discharges, EPA will continue working closely with the USCG on addressing ballast water discharges domestically, and with the interagency work group and U.S. delegation to Marine Environmental Protection Committee (MEPC) on international controls. EPA will continue to work closely with the USCG, Alaska and other states, and the International Council of Cruise Lines regarding regulatory and non-regulatory approaches to managing wastewater discharges from cruise ships. EPA will also continue to work with the Coast Guard regarding the vessel sewage discharge standards and with the Navy on developing Uniform National Discharge Standards for Armed Forces vessels. Regarding dredged material management, EPA will continue to work closely with the COE on standards for

permit review, as well as site selection/designation and monitoring.

OIA also serves as the primary point-of-contact and liaison with USAID. Specially drawing on expertise from throughout EPA, OIA administers a number of interagency agreements for environmental assistance.

EPA works closely with a number of other Federal agencies with environmental, health, or safety mandates. These include (among others) the DOL, DOT, USDA, DOI, HHS and FDA.

EPA works with the Department of State, NOAA, USCG, Navy, and other Federal agencies in developing the technical basis and policy decisions necessary for negotiating global treaties concerning marine antifouling systems, invasive species, and air pollution from ships. EPA also works with the same Agencies in addressing land-based sources of marine pollution in the Gulf of Mexico and Wider Caribbean Basin.

### ***Objective: Enhance Science and Research***

While EPA is the Federal agency mandated to ensure safe drinking water, other Federal and non-Federal entities are conducting research that complements EPA's research program on priority contaminants in drinking water. For example, the CDC and NIEHS conduct health effects and exposure research. FDA also performs research on children's risks.

Many of these research activities are being conducted in collaboration with EPA scientists. The private sector, particularly the water treatment industry, is conducting research in such areas as analytical methods, treatment technologies, and the development and maintenance of water resources. Cooperative research efforts have been

ongoing with the American Water Works Association Research Foundation and other stakeholders to coordinate drinking water research. EPA is also working with USGS to evaluate performance of newly developed methods for measuring microbes in potential drinking water sources.

EPA has developed joint research initiatives with NOAA and USGS for linking monitoring data and field study information with available toxicity data and assessment models for developing sediment criteria.

EPA is also working with other agencies (FDA, USGS, USDA, NOAA, CDC) on new contaminants of concern in the environment. EPA and others are gathering information on the occurrence, health and ecological effects, and is developing techniques to measure these emerging contaminants in water, fish tissue, and biosolids. These emerging contaminants include pharmaceuticals and personal care products (PPCPs), endocrine disrupting compounds (EDCs), polybrominated diphenyl ether flame retardants (PBDEs), perfluorooctanoate (PFOA), nanomaterials, and prions. Data gaps are being identified for further research into whether there is a link between specific contaminants and adverse impacts to humans or aquatic organisms.

The Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR) is also coordinating the research efforts among Federal agencies to assess the impacts of nutrients and hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico.

Urban wet weather flow research is being coordinated with other organizations such as the Water Environment Research Foundation's Wet Weather Advisory Panel, the ASCE Urban Water Resources Research Council, the COE, and USGS. Research on the characterization and management of

pollutants from agricultural operations (e.g., CAFOs) is being coordinated with USDA through workshops and other discussions.

EPA is pursuing collaborative research projects with the USGS to utilize water quality data from urban areas obtained through the USGS National Ambient Water Quality Assessment (NAWQA) program, showing levels of pesticides that are even higher than in many agricultural area streams. These data have potential uses for identifying sources of urban pesticides, and EPA will evaluate how the USGS data could be integrated into the Geographic Information System (GIS) database system.

The Drinking Water and Water Quality research programs plan to collaborate with the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, the Global Water Research Coalition, the National Research Council, Institute for Research in Construction, the American Society for Civil Engineers and several university Research organizations including Penn State University, the University of Houston, Louisiana Tech University, and the Polytechnic University of New York to carryout the new Water Infrastructure Initiative.

### **Goal 3-Land Preservation and Restoration**

#### ***Objective: Preserve Land***

Pollution prevention activities entail coordination with other Federal departments and agencies. EPA coordinates with the General Services Administration (GSA) on the use of safer products for indoor painting and cleaning, with the Department of Defense (DoD) on the use of safer paving materials for parking lots, and with the Defense Logistics Agency on safer solvents. The program also works with the National Institute of Standards and Technology and

other groups to develop standards for Environmental Management Systems.

In addition to business, industry, and other non-governmental organizations, EPA works with Federal, state, Tribal, and local governments to encourage reduced generation and safe recycling of wastes. Partners in this effort include the Environmental Council of States and the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials.

The Federal government is the single largest potential source for “green” procurement in the country, for office products as well as products for industrial use. EPA works with the Office of Federal Environmental Executive and other Federal agencies and departments in advancing the purchase and use of recycled-content and other “green” products. In particular, the Agency is currently engaged with other organizations within the Executive Branch to foster compliance with Executive Order 13423 and in tracking and reporting purchases of products made with recycled contents, in promoting electronic stewardship and achieving waste reduction and recycling goals.

In addition, the Agency is currently engaged with the DoD, the Department of Education, the Department of Energy (DOE), the U.S. Postal Service, and other agencies to foster proper management of surplus electronics equipment, with a preference for reuse and recycling. With these agencies, and in cooperation with the electronics industry, EPA and the Office of the Federal Environmental Executive launched the Federal Electronics Challenge which will lead to increased reuse and recycling of an array of computers and other electronics hardware used by civilian and military agencies.

### ***Objective: Restore Land***

#### ***Superfund Remedial Program***

The Superfund Remedial program coordinates with several other Federal agencies, such as ATSDR or NIEHS, in providing numerous Superfund related services in order to accomplish the program’s mission. In FY 2009, EPA will have active interagency agreements with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Department of the Interior (DOI).

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers also substantially contributes to the cleanup of Superfund sites by providing technical support for the design and construction of many fund-financed remediation projects through site-specific interagency agreements. This Federal partner has the technical design and construction expertise and contracting capability needed to assist EPA regions in implementing most of Superfund’s remedial action projects. This agency also provides technical on-site support to Regions in the enforcement oversight of numerous construction projects performed by private Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs).

#### ***Superfund Federal Facilities Program***

The Superfund Federal Facilities Program coordinates with Federal agencies, states, Tribes and state associations and others to implement its statutory responsibilities to ensure cleanup and property reuse. The Program provides technical and regulatory oversight at Federal facilities to ensure human health and the environment are protected.

EPA has entered into Interagency Agreements (IAGs) with DoD and DOE to expedite the cleanup and transfer of Federal

properties, and was recently approached by the U.S. Coast Guard for oversight assistance as they focus on downsizing their lighthouse inventory. A Memorandum of Understanding has been negotiated with DoD to continue the Agency's oversight support through September 30, 2011 for the acceleration of cleanup and property transfer at Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) installations affected by the first four rounds of BRAC. In addition, EPA has signed an IAG with DOE for technical input regarding innovative and flexible regulatory approaches, streamlining of documentation, integration of projects, deletion of sites from the National Priorities List (NPL), field assessments, and development of management documents and processes. The joint EPA/DOE IAG has received recognition as a model for potential use at other DOE field offices.

#### *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act*

The RCRA Permitting and Corrective Action Programs coordinate closely with other Federal agencies, primarily the DoD and DOE, which have many sites in the corrective action and permitting universe. Encouraging Federal facilities to meet the RCRA Corrective Action and permitting program's goals remains a top priority. RCRA Programs also coordinate with the Department of Commerce and the Department of State to ensure the safe movement of domestic and international shipments of hazardous waste.

#### *Leaking Underground Storage Tanks*

EPA, with very few exceptions, does not perform the cleanup of leaking underground storage tanks (LUST). States and territories use the LUST Trust Fund to administer their corrective action programs, oversee cleanups by responsible parties, undertake necessary enforcement actions, and pay for

cleanups in cases where a responsible party cannot be found or is unwilling or unable to pay for a cleanup.

States are key to achieving the objectives and long-term strategic goals. Except in Indian Country, EPA relies on state agencies to implement the LUST Program, including overseeing cleanups by responsible parties and responding to emergency LUST releases. LUST cooperative agreements awarded by EPA are directly given to the states to assist them in implementing their oversight and programmatic role.

#### *Emergency Preparedness and Response*

EPA plays a major role in reducing the risks that accidental and intentional releases of harmful substances and oil pose to human health and the environment. EPA implements the Emergency Preparedness program coordination with the Department of Homeland Security and other Federal agencies to deliver Federal assistance to state, local, and Tribal governments during natural disasters and other major environmental incidents. This requires continuous coordination with many Federal, state and local agencies. The Agency participates with other Federal agencies to develop national planning and implementation policies at the operational level.

The National Response Plan (NRP), under the direction of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), provides for the delivery of Federal assistance to states to help them deal with the consequences of terrorist events as well as natural and other significant disasters. EPA maintains the lead responsibility for the NRP's Emergency Support Function covering inland hazardous materials and petroleum releases and participates in the Federal Emergency Support Function Leaders Group which

addresses NRP planning and implementation at the operational level.

EPA coordinates its preparedness activities with DHS, FEMA, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other Federal agencies, states and local governments. EPA will continue to clarify its roles and responsibilities to ensure that Agency security programs are consistent with the national homeland security strategy.

### *Superfund Enforcement*

As required by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and Executive Order (EO) 12580, OSRE coordinates with other federal agencies in their use of CERCLA enforcement authority. This includes the coordinated use of CERCLA enforcement authority at individual hazardous waste sites that are located on both nonfederal land (EPA jurisdiction) and federal lands (other agency jurisdiction). As required by EO13016, the Agency also coordinates the use of CERCLA section 106 administrative order authority by other Departments and agencies.

EPA also coordinates with the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce to ensure that appropriate and timely notices required under CERCLA are sent to the Natural Resource Trustees. The Department of Justice also provides assistance to EPA with judicial referrals seeking recovery of response costs incurred by the U.S., injunctive relief to implement response actions, or enforcement of other CERCLA requirements.

### *Superfund Federal Facilities Enforcement Program*

The Superfund Federal Facilities Enforcement program ensures that 1) all Federal facility sites on the National Priority

List have interagency agreements (IAGs), which provide enforceable schedules for the progression of the entire cleanup; 2) these IAGs are monitored for compliance; and 3) Federal sites that are transferred to new owners are transferred in an environmentally responsible manner. After years of service and operation, some Federal facilities contain environmental contamination, such as hazardous wastes, unexploded ordnance, radioactive wastes or other toxic substances. To enable the cleanup and reuse of such sites, the Federal Facilities Enforcement program coordinates creative solutions that protect both human health and the environment. These enforcement solutions help restore facilities so they can once again serve an important role in the economy and welfare of local communities and our country.

### *Oil Spills*

Under the Oil Spill Program, EPA works with other Federal agencies such as U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), NOAA, FEMA, DOI, DOT, DOE, and other Federal agencies and states, as well as with local government authorities to develop Area Contingency Plans. The Department of Justice also provides assistance to agencies with judicial referrals when enforcement of violations becomes necessary. In FY 2009, EPA will have an active interagency agreement with the USCG. EPA and the USCG work in coordination with other Federal authorities to implement the National Preparedness for Response Program.

### ***Objective: Enhance Science and Research***

EPA expends substantial effort coordinating its research with other Federal agencies, including work with DoD in its Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) and the Environmental

Security Technology Certification Program, DOE and its Office of Health and Environmental Research. EPA also conducts collaborative laboratory research with DoD, DOE, DOI (particularly the USGS), and NASA to improve characterization and risk management options for dealing with subsurface contamination.

contaminants are being conducted with the USGS and DOE's Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

The Agency is also working with NIEHS, which manages a large basic research program focusing on Superfund issues, to advance fundamental Superfund research. The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) also provides critical health-based information to assist EPA in making effective cleanup decisions. EPA works with these agencies on collaborative projects, information exchange, and identification of research issues and has a MOU with each agency. EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, and Navy recently signed a MOU to increase collaboration and coordination in contaminated sediments research. Additionally, the Interstate Technology Regulatory Council (ITRC) has proved an effective forum for coordinating Federal and state activities and for defining continuing research needs through its teams on topics including permeable reactive barriers, radionuclides, and Brownfields EPA has developed an MOU<sup>10</sup> with several other agencies [DOE, DoD, NRC, USGS, NOAA, and USDA] for multimedia modeling research and development.

Other research efforts involving coordination include the unique controlled-spill field research facility designed in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation. Geophysical research experiments and development of software for subsurface characterization and detection of

---

<sup>10</sup> For more information please go to: Interagency Steering Committee on Multimedia Environmental Models MOU, <http://www.iscmem.org/Memorandum.htm>



## **Goal 4-Healthy Communities and Ecosystems**

Coordination with state lead agencies and with the USDA provides added impetus to the implementation of the Certification and Training program. States also provide essential activities in developing and implementing the Endangered Species and Worker Protection programs and are involved in numerous special projects and investigations, including emergency response efforts. The Regions provide technical guidance and assistance to the states and Tribes in the implementation of all pesticide program activities.

EPA uses a range of outreach and coordination approaches for pesticide users, agencies implementing various pesticide programs and projects, and the general public. Outreach and coordination activities are essential to effective implementation of regulatory decisions. In addition coordination activities protect workers and endangered species, provide training for pesticide applicators, promote integrated pest management and environmental stewardship, and support for compliance through EPA's Regional programs and those of the states and Tribes.

In addition to the training that EPA provides to farm workers and restricted use pesticide applicators, EPA works with the State Cooperative Extension Services designing and providing specialized training for various groups. Such training includes instructing private applicators on the proper use of personal protective equipment and application equipment calibration, handling spill and injury situations, farm family safety, preventing pesticide spray drift, and pesticide and container disposal. Other specialized training is provided to public works employees on grounds maintenance, to pesticide control operators on proper

insect identification, and on weed control for agribusiness.

EPA coordinates with and uses information from a variety of Federal, state and international organizations and agencies in our efforts to protect the safety of America's health and environment from hazardous or higher risk pesticides. In May 1991, the USDA implemented the Pesticide Data Program (PDP) to collect objective and statistically reliable data on pesticide residues on food commodities. This action was in response to public concern about the effects of pesticides on human health and environmental quality. EPA uses PDP data to improve dietary risk assessment to support the registration of pesticides for minor crop uses.

PDP is critical to implementing the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA). The system provides improved data collection of pesticide residues, standardized analytical and reporting methods, and sampling of foods most likely consumed by infants and children. PDP sampling, residue, testing and data reporting are coordinated by the Agricultural Marketing Service using cooperative agreements with ten participating states representing all regions of the country. PDP serves as a showcase for Federal-state cooperation on pesticide and food safety issues.

FQPA requires EPA to consult with other government agencies on major decisions. EPA, USDA and FDA work closely together using both a MOU and working committees to deal with a variety of issues that affect the involved agencies' missions. For example, agencies work together on residue testing programs and on enforcement actions that involve pesticide residues on food, and we coordinate our review of antimicrobial

pesticides. The Agency coordinates with USDA/ARS in promotion and communication of resistance management strategies. Additionally, we participate actively in the Federal Interagency Committee on Invasive Animals and Pathogens (ITAP) which includes members from USDA, DOL, DoD, DHS and CDC to coordinate planning and technical advice among Federal entities involved in invasive species research, control and management.

While EPA is responsible for making registration and tolerance decisions, the Agency relies on others to carry out some of the enforcement activities. Registration-related requirements under FIFRA are enforced by the states. The HSS/FDA enforces tolerances for most foods and the USDA/Food Safety and Inspection Service enforces tolerances for meat, poultry and some egg products.

Internationally, the Agency collaborates with the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS), the CODEX Alimentarius Commission, the North American Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and NAFTA Commission. These activities serve to coordinate policies, harmonize guidelines, share information, correct deficiencies, build other nations' capacity to reduce risk, develop strategies to deal with potentially harmful pesticides and develop greater confidence in the safety of the food supply.

One of the Agency's most valuable partners on pesticide issues is the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC), which brings together a broad cross-section of knowledgeable individuals from organizations representing divergent views to discuss pesticide regulatory, policy and implementation issues. The PPDC consists

of members from industry/trade associations, pesticide user and commodity groups, consumer and environmental/public interest groups and others.

The PPDC provides a structured environment for meaningful information exchanges and consensus building discussions, keeping the public involved in decisions that affect them. Dialogue with outside groups is essential if the Agency is to remain responsive to the needs of the affected public, growers and industry organizations.

EPA works closely with Federal agencies to improve the health of children and older adults. Working with the CDC, the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS), and the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials (ASTHO), a national action agenda to reduce environmental triggers of childhood asthma was developed and implemented.

The Agency continues to work with other Federal agencies in the development of children's environmental health indicators used to monitor the outcomes of children's health efforts. The Agency collaborates with the CDC, National Center for Health Statistics and obtains approval from the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics ([www.childstats.gov](http://www.childstats.gov)) on the reporting of appropriate children's health indicators and data. EPA also participates in the development of the annual report entitled "America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being."

As a member of the Interagency Forum on Aging Related Statistics, EPA helps to assure that key indicators associated with important aspects of older Americans' lives are considered in reports such as "Older Americans 2004: Key Indicators of Well-Being."

EPA and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) support the Pediatric Environmental Health Specialty Units (PEHSUs) which provide education and consultation services on children's environmental health issues to health professionals, public health officials, and the public.

EPA works closely with other Federal agencies to improve children's health in schools. For example, EPA has incorporated into the new Healthy School Environments Assessment Tool (HealthySEAT), a number of recommendations and requirements from the Department of Education, the CDC, DOT, DOE, CPSC and OSHA.

EPA relies on data from HHS to help assess the risk of pesticides to children. Other collaborative efforts that go beyond our reliance on the data they collect include developing and validating methods to analyze domestic and imported food samples for organophosphates, carcinogens, neurotoxins and other chemicals of concern. These joint efforts protect Americans from unhealthful pesticide residue levels.

EPA's chemical testing data provides information for the OSHA worker protection programs, NIOSH for research, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) for informing consumers about products through labeling. EPA frequently consults with these Agencies on project design, progress and the results of chemical testing projects.

The Agency works with a full range of stakeholders on homeland security issues: USDA, CDC, other Federal agencies, industry and the scientific community. Review of the agents that may be effective against anthrax has involved GSA, State Department, Research Institute for Infectious Disease, FDA, EOSA, USPS, and

others, and this effort will build on this network.

The Acute Exposure Guidelines (AEGL) program is a collaborative effort that includes ten Federal agencies (EPA, DHS, DOE, DoD, DOT, NIOSH, OSHA, CDC, ATSDR, and FDA), numerous state agencies, private industry, academia, emergency medical associations, unions, and other organizations in the private sector. The program also has been supported internationally by the OECD and includes active participation by the Netherlands, Germany and France.

The success of EPA's lead program is due in part to effective coordination with other Federal agencies, states and Indian Tribes through the President's Task Force on Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children. EPA will continue to coordinate with HUD to clarify how new rules may affect existing EPA and HUD regulatory programs, and with the FHWA and OSHA on worker protection issues. EPA will continue to work closely with state and Federally recognized Tribes to ensure that authorized state and Tribal programs continue to comply with requirements established under TSCA, that the ongoing Federal accreditation certification and training program for lead professionals is administered effectively, and states and Tribes adopt the Renovation and Remodeling and the Buildings and Structures Rules when these rules become effective.

EPA has a MOU with HUD on coordination of efforts on lead-based paint issues. As a result of the MOU, EPA and HUD have co-chaired the President's Task Force since 1997. There are fourteen other Federal agencies including CDC and DoD on the Task Force. HUD and EPA also maintain

the National Lead Information Center and share enforcement of the Disclosure Rule.

Mitigation of existing risk is a common interest for other Federal agencies addressing issues of asbestos and PCBs. EPA will continue to coordinate interagency strategies for assessing and managing potential risks from asbestos and other fibers. Coordination on safe PCB disposal is an area of ongoing emphasis with the DoD, and particularly with the U.S. Navy, which has special concerns regarding PCBs encountered during ship scrapping. Mercury storage and safe disposal are also important issues requiring coordination with the Department of Energy and DoD as they develop alternatives and explore better technologies for storing and disposing high risk chemicals.

To effectively participate in the international agreements on POPs, heavy metals and PIC substances, EPA must continue to coordinate with other Federal agencies and external stakeholders, such as Congressional staff, industry, and environmental groups. For example, EPA has an interest in ensuring that the listing of chemicals, including the application of criteria and processes for evaluating future chemicals for possible international controls, is based on sound science. Similarly, the Agency typically coordinates with FDA's National Toxicology Program, the CDC/ATSDR, NIEHS and/or the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) on matters relating to OECD test guideline harmonization.

EPA's objective is to promote improved health and environmental protection, both domestically and worldwide. The success of this objective is dependent on successful coordination not only with other countries, but also with various international organizations such as the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS), the

North American Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC), OECD, the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the CODEX Alimentarius Commission. NAFTA and cooperation with Canada and Mexico play an integral part in the harmonization of data requirements.

EPA is a leader in global discussions on mercury and was instrumental in the launch of UNEP's Global Mercury Program, and we will continue to work with developing countries and with other developed countries in the context of that program. In addition, we have developed a strong network of domestic partners interested in working on this issue, including the DOE and the USGS.

EPA has developed cooperative efforts on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) with key international organizations and bodies, such as the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, the United Nations Environment Program, the Arctic Council, and the World Bank. EPA is partnering with domestic and international industry groups and foreign governments to develop successful programs.

### ***Objective: Communities***

The Governments of Mexico and the United States agreed, in November 1993, to assist communities on both sides of the border in coordinating and carrying out environmental infrastructure projects. The agreement between Mexico and the United States furthers the goals of the North American Free Trade Agreement and the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation. To this purpose, the governments established two international institutions, the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC) and the North American Development Bank (NADBank), which manages the Border Environment Infrastructure Fund (BEIF), to

support the financing and construction of much needed environmental infrastructure.

The BECC, with headquarters in Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico, assists local communities and other sponsors in developing and implementing environmental infrastructure projects. The BECC also certifies projects as eligible for NADBank financing. The NADBank, with headquarters in San Antonio, Texas, is capitalized in equal shares by the United States and Mexico. NADBank provides new financing to supplement existing sources of funds and foster the expanded participation of private capital.

A significant number of residents along the U.S.-Mexico border area are without basic services such as potable water and wastewater treatment and the problem has become progressively worse in the last few decades. Over the last several years, EPA has continued to work with the U.S. and Mexican Sections of the International Boundary and Water Commission and Mexico's national water commission, Comisión Nacional del Agua (CONAGUA), to further efforts to improve drinking water and wastewater services to communities within 100 km on the U.S. and 300 km on the Mexico side of the U.S.-Mexico border.

### *Brownfields*

EPA continues to lead the Brownfields Federal Partnership. The Partnership includes more than 20 federal agencies dedicated to the cleanup and redevelopment of brownfields properties. Partner agencies work together to prevent, assess, safely clean up, and redevelop brownfields. The Brownfields Federal Partnership's on-going efforts include promoting the Portfields and Mine-Scarred Lands projects and looking for additional opportunities to jointly promote community revitalization by

participating in multi-agency collaborative projects, holding regular meetings with federal partners, and supporting regional efforts to coordinate federal revitalization support to state and local agencies.

### *Environmental Justice*

Through the Federal Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice (IWG), EPA is working in partnership with ten other federal agencies to address the environmental and public health issues facing communities with environmental justice concerns. In 2009, the IWG will continue its efforts to work collaboratively and constructively with all levels of government, and throughout the public and private sectors. The issues range from lead exposure, asthma, safe drinking water and sanitation systems to hazardous waste clean-up, renewable energy/wind power development, and sustainable environmentally-sound economies. The IWG is utilizing EPA's collaborative problem-solving model, based on the experiences of federal collaborative partnerships, to improve the federal government's effectiveness in addressing the environmental and public health concerns facing communities. As the lead agency, EPA shares its knowledge, experience and offers assistance to other federal agencies as they enhance their strategies to integrate environmental justice into their programs, policies and activities.

### *Objective: Ecosystems*

#### *National Estuary Program*

Effectively implementing successful comprehensive management plans for the estuaries in the NEP depends on the cooperation, involvement, and commitment of Federal and state agency partners that have some role in protecting and/or

managing those estuaries. Common Federal partners include NOAA, USFWS, COE, and USDA. Other partners include state and local government agencies, universities, industry, non-governmental organizations (NGO), and members of the public.

### *Wetlands*

Federal agencies share the goal of increasing wetlands functions and values, and implementing a fair and flexible approach to wetlands regulations. In addition, EPA has committed to working with ACOE to ensure that the Clean Water Act Section 404 program is more open, consistent, predictable, and based on sound science.

### *Coastal America*

In efforts to better leverage our collaborative authorities to address coastal communities' environmental issues (e.g., coastal habitat losses, nonpoint source pollution, endangered species, invasive species, etc.), EPA, by memorandum of agreement in 2002 entered into an agreement with Multi-agency signatories. November 2002. *Coastal America 2002 Memorandum of Understanding*. Available online at <http://www.coastalamerica.gov/text/mou02.htm>

### *Great Lakes*

Pursuant to the mandate in Section 118 of the Clean Water Act to "coordinate action of the Agency with the actions of other Federal agencies and state and local authorities..." the Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) is engaged in extensive coordination efforts with state, Tribal, and other Federal agencies, as well as with our counterparts in Canada pursuant to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA). EPA leads a Federal Interagency Task Force, created by EO 13340, charged with

increasing and improving collaboration and integration among Federal programs involved in Great Lakes environmental activities. The Great Lakes task force brings together ten Cabinet department and Federal agency heads to coordinate restoration of the Great Lakes, focusing on outcomes, such as cleaner water and sustainable fisheries, and targeting measurable results. In December 2005, the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration issued a Great Lakes Regional Collaboration Strategy. This Strategy is being used to guide the Great Lakes environmental efforts. Coordination by GLNPO supports the GLWQA and other efforts to improve the Great Lakes: GLNPO monitoring involves extensive coordination among state, federal, and provincial partners, both in terms of implementing the monitoring program, and in utilizing results from the monitoring to manage environmental programs: GLNPO's sediments program works closely with the states and the Corps regarding dredging issues; implementation of the Binational Toxics Strategy involves extensive coordination with Great Lakes States; GLNPO works closely with states, Tribes, FWS, and NRCS in addressing habitat issues; and EPA also coordinates with these partners regarding development and implementation of Lakewide Management Plans for each of the Great Lakes and for Remedial Action Plans for the 30 remaining U.S./binational Areas of Concern.

### *Chesapeake Bay*

The Chesapeake Bay Program has a Federal Agencies Committee, chaired by EPA, which was formed in 1984 and has met regularly ever since. There are currently over 20 different Federal agencies actively involved with the Bay Program through the Federal Agencies Committee. The Federal agencies have worked together over the past decade to implement the commitments laid

out in the 1994 *Agreement of Federal Agencies on Ecosystem Management in the Chesapeake Bay* and the 1998 *Federal Agencies Chesapeake Ecosystem Unified Plan (FACEUP)*. The Federal Agencies Committee has been focusing on how its members can help to achieve the 104 commitments contained in the *Chesapeake 2000* agreement adopted by the Chesapeake Bay Program in June 2000. Through this interagency partnership Federal agencies have contributed to some major successes, such as the U.S. Forest Service helping to meet the year 2010 goal to restore 2,010 miles of riparian forest buffers eight years early; the NPS the effort to establish over 500 miles of water trails three years early; and the USFWS in reaching the Program's fish passage goal of reopening 1,357 miles of formerly blocked river habitat in 2004. Also in 2004, through the Federal Agencies Committee, the members sought better coordination of agency budgets and other programs to try to leverage maximum benefit to the state, private, and Federal efforts protect and restore the Bay.

### *Gulf of Mexico*

Key to the continued progress of the Gulf of Mexico Program is a broad multi-organizational Gulf states-led partnership comprised of regional; business and industry; agriculture; state and local government; citizens; environmental and fishery interests; and, numerous Federal departments and agencies. This Gulf partnership is comprised of members of the Gulf Program's Policy Review Board, subcommittees, and workgroups. Established in 1988, the Gulf of Mexico Program is designed to assist the Gulf States and stakeholders in developing a regional, ecosystem-based framework for restoring and protecting the Gulf of Mexico through coordinated Gulf-wide as well as priority area-specific efforts. The Gulf States

strategically identify the key environmental issues and work at the regional, state, and local level to define, recommend, and voluntarily implement the supporting solutions. To achieve the Program's environmental objectives, the partnership must target specific Federal, state, local, and private programs, processes, and financial authorities in order to leverage the resources needed to support state and community actions.

### ***Objective: Enhance Science and Research***

Several Federal agencies sponsor research on variability and susceptibility in risks from exposure to environmental contaminants. EPA collaborates with a number of the Institutes within the NIH and CDC. For example, NIEHS conducts multi-disciplinary biomedical research programs, prevention and intervention efforts, and communication strategies. The NIEHS program includes an effort to study the effects of chemicals, including pesticides and other toxics, on children. EPA collaborates with NIEHS in supporting the Centers for Children's Environmental Health and Disease Prevention, which study whether and how environmental factors play a role in children's health. EPA coordinates with ATSDR through a memo of understanding on the development of toxicological reviews and toxicology profiles, respectively. EPA also is coordinating improvements to the IRIS process through an ad hoc working group of federal partners (e.g., DOD, DOE, and NASA). The Agency collaborates with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) on very difficult and complex human health risk assessments through consultation or review.

Research in ecosystems protection is coordinated government-wide through the Committee on Environment and Natural

Resources (CENR). EPA actively participates in the CENR and all work is fully consistent with, and complementary to, other Committee member activities. The Ecological Research Program (ERP) scientists staff two CENR Subcommittees: the Subcommittee on Ecological Systems (SES) and the Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality (SWAQ). The ERP has initiated discussions within the SES on the subject of ecosystem services and potential ERP collaborations are being explored with the U.S. Geological Service (USGS) and with USDA Forest Service. Within SWAQ, the ERP has contributed to an initiative for a comprehensive census of water availability and quality, including the use of Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program methods and ongoing surveys as data sources. In addition, the ERP has taken a lead role with USGS in preparing a SWAQ document outlining new challenges for integrated management of water resources, including strategic needs for monitoring and modeling methods, and identifying water requirements needed to support the ecological integrity of aquatic ecosystems.

Consistent with the broad scope of the ecological research program, ERP has had complementary and joint programs with FS, USGS, USDA, NOAA, BLM, USFS, NGOs, and many others specifically to minimize duplication, maximize scope, and maintain a real time information flow that have been ongoing since the inception of the program. For example, all of these organizations work together to produce the National Land Cover Data used by all landscape ecologists nationally. Each contributes funding, services and research to this uniquely successful effort.

Homeland Security research is conducted in collaboration with numerous agencies, leveraging funding across multiple programs

and producing synergistic results. EPA's National Homeland Security Research Center (NHSRC) works closely with the DHS to assure that EPA's efforts are directly supportive of DHS priorities. EPA is also working with DHS to provide support and guidance to DHS in the startup of their University Centers of Excellence program.

Recognizing that the DoD has significant expertise and facilities related to biological and chemical warfare agents, the NHSRC works closely with the Edgewood Chemical and Biological Center (ECBC), the Technical Support Working Group, the Army Corps of Engineers, and other Department of Defense organizations to address areas of mutual interest and concern. In conducting biological agent research, the NHSRC is also collaborating with CDC. The NHSRC works with DOE to access and support research conducted by DOE's National Laboratories, as well as to obtain data related to radioactive materials.

In the computational toxicology program, through its ToxCast<sup>TM</sup> program, a multi-component effort launched in FY 2007, the Agency is obtaining high-throughput screening data on 320 chemicals of known toxicological profiles. More than 400 endpoints are being generated on each chemical through multiple research contracts and an Interagency Agreement with the National Institutes of Health Molecular Libraries Initiative at the National Chemical Genomics Center.

In addition to these major collaborations, the NHSRC has relationships with numerous other Federal agencies, including the U.S. Air Force, U.S. Navy, FDA, USGS and NIST. Also, the NHSRC is working with state and local emergency response personnel to understand better their needs and build relationships, which will enable the quick deployment of NHSRC products.



In the water infrastructure arena, the NHSRC is providing information to the Water Information Sharing and Analysis Center (WaterISAC) operated by the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA). The NAS has also been engaged to provide advice on the long-term direction of the water research and technical support program.

EPA coordinates its nanotechnology research with other Federal agencies through the National Nanotechnology Initiative (NNI),<sup>11</sup> which is managed under the Subcommittee on Nanoscale Science, Engineering and Technology (NSET) of the NSTC Committee on Technology (CoT). The Agency's Science to Achieve Results (STAR) program, which awards research grants to universities and non-profit organizations, has issued its recent nanotechnology grants<sup>12</sup> jointly with NIOSH, NIEHS, and NSF.

The Agency coordinates its global change research with other Federal agencies through the Climate Change Science Program (CCSP),<sup>13</sup> which is managed under the Subcommittee on Global Change Research of the NSTC Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR).

EPA collaborates with DOE, USGS, and the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)<sup>14</sup> to conduct research on mercury. EPA also works with other Federal agencies to coordinate U.S. participation in the Arctic Mercury Project, a partnership established in 2001 by the eight member states of the Arctic Council—Canada, Denmark, Finland,

Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the U.S.

The Agency coordinates its research fellowship programs with other Federal agencies and the nonprofit sector through the National Academies' Fellowships Roundtable, which meets biannually.<sup>15</sup>

EPA coordinates its research on endocrine disruptors with other Federal agencies through the interagency working group on endocrine disruptors under the auspices of the Toxics and Risk Subcommittee of the CENR. EPA coordinates its biotechnology research through the interagency biotechnology research working group and the agricultural biotechnology risk analysis working group of the Biotechnology Subcommittee of NSTC's Committee on Science.

---

<sup>11</sup> For more information, see <<http://www.nano.gov>>.

<sup>12</sup> For an example, see <[http://es.epa.gov/ncer/rfa/2005/2005\\_star\\_nano.html](http://es.epa.gov/ncer/rfa/2005/2005_star_nano.html)>.

<sup>13</sup> For more information, see <<http://www.climatescience.gov/>>.

<sup>14</sup> For more information, see <<http://www.epri.com/>>.

---

<sup>15</sup> For more information, see <<http://www7.nationalacademies.org/fellowships/roundtable.html>>.

## **Goal 5-Compliance and Environmental Stewardship**

### ***Objective: Improve Compliance***

The Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Program coordinates closely with DOJ on all enforcement matters. In addition, the program coordinates with other agencies on specific environmental issues as described herein.

The Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) coordinates with the Chemical Safety and Accident Investigation Board, OSHA, and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry in preventing and responding to accidental releases and endangerment situations, with the BIA on Tribal issues relative to compliance with environmental laws on Tribal Lands, and with the SBA on the implementation of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA). OECA also shares information with the IRS on cases which require defendants to pay civil penalties, thereby assisting the IRS in assuring compliance with tax laws. In addition, it coordinates with the SBA and a number of other Federal agencies in implementing the Business Gateway initiative, an "E-Government" project in support of the President's Regulatory Management Agenda. OECA also works with a variety of Federal agencies including the DOL and the IRS to organize a Federal Compliance Assistance Roundtable to address cross cutting compliance assistance issues. Coordination also occurs with the COE on wetlands.

Due to changes in the Food Security Act, the USDA/NRCS has a major role in determining whether areas on agricultural lands meet the definition of wetlands and are therefore regulated under the CWA. Civil Enforcement coordinates with USDA/NRCS on these issues also. The program

coordinates closely with the USDA on the implementation of the Unified National Strategy for Animal Feedlot Operations. EPA's Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Program also coordinates with USDA on food safety issues arising from the misuse of pesticides, and shares joint jurisdiction with Federal Trade Commission (FTC) on pesticide labeling and advertising. Coordination also occurs with Customs and Border Protection on implementing the secure International Trade Data System across all Federal agencies, and on pesticide imports. EPA and the FDA share jurisdiction over general-purpose disinfectants used on non-critical surfaces and some dental and medical equipment surfaces (e.g., wheelchairs). The Agency has entered into a MOU with HUD concerning lead poisoning.

The Criminal Enforcement Program coordinates with other Federal law enforcement agencies (i.e., FBI, Customs, DOL, U.S. Treasury, USCG, DOI and DOJ) and with state and local law enforcement organizations in the investigation and prosecution of environmental crimes. EPA also actively works with DOJ to establish task forces that bring together Federal, state and local law enforcement organizations to address environmental crimes. In addition, the program has an Interagency Agreement with the DHS to provide specialized criminal environmental training to Federal, state, local, and Tribal law enforcement personnel at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Glynco, GA. The Homeland Security and Forensics Support Programs also coordinate with other Federal law enforcement agencies and with state and local law enforcement organizations to support counter-terrorism efforts.

Under Executive Order 12088, EPA is directed to provide technical assistance to other Federal agencies to help ensure their compliance with all environmental laws. The Federal Facility Enforcement Program coordinates with other Federal agencies, states, local, and Tribal governments to ensure compliance by Federal agencies with all environmental laws. In FY 2009, EPA will also continue working with other Federal agencies to support the Federal Facilities Stewardship and Compliance Assistance Center ([www.fedcenter.gov](http://www.fedcenter.gov)).

OECA collaborates with the states and Tribes. States perform the vast majority of inspections, direct compliance assistance, and enforcement actions. Most EPA statutes envision a partnership between EPA and the states under which EPA develops national standards and policies and the states implement the program under authority delegated by EPA. If a state does not seek approval of a program, EPA must implement that program in the state. Historically, the level of state approvals has increased as programs mature and state capacity expands, with many of the key environmental programs approaching approval in nearly all states. EPA will increase its effort to coordinate with states on training, compliance assistance, capacity building and enforcement. EPA will continue to enhance the network of state and Tribal compliance assistance providers.

The Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance chairs the Interagency Environmental Leadership Workgroup established by Executive Order 13148. The Workgroup consists of over 100 representatives from most Federal departments and agencies. Its mission is to assist all Federal agencies with meeting the mandates of the Executive Order, including implementation of environmental management systems and environmental

compliance auditing programs, reducing both releases and uses of toxic chemicals, and compliance with pollution prevention and pollution reporting requirements. In FY 2009, the OECA will work directly with a number of other Federal agencies to improve CWA compliance at Federal facilities. OECA and other agencies will jointly investigate the underlying causes of persistent CWA violations and design and implement fixes to the problems to keep facilities in compliance over the long term. OECA anticipates that FY 2009 will see the completion of a multiple-year partnership with the Veterans Health Administration (VHA), a part of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). OECA and the VHA formed the partnership in 2002 to improve compliance at VHA medical centers across the nation. Since then, EPA and VHA have jointly designed and begun implementing environmental management systems at all VHA medical centers, completed multi-day onsite reviews at more than 20 medical centers to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their environmental programs and to guide the VHA in making program improvements at all its medical centers, and delivered multiple environmental compliance courses for VHA staff and managers.

EPA works directly with Canada and Mexico bilaterally and in the trilateral Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC). EPA's border activities require close coordination with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Justice, and the States of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. EPA is the lead agency and coordinates U.S. participation in the CEC. EPA works with NOAA, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Geological Survey on CEC projects to promote biodiversity cooperation, and with the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative to reduce

potential trade and environmental impacts such as invasive species.

The Agency is required to review environmental impact statements and other major actions impacting the environment and public health proposed by all Federal agencies, and make recommendations to the proposing Federal agency on how to remedy/mitigate those impacts. Although EPA is required under § 309 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) to review and comment on proposed Federal actions, neither the National Environmental Policy Act nor § 309 CAA require a Federal agency to modify its proposal to accommodate EPA's concerns. EPA does have authority under these statutes to refer major disagreements with other Federal agencies to the Council on Environmental Quality. Accordingly, many of the beneficial environmental changes or mitigation that EPA recommends must be negotiated with the other Federal agency. The majority of the actions EPA reviews are proposed by the Forest Service, Department of Transportation (including the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Aviation Administration), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Interior (including Bureau of Land Management, Minerals Management Service and National Parks Service), Department of Energy (including Federal Regulatory Commission), and Department of Defense.

EPA works directly with Canada and Mexico bilaterally and in the trilateral Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC). EPA's border activities require close coordination with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Justice, and the States of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. EPA is the lead agency and coordinates U.S. participation in the CEC. EPA works with NOAA, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Geological

Survey on CEC projects to promote biodiversity cooperation, and with the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative to reduce potential trade and environmental impacts such as invasive species.

***Objective: Improve Environmental Performance through Pollution Prevention and Innovation***

EPA is involved in a broad range of pollution prevention (P2) activities which can yield reductions in waste generation and energy consumption in both the public and private sectors. For example, the EPP initiative, which implements Executive Orders 12873 and 13101, promotes the use of cleaner products by Federal agencies. This is aimed at stimulating demand for the development of such products by industry.

This effort includes a number of demonstration projects with other federal Departments and agencies, such as the NPS (to use Green Purchasing as a tool to achieve the sustainability goals of the parks), DoD (use of environmentally preferable construction materials), and Defense Logistics Agency (identification of environmental attributes for products in its purchasing system). The program is also working within EPA to "green" its own operations. The program also works with NIST to develop a life-cycle based decision support tool for purchasers.

Under the Suppliers' Partnership for the Environment program and its umbrella program, the GSN, EPA's P2 Program is working closely with NIST and its Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program to provide technical assistance to the process of "greening" industry supply chains. The EPA is also working with the DOE's Industrial Technologies Program to provide energy audits and technical assistance to these supply chains.

EPA is working with DOE and USDA to develop a "Biofuels Posture Plan," the first step in implementing a Biofuels Initiative to support the goals of the President's Advanced Energy Initiative. The Biofuels Posture Plan will be designed to promote the development of a biofuels industry in the U.S. to help shift the country towards clean, domestic energy production and away from dependence on foreign sources of energy (mostly petroleum). EPA is investigating the use of municipal and industrial solid and hazardous wastes as sources of biomass that can be used to produce clean biofuels. EPA is promoting specific waste-to-energy technologies through policy development, research, and, where feasible, regulatory change.

The Agency is required to review environmental impact statements and other major actions impacting the environment and public health proposed by all Federal agencies, and make recommendations to the proposing Federal agency on how to remedy/mitigate those impacts. Although EPA is required under § 309 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) to review and comment on proposed Federal actions, neither the National Environmental Policy Act nor § 309 CAA require a Federal agency to modify its proposal to accommodate EPA's concerns. EPA does have authority under these statutes to refer major disagreements with other Federal agencies to the Council on Environmental Quality. Accordingly, many of the beneficial environmental changes or mitigation that EPA recommends must be negotiated with the other Federal agency. The majority of the actions EPA reviews are proposed by the Forest Service, Department of Transportation (including FHWA and FAA), COE, DOI (including Bureau of Land Management, Minerals Management Service and NPS), DOE (including Federal Regulatory Commission), and DoD.

EPA and DOI are coordinating an Interagency Tribal Information Steering Committee that includes the Bureau of Reclamation, DOE, HUD, USGS, Federal Geographic Data Committee, BIA, Indian Health Service, Department of the Treasury, and DOJ. This Interagency effort is aimed to coordinate the exchange of selected sets of environmental, resource, and programmatic information pertaining to Indian Country among Federal agencies in a "dynamic" information management system that is continuously and automatically updated and refreshed, to be shared equally among partners and other constituents.

Under a two-party interagency agreement, EPA works extensively with the Indian Health Service to cooperatively address the drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of Indian Tribes. EPA is developing protocols with the Indian Health Service Sanitation Facilities Construction Program for integration of databases of the two agencies, within the framework of the Tribal Enterprise Architecture.

EPA has organized a Tribal Data Working Group under the Federal Geographic Data Committee, and, along with BIA, is the co-chair of this group. EPA will play a lead role in establishing common geographic data and metadata standards for Tribal data, and in establishing protocols for exchange of information among Federal, non-Federal and Tribal cooperating partners.

EPA is developing protocols with the Bureau of Reclamation, Native American Program, for integration of databases of the two agencies, within the framework of the Tribal Enterprise Architecture. EPA is also developing agreements to share information with the Alaska District, COE.

To promote mutual goals as leadership programs with industry, the Office of Policy,

Economics, and Innovation (OPEI) through its National Environmental Performance Track, works with the Voluntary Protection Programs (VPP) in the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). EPA and OSHA collaborate in developing incentives for members, identifying potential members, providing joint recognition, and sharing best practices from their experience in managing leadership programs.

Under a MOU, EPA and NPS established a partnership to share resources for promoting environmental management system approaches that are good for both the environment and business. The MOU promotes the implementation of cost-effective environmental management practices for businesses in the tourism industry, including the approximately 600 NPS concessionaires that provide various visitor services in more than 130 national parks.

Information on regulations and other issues that may have an adverse impact on small businesses is shared regularly with the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy. An ongoing activity includes the coordination of interactions among the Office of Air and Radiation, the State Small Business Assistance Program's National Steering Committee, and the Office of Advocacy in the development of the proposed 55 area source Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) rules that will impact small businesses and state programs.

The Sector Strategies program addresses issues that directly affect the environmental performance of selected industries and other sectors of the economy. At times, actions taken to enhance sector-wide performance involve other Federal agencies. This work tends to be informal and issue-specific, as

opposed to formal inter-agency partnerships. For example, previous work on Agribusiness sector issues involved the Natural Resource Conservation Service of the USDA. Energy conservation work with the Metal Foundry sector involved the DOE's innovative technologies program. In 2005, Port sector stakeholders include the U.S. Maritime Administration (DOT), COE and NOAA. Data work with the Cement sector involves USGS contacts. And future "green highway" work of the Construction Sector may involve the FHWA.

Activities associated with the Environmental Education Program are coordinated with other Federal agencies in a variety of ways:

EPA currently funds approximately \$1.5M for eight interagency agreements with four Federal agencies. Current projects are focused on helping these agencies to better coordinate their environmental education efforts (see [www.handsontheland.org](http://www.handsontheland.org)) and improving capacity to measure environmental education program outcomes. All of the activities are funded jointly by the cooperating Federal agency and a third non-profit partner. Detailed information about the interagency agreements is available at <http://www.epa.gov/enviroed/iag.html>.

EPA chairs the Task Force on Environmental Education which meets periodically to share information. The current focus involves sharing information on linking environmental education programs to the strategic planning initiatives of Federal agencies and developing program impact measures.

EPA, in partnership with Department of Education, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, the Department of Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and the Centers for Disease Control, is

implementing a national Schools Chemical Cleanout Campaign (SC3). SC3 is building a national public/private network that will facilitate the removal of dangerous and inappropriate chemicals from K - 12 schools; encourage responsible chemical management practices to prevent future chemical accidents and accumulations; and raise issue awareness.

As a participant on the following interagency workgroups, EPA remains informed of related efforts across the government and provides coordination assistance as necessary: The Interagency Committee on Education (Chair: Department of Education); Partners in Resource Education (Chair: National Environmental Education and Training Foundation); the Federal Interagency Committee on Interpretation (Chair: National Park Service); Ocean Education Task Force (workgroup of the U.S. Ocean Commission); and the Afterschool.gov (Chair: General Services Administration).

EPA coordinates U.S. participation in the activities of the North American Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC) on green purchasing, supply chains, and buildings.

EPA's web portal of all Federal environmental education program web sites is:

<http://www.epa.gov/enviroed/FTFmemws.html>.

***Objective: Improve Human Health and the Environment in Indian Country***

In 2007, EPA completed two important tribal infrastructure Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) by five federal agencies. EPA, the Department of the Interior, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Agriculture, and the

Department of Housing and Urban Development committed to work as partners to improve infrastructure on tribal lands and focus efforts on providing access to safe drinking water and basic wastewater facilities to tribes.

The first MOU promotes coordination between federal tribal infrastructure programs and financial services while allowing department programs to retain their unique advantages. It is fully expected that the efficiencies and partnerships resulting from this collaboration will directly assist tribes with their infrastructure needs. For the first time five federal departments have joined together and agreed to work across traditional program boundaries on tribal infrastructure issues. The second MOU signed by the parties was created under this authority and addresses the issue of access to safe drinking water and wastewater facilities on tribal lands. For more information, please see the web link: <http://www.epa.gov/tribalportal/mous.htm>.

***Objective: Enhance Science and Research***

EPA is coordinating with DoD's Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) in an ongoing partnership, especially in the areas of sustainability research and of incorporating materials lifecycle analysis into the manufacturing process for weapons and military equipment. EPA's People, Prosperity, and Planet (P3) student design competition for sustainability will partner with NASA, NSF, OFEE, USAID, USDA, CEQ, and OSTP. EPA is continuing its partnerships with NSF, NIEHS, AND NIOSH on jointly issued grant solicitations for nanotechnology, and its coordination through the NSET with all agencies that are part of the NNI.

EPA will continue work under the MOA

with the USCG and the State of Massachusetts on ballast water treatment technologies and mercury continuous emission monitors. The agency also coordinates technology verifications with NOAA (multiparameter water quality probes); DOE (mercury continuous emission monitors); DoD (explosives monitors, PCB detectors, dust suppressants); USDA (ambient ammonia monitors); Alaska and Pennsylvania (arsenic removal); Georgia, Kentucky, and Michigan (storm water treatment); and Colorado and New York (waste-to-energy technologies).



## COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

### Enabling Support Programs

#### Office of the Administrator (OA)

EPA collaborates with other Federal agencies in the collection of economic data used in the conduct of economic benefit-cost analyses of environmental regulations and policies. The Agency collaborates with the Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census on the Pollution Abatement Costs and Expenditure (PACE) survey in order to obtain information on pollution abatement expenditures by industry. In our effort to measure the beneficial outcomes of Agency programs, we co-sponsor with several other agencies the U.S. Forest Service's National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE), which measures national recreation participation and recreation trends. EPA also collaborates with other natural resource agencies (e.g., United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Department of Interior, Forest Service, National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)) to foster improved interdisciplinary research and reporting of economic information by collaboratively supporting workshops and symposiums on environmental economics topics (ecosystem valuation resource evaluation); economics of invasive species; and measuring health benefits.

The Agency also continues to work with other Federal agencies in the development of children's environmental health indicators used to monitor the outcomes of children's health efforts. The Agency collaborates with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Center for Health Statistics to obtain approval of the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics ([www.childstats.gov](http://www.childstats.gov)) on the reporting of appropriate children's health

indicators and data. Furthermore, the Agency is an active member of the Interagency Forum on Aging-Related Statistics ([www.agingstats.gov](http://www.agingstats.gov)). The Forum was created to foster collaboration among Federal agencies that produce or use statistical data on the older population. The biannual chartbook contains an indicator on air quality and the counties where older adults reside that have experienced poor air quality.

EPA's Office of Homeland Security (OHS) continues to focus on broad, Agency and government-wide homeland security policy issues that cannot be adequately addressed by a single program office, as well as ensuring implementation of EPA's Homeland Security Strategy. A significant amount of the responsibilities require close coordination with Federal partners, through Policy Coordinating Committees (PCCs), briefings and discussions with individual senior Federal officials. The Associate Administrator for Homeland Security and OHS represent the Administrator, Deputy Administrator, and other senior Agency officials at meetings with personnel from the White House and Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and other high-level stakeholders. OHS coordinates the development of responses to inquiries from the White House, DHS, the Congress, and others with oversight responsibilities for homeland security efforts. EPA's ability to effectively implement its broad range of homeland security responsibilities is significantly enhanced through these efforts. OHS ensures consistent development and implementation of the Agency's homeland security policies and procedures, while building an external network of partners so

that EPA's efforts can be integrated into, and build upon, the efforts of other Federal agencies.

The Science Advisory Board (SAB) primarily provides the Administrator with independent peer reviews and advice on the scientific and technical aspects of environmental issues to inform the Agency's environmental decision-making. Often, the Agency program office seeking the SAB's review and advice has identified the Federal agencies interested in the scientific topic at issue. The SAB coordinates with those Federal agencies by providing notice of its activities through the Federal Register, and as appropriate, inviting Federal agency experts to participate in the peer review or advisory activity. The SAB, from time to time, also convenes science workshops on emerging issues, and invites Federal agency participation through the greater Federal scientific and research community.

EPA's Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (OSDBU) works with the Small Business Administration (SBA) and other Federal agencies to increase the participation of small and disadvantaged businesses in EPA's procurement of goods, services, equipment, and construction. OSDBU works with the SBA to develop EPA's goals for contracting with small and disadvantaged businesses; address bonding issues that pose a roadblock for small businesses in specific industries, such as environmental clean-up and construction; and address data-collection issues that are of concern to OSDBUs throughout the Federal government. EPA's OSDBU works closely with the Center for Veterans Enterprise and EPA's Regional and program offices to increase the amount of EPA procurement dollars awarded to Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSB). It also works with the

Department of Education and the White House Historically Black College and University (HBCU) Workgroup to increase opportunities for HBCUs to partner with small businesses and Federal agencies, especially in the area of scientific research and development. Work is also coordinated with the Minority Business Development Agency to fund opportunities for small disadvantaged businesses, and to collaborate to provide outreach to small disadvantage businesses and Minority-Serving Institutions throughout the United States and the trust territories. EPA's OSDBU Director is an active participant in the Federal OSDBU Council ([www.osdbu.gov](http://www.osdbu.gov)), and served as the Council's Chairperson in FYs 2004 and 2006. The OSDBU Directors collaborate to the extent possible to support major outreach efforts to small and disadvantaged businesses, SDVOSB, and minority-serving educational institutions via conferences, business fairs, and speaking engagements.

#### **Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)**

EPA makes active contributions to standing interagency management committees, including the Chief Financial Officers Council and the Federal Financial Managers' Council. These groups are focused on improving resources management and accountability throughout the Federal government. EPA also coordinates appropriately with Congress and other Federal agencies, such as Department of Treasury, Office of Management of Budget (OMB), and the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

#### **Office of Administration and Resources Management (OARM)**

EPA is committed to working with Federal partners that focus on improving

management and accountability throughout the Federal government. The Agency provides leadership and expertise to government-wide activities in various areas of human resources, grants administration, contracts management and Homeland Security. These activities include specific collaboration efforts with Federal agencies and departments through:

- Chief Human Capital Officers, a group of senior leaders that discuss human capital initiatives across the Federal government.
- Legislative and Policy Committee, a committee comprised of other Federal agency representatives who assist Office of Personnel and Management in developing plans and policies for training and development across the government.
- The Chief Acquisition Officers Council, the principal interagency forum for monitoring and improving the Federal acquisition system. The Council also is focused on promoting the President's Management Agenda in all aspects of the acquisition system, as well as the President's specific acquisition-related initiatives and policies.

The Agency is participating in government-wide efforts to improve the effectiveness and performance of Federal financial assistance programs, simplify application and reporting requirements, and improve the delivery of services to the public. This includes membership on the Grants Policy Committee, the Grants Executive Board, and the Grants.gov Users Group. EPA also participates in the Federal Demonstration

Partnership to reduce the administrative burdens associated with research grants.

EPA is working with the OMB, General Services Administrations, and Department of Commerce's National Institute of Standards and Technology to implement Homeland Security Presidential Directive No. 12 - Policy for a Common Identification Standard for Federal Employees and Contractors.

### **Office of Environmental Information (OEI)**

To support EPA's overall mission, OEI collaborates with a number of other Federal agencies and state and Tribal governments on a variety of initiatives, including initiatives to make government more efficient and transparent, protect human health and the environment, and assist in homeland security. OEI is more specifically involved in the information technology (IT), information management (IM), and information security aspects of the projects it collaborates on.

EPA is the managing partner agency of the eRulemaking Program, one of the President's 25 government-wide Electronic Government (E-Gov) initiatives. The eRulemaking Program is operated within OEI. The Program's mission is to improve public access to, understanding of, and participation in regulation development and to streamline government's management of and efficiency in promulgating regulations. In January 2003, eRulemaking launched the award-winning *Regulations.gov* web site. For the first time ever, citizens could access and comment on all proposed Federal regulations *from a single web site*. Tens of millions of public users have come to this site to find, view, and comment on proposed regulations. In September 2005, the

eRulemaking Program launched the award-winning Federal Docket Management System (publicly accessible at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov)). The Federal Docket Management System is an electronic document repository enabling agencies to post all rulemaking and non-rulemaking documents for public access and comment. Now the public also can access Federal Register documents, supporting technical/legal/economic analyses, and public comments previously only available by physically visiting a docket center. EPA and its partner agencies enhance the system each quarter by incorporating new capabilities for public and agency users, including: the ability to bookmark documents, email notification, Real Simple Syndication Feed (RSS), eAuthenticated login, electronic records, full-text search, and the ability for major search engines to locate documents within Regulations.gov. The eRulemaking Program has migrated more than 29 Departments and Independent Agencies, comprised of 161 bureaus, boards, agencies and administrations, representing more than 90% of the Federal rules promulgated annually. Collectively, this collaborative multi-agency effort is projected to result in significant savings to the Federal government through the elimination of duplicative systems (whether existing or proposed).

As part of its effort to help protect human health and the environment, EPA is coordinating with the states and tribes to improve the collection, management, and sharing of environmental information. A key component of these efforts is EPA's participation in the State/EPA Information Management Workgroup and Network Steering Board. As a member of the Board, EPA participates in action teams comprised of EPA, state, and Tribal members, designed to identify information projects that can

resolve information issues and to arrive at consensus solutions. Two of the areas that this forum has worked on extensively are developing environmental data standards and implementing new technologies for collecting and reporting information.

In addition to protecting human health and the environment, EPA also supports homeland security by coordinating extensively with a number of other Federal agencies to develop and expand the use of geographically based information. These efforts include coordination with the U. S. Geological Survey (USGS), Federal Geographic Data Committee, Chief Information Officer (CIO) Council (<http://www.cio.gov>), DHS, Council on Environmental Quality, Environmental Council of States, other national security agencies, and state agencies. Much of this work is done by multi-agency workgroups designed to ensure consistent implementation of standards and technologies across the Federal government to support efficient sharing of data, especially the sharing of geographically based data and Geographic Information Systems. A key aspect of this work is developing and implementing the infrastructure to support an assortment of national spatial data – data that can be attached to and portrayed on maps. This work has several key applications, including ensuring that human health and environmental conditions are represented in the appropriate contexts, supporting the assessment of environmental conditions and changes, and supporting first responders and other homeland security situations. Additionally, EPA coordinates with the CIO Council and other Federal agencies on projects related to information security, capital planning, workforce development, interoperability, and infrastructure related to homeland security.

Another area where EPA actively coordinates with other Governmental entities is public access to information. In addition to the E-Gov initiatives described above, EPA also coordinates with the USGS, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Fish and Wildlife Service, and state and local government partners to expand and improve public access to information affecting their lives. EPA also works with states, tribes, local agencies, and non-governmental organizations to design and implement specific community-based information projects.

OIGs of agencies with an environmental mission such as the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, and with other Federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies as prescribed by the IG Act, as amended. The OIG also promotes public awareness of opportunities to report possible fraud, waste and abuse through the OIG Hotline.

### **Office of the Inspector General (OIG)**

The EPA Inspector General is a member of the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE), an organization comprised of Presidentially-appointed Federal Inspectors General (IG), GAO, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The PCIE coordinates and improves the way Gs conduct audits, investigations and internal operations. The PCIE also promotes joint projects of government-wide interest, and reports annually to the President on the collective performance of the OIG community. The OIG Special Operations Division coordinates computer crime activities with other law enforcement organizations such as the FBI, Secret Service and Department of Justice. In addition, the OIG participates with various inter-governmental audit forums and professional associations to exchange information, share best practices, and obtain/provide training. The OIG further promotes collaboration among EPA's partners and stakeholders in the application of technology, information, resources and law enforcement efforts through its outreach activities. The EPA OIG initiates and participates in individual collaborative audits, evaluations and investigations with

## MAJOR MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

### **Introduction**

Management challenges represent potential vulnerabilities in program operations and susceptibilities to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. The Reports Consolidation Act of 2000 requires the Inspector General to identify the most serious management challenges facing EPA, briefly assess the Agency's progress in addressing them, and report annually. EPA has established a mechanism for identifying and addressing its key management challenges before they become serious problems. As part of its management integrity process, EPA senior managers meet with representatives from EPA's Office of Inspector General (OIG), the General Accountability Office (GAO), and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to hear their views on EPA's key management challenges. EPA managers also use audits, reviews, and program evaluations conducted internally and by GAO, OMB, and OIG to assess program effectiveness and identify potential management issues.

EPA remains committed to maintaining effective and efficient internal controls to ensure that program and financial activities are carried out effectively and according to applicable laws and sound management policy. The discussion that follows lists management challenges that OIG, GAO, and OMB have identified and summarizes actions EPA is taking to address these issues.

### **1. Emission Factors for Sources of Air Pollution**

*Scope of Challenge:* While the Agency has made some progress in improving its

*emission factors (e.g., developing a Quality Management Plan), challenges remain. A 2006 OIG evaluation found (1) conflicting guidance on appropriately using emissions factors, (2) a rating system that did not quantify the uncertainty associated with emissions factors, (3) inadequate funding of the program, and (4) the lack of a comprehensive plan to improve data collection and set priorities, and OIG concluded that emissions factors are being used inappropriately for key environmental decisions. EPA needs to address the large number of emission factors rated low, ensure sufficient funding to address data gaps and limitations, limit decisions being made with poor quality emissions factors, and provide industry and state or local agencies with significant non-regulatory incentives to obtain the data needed to improve emissions factors. (OIG)*

The Agency has made significant progress in addressing the issues identified in OIG's March 2006 evaluation report, *EPA Can Improve Emissions Factors Development and Management*. EPA remains on track in implementing its plan to make it easier for others to transmit and transform their emissions data into emissions factors that account for uncertainty. Building on previous success, the Agency continues to re-engineer the emissions factor program to develop emissions factors faster, increase the number of emission factors, and account for uncertainty in emissions factors.

With respect to developing guidance for using emissions factors, EPA agrees that the Agency needs to be clearer about the regulatory and environmental risks of using emissions factors, including the risks associated with their original intended application and for programs that have adopted their use as an expeditious means of achieving their goals. The Agency has

developed a new, streamlined emissions factor development process that is currently undergoing public review, and we expect to finalize these new procedures later this year.

In response to OIG's finding that the current emissions factor rating system did not quantify the uncertainty associated with emissions factors, the Agency has completed a statistical study of the uncertainty associated with published emissions factors that are based on emissions testing data, such as those contained in AP-42. We presented our approach and study results to internal reviewers and a panel of expert peer reviewers and addressed their comments and suggestions. In February 2007, EPA submitted a report describing the technical approach and the results to Congress and OMB. The report is currently available on the web for public review and comment. EPA is now beginning to analyze various policy options available for accounting for uncertainty.

The OIG has recommended the development of a comprehensive plan to improve data collection and set emission factor priorities. We have developed and submitted a comprehensive strategic plan meeting those recommendations, which is currently under review by OIG. The plan focuses on advancing direct, continuous site-specific measurements of the pollutant of concern and addresses the development and use of emissions factors for situations where site-specific measurements are infeasible or the risks of adverse program decisions are unacceptable.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Launched WebFIRE, an interactive website that combines AP-42 and FIRE data so that users are no longer required to conduct independent checks while searching for emission factors.

- Conducted an analysis to determine the uncertainty of highly-rated emissions factors.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Enhance WebFIRE to allow users independently to check and verify background information for emissions factors.
- Develop emissions factors for coke ovens, landfills, municipal waste combustors, steel mini-mills, landing losses for external floating roofs, and low pressure petroleum storage tanks.
- Initiate development of emissions factors for natural gas engines, rubber manufacturers, and animal feeding operations.

**2. Voluntary Climate Change Program/ Voluntary Climate Change Programs Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reporting**

**Scope of Challenge:** *Climate Leaders and Climate VISION, two voluntary programs aimed at securing private sector agreements to voluntarily reduce greenhouse gas emissions or emissions intensity, need to be better managed to achieve desired results. While many participants have completed program steps in a timely manner, some participants appear not to be progressing at the rate expected. GAO recommends that EPA develop written policies establishing the consequences for not completing program steps on schedule. OMB is concerned about the reliability of the estimates of GHG reduction attributable to voluntary programs such as Energy Star. (GAO and OMB)*

In its April 2006 report on climate change, GAO recommended that EPA develop written policy for increasing progress under the EPA Climate Leaders program. EPA believes GAO's recommendation was



addressed in the initial design of the program. The Agency has detailed its existing policy in an internal memorandum which documents the steps that EPA will take if it believes a participant is not completing the program requirements in a timely manner. When EPA believes a participant is not making a good faith effort to complete program requirements, the Agency will telephone the participant to re-invigorate the process; send an official letter urging the participant to act more expeditiously; and, if necessary, remove the participant from the program for noncompliance. EPA will continue to monitor participants' progress through its program tracking system, which includes a goal tracking spreadsheet and inventory of calls conducted to discuss progress.

In response to OMB's concerns about the reliability of the estimates of GHG, a recent Program Assessment Rating Tool review found EPA's climate programs to be achieving their goals. The review also highlighted the ENERGY STAR program as among the more successful in collecting and presenting performance information and using the data for management decision making. EPA publishes an annual report on the accomplishments of its voluntary programs for reducing GHG emissions. This report outlines EPA's robust methods to estimate the benefits of these programs and explains how the Agency is addressing evaluation issues. The report shows that ENERGY STAR, in particular, relies on robust, peer-reviewed methods.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Developed new peer-reviewed methods for documenting the benefits of ENERGY STAR, including energy savings and GHG reductions.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Continue to assess the progress of Climate Leader partners and request that they leave the program if they are not making sufficient progress in a reasonable period of time.
- Improve the methods that EPA employs to assess the impacts of its climate protection programs.
- Participate in interagency efforts to assess and report on the impacts of the federal climate protection policy and program.
- Review recent legislation, including the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 and the Fiscal Year 2008 Omnibus Appropriations Act, to determine the impacts of their provisions on EPA's methods for estimating the benefits of these programs.

**3. Capacity to Manage Climate Change Activities**

**Scope of Challenge:** *Recent developments in climate change science and policy (e.g., Massachusetts vs. EPA) will affect EPA's ability to protect public health and the environment. GAO believes EPA could benefit from assessing its capacity to manage climate change issues and the impact of a changing climate on existing Agency programs. EPA should evaluate its scientific and technical capacity to interpret scientific findings and incorporate them into regulatory decisions; assess its capacity to implement mandatory programs should Congress pass binding climate legislation; and review the administration of existing programs (air and water pollution) to determine implications of a changing climate on the Agency's ongoing regulatory efforts. (GAO)*

EPA agrees that recent developments in climate change science and policy will impact the Agency's programs and capacity



needs. While we have already begun the type of management and resource analyses recommended by GAO, we believe it is premature to conduct a full assessment at this time, given the uncertainty of future Congressional actions. The scope of possible future legislation under development is unknown (e.g., there is not yet consensus regarding the sectors to be covered by a possible policy or the type of “binding” measure to be used). Moreover, it is unclear when such legislation will pass and what kind of lead time EPA would have in terms of implementing the enacted policies. Under the circumstances, EPA believes Agency resources could be better used to track developments in Congress and provide technical support and analyses as requested.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Completed short-term realignment of resources to respond to the Massachusetts v. EPA decision and the President’s subsequent Executive Order to regulate GHG emissions from motor vehicles.
- With extensive senior management involvement, continue to assess the implications of Supreme Court decisions.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Continue to identify the potential air quality and climate policy implications of research on air programs.

**4. Challenges in Addressing Air Toxic Regulatory Programs Goals**

**Scope of Challenge:** *OMB believes EPA needs to continue focusing on addressing the backlog of residual risk standards and developing air toxics exposure data. (OMB)*

The 1990 Amendments to the Clean Air Act (CAA) required EPA to develop and issue Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standards to reduce emissions of air toxics from certain categories of stationary sources. EPA completed its obligation to develop initial MACT standards (96 standards for 174 source categories) in 2004. EPA anticipates that when fully implemented in 2007, the MACT standards will reduce air toxics emissions from stationary sources by 1.7 million tons per year. The CAA also requires EPA to evaluate air toxic emissions further and evaluate whether post-MACT emissions pose a risk to public health. These residual risk reviews and standards are to be developed for each source category within 8 years of promulgation of the MACT standard. In addition to the residual risk reviews, the CAA requires EPA to conduct technology reviews for each MACT standard within 8 years of promulgation. For each technology review EPA is to review and revise the MACT standard, if necessary, taking into account developments in practices, processes and control technologies.

EPA is combining the risk and technology reviews for each MACT standard. The Agency has completed risk and technology reviews for 8 MACT standards to date under consent decree orders. Sierra Club filed a notice of intent to sue on 17 additional MACT standards, and we are now beyond the 8 years for an additional 16 for a total of 33 MACT standards.

EPA has developed a new approach of streamlining the risk and technology reviews for the MACT standards. Under the new risk and technology review EPA will perform the risk and technology reviews for groups of MACT standards rather than individually. Post-MACT emissions contained in the NEI database will be used as the basis to model risk. To conduct risk

analyses, data will be reviewed by EPA and supplemented with additional data for the source category. EPA will then solicit public comment on the data and any anomalies noted to obtain the best representation of emissions from the source category. Through the residual risk and technology review (RTR) process, EPA believes it can complete the residual risk standards in a timely, scientifically creditable and cost-effective manner.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Completed 6 residual risk and technology reviews.
- Completed the Halogenated Solvents Residual Risk Rule.
- Developed datasets for each source category from NEI and risk data.
- Performed screening assessments for 34 MACT standards (50 source categories).
- Completed the Halogenated Solvents Residual Risk Rule.
- Published advanced notice of proposed rulemaking (currently reviewing comments and adding corrections to the datasets).

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Continue to conduct residual risk reviews and rules under RTR process in an accelerated manner.

**5. Efficiently Managing Water and Wastewater Resources and Infrastructure/Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds**

**Scope of Challenge:** *The Agency faces a continuing challenge in reaching thousands of small utilities and influencing their management behavior, skills, and abilities. EPA needs to be more innovative on the finance and management fronts to assist states and communities in overcoming*

*infrastructure issues. The Agency also needs to define its role as part of a long-term national strategy on sustainable water infrastructure that addresses financial and management issues. OIG questions whether EPA's "Four Pillars of Sustained Infrastructure" approach adequately addresses the infrastructure challenge. OMB and OIG agree that EPA's regulation policy on state match options should no longer allow states to use bonds repaid from SRF to meet state match requirements. (OIG and OMB)*

EPA believes it has taken and will continue to take effective steps to define and pursue its role in ensuring that the nation's water and wastewater infrastructure is sustainable in the future. While much of the change is needed at the local level, EPA provides leadership, tools, innovation, and momentum to encourage a shift toward financial and managerial sustainability. The Agency's role is to provide education and outreach and to serve as a "wholesaler" of information to our state and national professional association partners. EPA's Four Pillars of Sustainable Infrastructure (SI) have provided the structure to define the sustainability challenge, raised the visibility of the issue to a national scale, and offered a suite of approaches to move towards sustainability. Water infrastructure has been further elevated on the national stage as one of the Administrator's top four priorities.

EPA is leading by example by breaking down barriers to progress in its own programs and partnerships and working toward policies that foster sustainability, while protecting human health and the environment. Internally, EPA is speaking with one voice—reaching across offices to promote the innovation needed to address the sustainability challenge. SI has been a major topic for the national Water Division Directors' and SES meetings, helping the Agency work across traditional organizational lines to allow and promote

innovation. The Agency is promoting SI through permits, Special Environmental Projects, and injunctive relief. The Agency is also coordinating efforts in its Performance Track and Smart Growth programs to foster aspects of sustainability, energy, and infrastructure related to climate change.

EPA's efforts go well beyond the areas of focus under the Four Pillars. In the area of innovative finance, the Agency is working to allow the expanded use of Private Activity Bonds to bring more private capital into the sector and exploring and promoting innovative uses of SRF loans. In March 2007, in partnership with 14 other organizations, EPA convened a national conference on Paying for Sustainable Water Infrastructure that brought stakeholders from all levels of government and the private sector together to explore creative methods of paying for sustainable water infrastructure. Four conference tracks covered topics related to reducing costs and increasing investment in drinking water and wastewater systems and programs. The conference looked beyond the Four Pillars to broader issues and expanding all stakeholders' efforts, since solutions to the sustainability challenge will require joint and collaborative effort. EPA has since met with conference co-sponsors to consolidate learning and define critical areas for additional collaborative action, such as improved outreach to local officials.

On July 2, 2007, EPA responded to OIG's audit recommendations and agreed to assess the effects on states of its state match bond policy and the potential impact of changes to the current policy. Our assessment indicates that states show near unanimous support for the current policy and believe that its cumulative effect on the SRF program has been highly beneficial. Some states that take advantage of the current policy believe they would be unable to procure state

appropriations for match, and therefore unable to apply for federal funds. EPA will continue to work with the OIG and states to analyze the effects of this policy.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Launched WaterSense, a market enhancement program that is increasing national awareness of water-efficient choices and the value of clean and safe water.
- Signed a ground-breaking agreement with six major water and wastewater associations jointly to promote effective utility management based on a series of *Attributes of Effectively Managed Utilities*, other management tools, and utility performance measures.
- Co-sponsored the Water Quality Trading Conference with USDA that brought utility companies and the agricultural community together to build momentum for trading programs that maximize impact from infrastructure investments.
- Continued to produce assistance documents and tools targeting the needs and special circumstances of small utilities (e.g., Simple Tools for Effective Performance and Total Electronic Asset Management Software).
- Convened a *Watershed Forum* with several major utilities to discuss ways to promote adoption of various watershed tools, such as green infrastructure, into local infrastructure decisions.
- Convened a panel of experts to discuss the importance of full cost pricing of water and wastewater services by utilities.
- Co-sponsored the *Paying for Sustainable Water Infrastructure: Innovations for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Conference* which brought together

stakeholders from all levels of government and the private sector to explore creative methods for paying for sustainable water infrastructure today and into the future.

- Issued the *Water Quality Trading Toolkit for Permit Writers*, which explains how to implement the National Water Quality Trading Policy and is the first "how to trade" guidance published by the Agency (August 2007).

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Develop a *Small Communities Team* work plan focused on better management of wastewater for small communities and disadvantaged or underserved populations.
- Prepare a *Drinking Water Capacity Development Strategic Plan* to ensure that the Agency's outreach efforts to small utilities are well coordinated and effective.
- By end of summer of 2008, publish a series of "technical guides" that will provide technical information for establishing trading programs in such areas as water quality monitoring and developing scientifically-based trade ratios.
- By winter 2008, complete the *Check Up Program for Small Systems* software, an asset management tool designed to help small systems.
- Work with the Green Infrastructure Collaborative workgroup on a strategy to expand the use of green infrastructure solutions.
- Host a National Capacity Development Program workshop to expand outreach and explore solutions to the challenges faced by small systems.

**6. Safe Drinking Water Information Systems (SDWIS)**

**Scope of Challenge:** *EPA's database for collecting drinking water information is populated by data from states on drinking water violations. The database was designed to served as a compliance tracking system; however, the system depends solely on what states report to EPA as drinking water violations. OMB is concerned that the database is unable to determine definitively such questions as the number of systems in compliance, posing a problem for EPA's Office of Water managers as they try to run a program based upon limited non-compliance information from states. OMB recommends that EPA identify better methods to account for violations, such as the stratified sampling of community water systems approach that the IG suggested in March 2004. (OMB)*

EPA has worked to improve the SDWIS database, completing a major software modernization in 2005 on-time and under-budget. Additionally, EPA has assessed data quality and outlined improvement in our triennial Data Reliability Implementation/Action Plan. In collaboration with states and the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators (ASDWA), we are now implementing a comprehensive data quality improvement plan. EPA and ASDWA have agreed on a data quality goal of 90 percent for health-based violation data by the 2008-2010 triennial evaluation period: 10 states have already met this goal, and the Agency is tracking progress through its annual performance goals and measures.

EPA has focused its efforts to improve data quality on two objectives: (1) ensuring that the system that receives and maintains the data is technologically robust and user friendly; and (2) ensuring that the compliance decisions made at the state level are appropriate and accurately entered into the data system. EPA has undertaken considerable effort in the last several years to modernize the SDWIS/FED database and

improve the SDWIS/STATE application. The Agency has identified completeness of data as an important issue affecting data quality. On-site data verifications (DVs) have proven critical to identifying data quality gaps and potential root causes. OGWDW has adhered to a robust data verification audit process, conducting 15 DV audits in each of FYs 2005, 2006, and 2007, and plans an additional 15 per year in FYs 2008 and 2009.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Completed SDWIS modernization.
- Implemented a comprehensive data quality improvement plan for the SDWIS/FED.
- Provided extensive training to primacy agencies on making compliance determinations.
- Developed an electronic tool that allows states to validate their data in advance of data submission to EPA in order to ensure data completeness and enhance data quality.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Continue efforts related to training, tool development, and completion of the next Data Reliability Improvement/Action Plan.
- Continue to review the results of DVs, both on-site and eDVs.
- In FY 2008, pilot the use of the eDV tool as a means to allow states to validate their data in advance of submission to SDWIS/FED.
- Continue to work with ASDWA to address documentation of a subset of state policy decisions on compliance determinations that deviate from regulatory requirements.

**7. Water Quality Monitoring and Data**

**Scope of Challenge:** *While EPA has made progress in monitoring water quality, OMB remains concerned about EPA's ability to provide a statistically valid national assessment of water quality for decision-making at the national, state, and regional levels. OMB believes EPA's allowance of states to use Section 106 funds to assess non-statistically valid water quality monitoring has exacerbated the water quality data problem by extending the time it will take EPA and states to have complete probabilistic programs in place. EPA needs to limit the use of the additional Section 106 funds to probabilistic monitoring activities. (OMB)*

EPA believes the use of 106 funds for non-probabilistic monitoring efforts provides regions and states with flexibility they need in assessing water quality. On March 29, 2006, EPA published "Guidelines for the Award of Monitoring Initiative Funds under Section 106 Grant to States, Interstate Agencies, and Tribes" in the *Federal Register*. These guidelines outline eligibility requirements and allocation of Monitoring Initiative funds (e.g., \$8.5M for state/tribal participation in national surveys, less minor rescission, and \$10.0M for enhancements to state monitoring programs, less minor rescission). In May 2007, the Deputy Administrator negotiated an agreement allowing EPA to continue allocating the funds using this approach and incorporating a performance-based standard that will provide EPA and states with the incentive to undertake additional statistical survey programs.

EPA's regional monitoring and grants programs have been working with states to distribute Monitoring Initiative funds based on these guidelines. We are making steady progress in working with states to adopt probability surveys and are on track for meeting the performance measure for 50 states implementing state surveys by 2011.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Issued the Wadeable Streams Assessment, which lays out the baseline conditions of streams in the lower 48 states.
- Completed the monitoring design for a national lakes survey (field sampling is underway).

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Complete the monitoring design for the national rivers survey.
- Issue the third National Coastal Condition Report, which will further our understanding of the trends in coastal water conditions.

**8. Strategies for Managing Watersheds**

**Scope of Challenge:** *EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program has over 100 measures to assess progress in meeting restoration commitments, but the Agency does not have an approach to translate the measures or a strategy to target limited resources to activities outlined in Chesapeake 2000. While EPA is currently developing a Web-based system to unify its planning documents, these activities do not fully address GAO's recommendations. Additionally, EPA has made progress in guiding the development of an overall strategy for restoring environmental conditions in the Great Lakes Basin. However, it is unclear whether the strategy will be the guiding document for Great Lakes restoration. The Agency needs a clearly defined organizational structure with measurable basin-wide goals and a monitoring system as called for in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement and the Clean Water Act. The Agency also needs to follow through to ensure that progress is made on achieving the goals of the strategy. (GAO)*

In May 2004, President Bush signed Executive Order 13340, creating a cabinet-

level interagency task force to bring an unprecedented level of collaboration and coordination to restore and protect the Great Lakes. EPA's Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) was cited in the Order and given the responsibility for providing assistance in carrying out the goals of the Order. In addition, the Order created a Federal Interagency Task Force to bring the many governmental partners together to protect and restore the Great Lakes. In December 2005, the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration developed a strategy to guide federal, state, tribal and other partners' action to restore the Great Lakes. Federal commitments have been identified in the Federal Near-Term Action Plan and are being implemented. GLNPO is tracking performance in improving the Great Lakes and progress toward commitments in the Federal Near-Term Action Plan.

To address GAO concerns regarding the Chesapeake Bay Program, EPA has taken steps to enhance assessment and reporting on the health and restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program Office is developing a strategic implementation plan (SIP) that identifies activities for achieving health and restoration goals for the Chesapeake Bay. This plan, which will be completed in phases, includes five overarching goals and ten key commitments. The first phase focuses on federal actions and is expected to be completed by the end of CY 2007. To date, federal partners (regional and national) have agreed to the goals in the SIP, determined the leads for each of the goals, and agreed to develop a strategic plan that includes annual goals and targets (based on federal funding). The next phase of the SIP will focus on integrating state and federal activities.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Issued an assessment report on the Chesapeake Bay which describes the

current health of the Bay and progress made in implementing management actions.

- Redesigned how the Agency presents indicator information on its Bay Trends and Indicators website (refer to <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/indicators.htm>).
- Supported the Great Lakes Interagency Task Force in meeting its requirement to submit a report that summarizes task force activities and recommendations that advance the policy of Executive Order 13340.
- Completed 13 of 48 near term actions, with almost all of the rest on track toward completion. Completed projects include a standardized sanitary survey tool for beach managers to identify pollution sources at beaches and \$525,000 in grants piloting the tool to assess 60 beaches in the Great Lakes. In addition, Asian Silver Carp, Largemouth Silver Carp, and Black Carp were listed as injurious under the Lacey Act; and the operation of the electric carp barrier in Illinois was continued, to prevent the spread of these species into the Great Lakes.
- Coordinated with NOAA, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, NRCS, and EPA to collectively provide almost \$2 million in federal funding, and even more in leveraged non-federal funds, to support 36 projects to make on-the-ground gains in protecting and restoring watersheds in the Great Lakes.
- Remediated over 800,000 cubic yards of contaminated sediment at five sites under the Great Lakes Legacy Act. Through leveraging, we have utilized federal, state, and private dollars to remove 1.5 million pounds of contaminated sediments

from the environment, thereby reducing risk to aquatic life and human health, including over 25,000 pounds of PCBs, over one million pounds of chromium, about 400 pounds of mercury, and 171 pounds of lead.

- Coordinated and leveraged resources with relevant agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, pursuant to the Great Lakes Habitat/Wetlands Initiative to restore, protect or improve approximately 65,000 acres of wetlands towards a 100,000 acre near-term goal. Great Lakes States have committed to meet a similar 100,000 acre wetlands goal.
- Established the Federal Aquatic Invasive Species Rapid Response Subcommittee to coordinate Federal efforts to respond to aquatic invasive species entering the Great Lakes. The Subcommittee and Collaboration partners have developed a Communication Protocol that will assist in coordinating efforts and communication to stem new invaders to the Lakes and to ensure resources and expertise can be brought to bear to the problems of new invaders.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Continue to work with partners to develop basin-wide goals and indicators for the Great Lakes.
- Continue to work with Environment Canada to develop indicators for measuring the health of the Great Lakes.
- Conduct an independent scientific review of the 2006 assessment report.

## 9. **Management of Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST)**

**Scope of Challenge:** *EPA relies on states to ensure that tank owners and operators are in compliance with federal financial responsibility regulations under the underground storage tank program, but does not provide specific guidance to states as to whether or how frequently they should verify coverage. GAO believes EPA lacks assurance that states are adequately overseeing and enforcing financial responsibility provisions and that the Agency's method of monitoring whether state assurance funds provide adequate financial responsibility coverage is limited. In addition, GAO finds that EPA's distribution of Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund money to states depends on data that may be inaccurate, due to state reporting requirements. (GAO)*

In response to GAO's report, *Leaking Underground Storage Tanks: EPA Should Take Steps to Better Ensure the Effective Use of Public Funding for Cleanups*, EPA agrees that regular verification of financial responsibility coverage is important to ensure adequate funding for cleaning up future releases. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct) requires EPA or states, as appropriate, to conduct on-site inspections of USTs every 3 years to determine compliance with requirements imposed by Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act. On April 24, 2007, EPA issued final grant guidelines to implement those requirements. These guidelines require that the inspections assess compliance with the financial responsibility requirements.<sup>16</sup>

Additionally, EPA agrees that increased oversight of state assurance fund (state fund)

solvency is necessary and important. As the report indicates, EPA recently developed a monitoring tool to assess the financial condition of state funds. EPA is working to improve implementation and utility of that tool. Also, in response to EPAct, EPA is working on guidance to revise and improve its process for monitoring the financial soundness of state funds and work with less solvent funds to improve solvency. EPA expects to complete this guidance in 2008.

Each year EPA distributes LUST Trust Fund money, under an allocation formula that reflects state performance and need, using information reported by states in their end-of-year activity reports. The information contained in these reports, including the number of releases and the population of active tanks, indicates program need and program performance. Nonetheless, EPA agrees with GAO that it is important to ensure the accuracy of information used to support the LUST allocation formula. EPA will continue to work with regions and states to implement quality control measures and, in particular, work toward ensuring that reported data is consistent with existing EPA definitions and is limited to federally-regulated USTs. In addition, as EPA begins working on the EPAct requirements pertaining to the LUST Trust Fund allocation, it will work with regions and states to consider other changes to improve the distribution of future LUST money, including changes that more specifically reflect the need at abandoned LUST sites.

### **Highlights of progress include:**

- Issued final Grant Guidelines on Inspection Requirements, Grant Guidelines to States for Implementing the Inspection Provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. [http://www.epa.gov/OUST/fedlaws/final\\_i.htm](http://www.epa.gov/OUST/fedlaws/final_i.htm)

<sup>16</sup> Grant Guidelines to States for Implementing the Inspection Provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, EPA 510-R-07-004, April 2007, [http://www.epa.gov/OUST/fedlaws/final\\_i.htm](http://www.epa.gov/OUST/fedlaws/final_i.htm)



- Continued to emphasize regions' use of the "Quality Assurance/Quality Control Evaluation Checklist" prior to submitting their states' mid-year and annual performance activities. This checklist is a tool to ensure the quality of state and regional data.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Increase efforts to assess the solvency of state funds by raising the level of attention to this issue at national level and providing guidance to regions on increasing their oversight of state funds and reporting annually on their findings.

## **10. Chemical Regulation**

**Scope of Challenge:** *Recent GAO reviews found that EPA does not routinely assess the risks of all existing chemicals and faces challenges in obtaining the information necessary to do so. Although EPA initiated the High Production Volume (HPV) Challenge Program, it is not yet clear whether the program will produce sufficient information for EPA to determine chemicals' risks to human health and the environment. Furthermore, EPA's reviews of new chemicals provide only limited assurance that health and environmental risks are identified before the chemicals enter commerce. In addition, EPA has limited ability to publicly share the information it receives from chemical companies under TSCA. GAO has recommended that Congress consider providing EPA additional authorities under TSCA to improve its ability to assess chemical risks. GAO recommends that EPA develop and implement a methodology for using information collected through the HPV Challenge Program to prioritize chemicals for further review and identify information needed to assess their risks; promulgate a rule requiring chemical companies to submit to EPA copies of health and safety studies they submit to foreign*

*governments; develop a strategy for validating risk assessment models; and revise regulations to require companies to reassert claims of confidentiality within a certain time period. (GAO)*

EPA will continue work initiated in FY 2007 to evaluate the screening level chemical hazard data obtained through the U.S. High Production Volume (HPV) Challenge Program and companion Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Screening Information Data Set (SIDS) Program. These efforts, combined with the expanded exposure information reported under the 2006 TSCA Inventory Update Reporting (IUR) rule, will lead to the development of risk-based prioritization documents for HPV chemicals. Similar work was initiated in FY 2008, and will continue in 2009, to develop prioritization documents on Moderate Production Volume (MPV) chemicals (25,000 – 1 million pounds/year). This work is included in the Security and Prosperity Partnership agreement between the U.S., Canada and Mexico, under which the U.S. committed to assess and initiate action on over 9,000 HPV and MPV chemicals by 2012. The risk- and hazard-based prioritization documents identify needed actions on chemicals presenting potential risks. Actions initiated by EPA could involve voluntary information collection, chemical testing, or risk reduction efforts and regulatory actions such as Significant New Use Rules (SNURs), Section 4 Test Rules, or other rules to prevent unreasonable risks.

In addition, EPA continues to follow the Council on Regulatory Environmental Monitoring guidance for evaluating environmental models. EPA is also working internally to validate the use of Structure Activity Relationships assessment tools, giving the Agency confidence in the models

and tools it uses to investigate potential risks from new chemicals.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Completed screening-level hazard characterization reports for 301 HPV chemicals, exceeding the FY 2007 target of 259. Cumulative progress is 931.
- Completed 33 Proposed Acute Exposure Guideline Levels (AEGs) which emergency planners and first responders use to prepare for and deal with chemical emergencies by determining safe exposure levels. (This brings the cumulative total since 2006 to 56.)
- Developed and released a Global Data Portal, which allows searching, viewing, and exchanging of test data between the United States, European Union, and other governments (2008). (See <http://cs3-hq.oecd.org/scripts/hpv/> for more information.)
- Hosted the "National HPV Chemical Data Users Conference" in December 2006 and two regional conferences in 2007, and used feedback to improve public accessibility to the HPV data.
- Collected expanded screening level exposure-related data on an estimated 7 to 8 thousand chemicals, including processing and use exposure-related data on approximately 40% of those chemicals, under IUR.
- Initiated the Nanoscale Materials Stewardship Program (NMSP) to better characterize existing chemical risks from nanoscale materials.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Increase the production of HPV risk-based decisions to bring the

cumulative total to from 150 to 490 chemicals in FY 2009.

- Increase the number of MPV hazard-based decisions from 55 anticipated in FY 2008 to 650 planned for FY 2009.
- Industry will contribute as well to the 3,000 HPV chemical component of the SPP commitments through the industry-led Extended High Production Volume Challenge Program (EHPV), which focuses on approximately 500 chemicals that achieved HPV status after the HPV Challenge Program had commenced.
- Implement its NMSP, which will gather existing data on manufactured nanoscale materials and encourage the development of additional test data.
- Complete the development of a final HPV Challenge report and make it publicly available.
- Evaluate options to change the Voluntary Children's Chemical Evaluation Program (VCCEP) based on experience gained during the pilot phase of the program. Options include modifying certain features of the program to enable VCCEP to operate more rapidly and efficiently, and applying the VCCEP approach to further evaluate HPV Challenge chemicals for which EPA has special concerns after completing screening-level hazard, exposure and risk characterizations.

## **11. Enforcement and Compliance Activities**

**Scope of Challenge:** *With budget constraints and limited resources and the Nation's high expectations for environmental protection, EPA must develop more flexible and cost-effective approaches for managing environmental enforcement and compliance programs. The Agency*

*needs to intensify efforts to move from a performance management system focused on inspections toward a system focused on achieving measurable improvements; ensure that funds are used to achieve consistent and equitable enforcement; and develop an effective workforce strategy and assessment system to ensure resources are appropriately allocated. Additionally, EPA needs to improve its enforcement data to determine the universe of regulated entities and their characteristics and address apparent inconsistencies in program delivery among EPA's regional offices. (GAO)*

EPA has made considerable progress in recent years in developing and implementing a performance and results-based national enforcement and compliance program. In FY 2005, the Agency began to focus its national enforcement and compliance program on “national enforcement priority” areas of noncompliance that have the most significant effects on public health and the environment. These priorities were determined in consultation with the regions and states and were set for an initial 3-year cycle of 2005-2007. For each priority area, the Agency developed a specific strategy for targeting and achieving results. The Agency also developed specific measures of success, including the key outcome measure of “pounds of pollution reduced or treated” and used a limited number of key management measures, developed in concert with regional measures, to monitor its progress and ensure the accomplishment of its annual goals.

In FY07, the Agency again consulted with regions and states to determine whether the current set of priorities should remain in place for the next 3-year cycle, and whether additional environmental risk and noncompliance problems should be considered. The consensus indicated that the current priorities remain the highest

priority problems of national significance. The Agency evaluated progress toward the goals set for each of the national priorities using data derived from key measures. Based on that analysis, strategies were adjusted where needed to ensure efforts are focused appropriately, and goals and measures were refined to better articulate and measure the effectiveness of the Agency's national enforcement program.

EPA has implemented several measures and management practices to ensure equitable and consistent enforcement across the nation. We have established national enforcement priorities; created national Strategy Implementation Teams, with regional and headquarters members, to develop the implementation plans for each national priority area; issued national policies and guidance; and implemented the State Review Framework to enhance the Agency's ability to evaluate and oversee state programs.

EPA continues work to ensure that its resources are directed to the most significant risks to public health and the environment. Identifying national enforcement priorities is critical to this effort, and EPA has used a collaborative process that examines noncompliance in a particular candidate area, the environmental gains from reducing or eliminating the problem, and the appropriateness of an active Federal role in achieving compliance. For the past 5 years, the Agency has reserved funds for addressing resource gaps in implementing these national priorities. Teams responsible for overseeing the implementation of each of the priorities develop competitive proposals to fund activities, tools, and technology to support implementation. Preference in funding is given to proposals that leverage existing resources, improve efficiency, address unmet needs, and have the greatest potential to produce results.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Reduced, treated, or eliminated 890 million pounds of pollutants and 1.5 million cubic yards of contaminated soil and water in FY 2007.
- Issued the *Guide for Addressing Environmental Problems: Using an Integrated Strategic Approach*, which provides guidance on selecting the appropriate tools to address noncompliance and environmental problems in a specific context in order to achieve the best outcome.
- Conducted a detailed data-driven review of the performance of each region's compliance and enforcement program including fact-based discussion with regions regarding their results.
- Implemented the SRF to ensure that regional offices conduct consistent oversight of states, and that states consistently implement environmental enforcement programs. The SRF provides critical information on a state's or region's core environmental and compliance assurance performance based on existing data available in EPA's national database. With funding from OPEI, began an in-depth program evaluation of the SRF to enable adjustments aimed at maximizing its effectiveness. The review process has included state and regional participation to ensure all stakeholders' experiences and perspectives are considered.
- Developed the *Key Management Measures Report* for senior managers, which highlights key data on significant noncompliance, raising the visibility and scrutiny of such information.
- In December 2007, held a workshop in which experts discussed white papers on the state of the science of

measuring compliance assistance outcomes as well as general and specific deterrent impacts of monitoring and enforcement.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Work toward developing an environmental problem-based strategic architecture centered on enforcement, monitoring, and assistance. This will replace the current tool-based objectives.
- Building on the findings and recommendations in the white papers discussed above, the Agency will explore the feasibility of a pilot project aimed at developing a methodology for measuring general deterrence within specific sectors.

## **12. Workforce Planning/Human Capital Management**

**Scope of Challenge:** *OIG and GAO believe that EPA continues to face challenges in managing human capital and workforce planning, including its ability to attract, develop, and retain a skilled, diverse, and results-oriented workforce. Although EPA has completed a comprehensive Strategic Workforce Plan for maintaining the right people, at the right location, and at the right time, an OIG review of the Agency's workforce planning effort reveals challenges which may affect the Agency's ability to get to "green" status on the PMA scorecard. GAO finds that despite EPA's progress in improving the management of its human capital, the Agency has not effectively implemented its human capital strategic plan and needs to comprehensively assess its workforce and continue monitoring its progress to ensure a well-trained and motivated workforce with the right mix of skills and experience. GAO further notes that if EPA is to improve its resource planning process, the Agency needs to obtain reliable data on key workload indicators and design budget and*

*cost accounting systems that can isolate resources needed and allocated to key activities. (OIG and GAO)*

In FY 2001, EPA acknowledged human capital (HC) as an Agency-level weakness. Over the years, the Agency has made significant progress in strengthening its HC program. This included developing a robust HC accountability program, improving the HC audit program, expanding the Agency's leadership development programs to enhance skills and ensure continuity of leadership, and establishment of a workforce planning system. As of FY 2007, the Agency had completed all of its improvements except for a few final improvements to address the workforce planning component of the human capital weakness identified in FY 2001. To address the workforce planning concerns identified by OIG and GAO, EPA developed a workforce planning/competency management system that gauges skill gaps and guides the design of strategies for closing the gaps. EPA has worked closely with OMB and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to align the Agency's Human Capital Strategy to meet the objectives outlined in the President's Management Agenda (PMA) as it relates to the Strategic Management of Human Capital. The Agency expects to complete all final corrective actions related to this weakness in FY 2008.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- In FY 2007, retained a "green" progress score for Human Capital under the PMA in every quarter, and remained on target to attain a "green" status score in December 2008.
- Completed implementation of all cycles of the workforce planning process for EPA's priority Mission Critical Occupations, resulting in no major competency or resource gaps.

- Completed implementation of a complete, self-directed Human Capital Accountability system for EPA.
- Continued preparation for full implementation of the electronic Official Personnel Folders (e-OPF).
- Completed initial cost-benefit analysis on HR LoB initiative options for EPA HR IT systems and completed initial analysis of EPA HR consolidation options for EPA HR operations.
- Launched the *"Successful Leaders Program"* as the new EPA-wide mandatory new supervisors training program.
- Achieved EPA's objective for SES time-to-hire of less than 73 days between advertisement and offer.
- Implemented the second successful round of the EPA Agency-wide SES mobility program.
- Achieved full certification from OPM for EPA's SES pay and performance system.
- Completed a full succession planning analysis for EPA SES critical positions, exceeding targets for bench-strength.
- Completed a new EPA Recruiting Plan.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Complete all final corrective actions for workforce planning related to this weakness in FY 2008.

**13. Grants Management**

**Scope of Challenge:** *GAO believes that while EPA has issued a 5-year grants management plan and made progress in achieving reforms, weaknesses in implementation and accountability continue to hamper effective grants management. In particular, GAO cites problems remaining*

*in documenting ongoing monitoring of grantee performance and in closing out grants. EPA's lack of monitoring documentation hinders the Agency's ability to collect important data and ensure that grant recipients have met all financial requirements. (OIG and GAO)*

In FY 2000, EPA acknowledged assistance agreements as an Agency-level weakness. Over the years, the Agency has taken substantial actions to improve its management of assistance agreements through updated policies, increased training, and improved accountability. While grants management will continue to require sustained management attention, the Agency has in place an infrastructure responsive to the concerns identified by OIG and GAO. EPA has completed and validated the effectiveness of all corrective actions associated with this weakness. The Agency closed this weakness in September 2007.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Continued to enhance grant management skills of EPA employees through mandatory training. As a result, virtually all EPA grants are now managed by certified project officers.
- To strengthen oversight and respond to GAO and internal EPA recommendations, EPA developed a revised Post-Award Monitoring Order that becomes effective January 2008.
- Implemented the Agency's Green Plan for the improvement of financial data, specifically the interface between the Integrated Grants Management System and the Integrated Financial Management System.
- Conducted a two-phase study to review the identified output and outcomes of grant work plans and

the progress reports that follow these work plans.

- Continued to implement the Agency's revised competition policy, having competed almost 92 percent of new grants, exceeding performance targets in the Grants Management Plan.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Sustain management attention to grants management.
- Maintain the infrastructure the Agency has established in response to issues identified by GAO and OIG.

**14. Financial Management Practices**

**Scope of Challenge:** *GAO annual reviews of EPA's budget justification and related financial management practices have identified several management challenges: the need for enhancing oversight of processes for conducting and tracking closeouts of expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements and limitations in the Agency's ability to account for its spending on voluntary programs or certain fixed costs, including security and utilities. GAO believes EPA also needs to better account for and report on deobligations and recertifications of expired funds. (GAO)*

EPA currently uses several financial systems to account for Agency spending. The Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS) is based on 1980s technology and has required several work-around databases and modules to track expenditures effectively. The Budget Automation System (BAS) system, for example, tracks program budgets in more detail than IFMS permits. The Agency's Business Intelligence Tool (ORBIT) was recently upgraded, and some program offices have been unable to utilize fully the system's capabilities. EPA is developing a replacement system for IFMS

that will enable better practices in financial management. While a temporary interim fix would be to create additional sub-object class codes for fixed costs, the Agency already tracks utility costs closely and is taking steps to further improve the oversight of utility and security charges.

In response to GAO's concerns regarding closeout of expired contracts, EPA's contracting officers review all expired contracts on a monthly basis and report to Office Directors and Deputy Directors on the status of closeout actions. Whenever possible, the Agency performs desk reviews to expedite contract closeouts. However, when we encounter issues with a contractor's direct or indirect cost rates or potential claims about the completion of work or deliverables under a contract, we cannot close the contract and deobligate all unliquidated obligations immediately after it expires. In these cases, not only EPA but either party may recover funds.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Installed advanced web-based metering systems at the Research Triangle Park field office, which covers 40 percent of EPA's total energy usage.
- Completed advance metering site visits at 75 percent of its other field offices.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Continue to review energy usage quarterly for each reporting laboratory.
- Complete remaining 25 percent of advance metering site visits.
- Begin implementing the EPA Act 2005 requirements to install "advance metering at all appropriate facilities by 2012.

## **15. Managing for Results**

**Scope of Challenge:** *OIG states that while many of EPA's programs received high PART scores in areas such as program purpose and program management, the Agency continues to face challenges in demonstrating program results due to the lack of independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality; the failure to collect timely and credible performance information; the lack of ambitious targets and timeframes for long-term measures; and the failure to tie budget requests to accomplishing performance goals. OIG believes EPA needs to focus on the logic of program design to ensure that programs and processes have clear and measurable results that allow for transparency and accountability for program performance. Further, OIG believes EPA needs to develop a systematic process for conducting its program evaluations, including leveraging resources for program evaluation competitions and establishing a community of knowledgeable and experienced evaluators from which to draw. Additionally, EPA must continue its efforts to improve strategic planning and tracking of accomplishments and their associated costs. (OIG)*

Over the past years, national programs, regional offices, and the Agency's external stakeholders have worked collaboratively to strengthen results-based management at EPA. In FY 2006, the Agency issued its *2006-2011 Strategic Plan*, which charts an ambitious course for environmental protection over the next 5 years and focuses on achieving measurable results that will help advance the protection of human health and the environment. The revised *Strategic Plan* reflects more outcome-oriented goals and objectives and benefits from information on environmental indicators and from futures analysis. The Agency continues to improve the quality of its performance measures as well as its ability to track the cost of achieving environmental

results by reducing reporting burden, strengthening data quality, and reinforcing accountability.

OMB acknowledges EPA's significant accomplishments in the area of Financial Performance and Budget and Performance Integration under the PMA. For the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> quarters of FY 2007, EPA received status and progress scores of "green" for its continued use of financial and performance information in day-to-day program management and decision making. EPA also continued efforts to streamline efficiency measures.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Enhanced the Annual Commitment System (ACS) to track three new classes of measures (Senior Executive Service organizational assessment, state grant template, and regional priorities). The system also flags measures that contribute to OMB's PART reviews.
- Launched a new intranet website (<http://intranet.epa.gov/ocfo/acs>) to provide Agency staff with information on ACS development and the annual performance commitment process.
- Developed new detailed performance reports through the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's Reporting and Business Intelligence Tool (ORBIT).
- Retired the Management and Accounting Reporting Systems (MARS), saving \$1 million annually and improving Agency access to key budget and financial management reports.
- Achieved OMB approval of efficiency measures for all 51 of EPA's completed PART programs.
- Issued the *2006-2011 Strategic Plan*, which reflects a sharper focus on priorities established by the

Administrator (i.e., environmental justice, innovation and collaboration, environmental stewardship, and the role of state and tribal partners).

- Received a "green" status score for Budget and Performance Integration under the PMA for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarters of FY 2007.
- Maintained and improved the ACS as a management tool for senior managers to support more effective program management and use of results in Agency decision making.

**Plans for further improvements:**

- Identify and implement initiatives that support the Agency's vision for greater central governance of performance measures and stronger program and organizational accountability.
- Improve senior managers' access to the Agency's performance information by modifying data systems (BAS, PERS, ACS) to include a "measures central" screen. The screen will improve the usability of the data system and serve as a filter for all Agency performance measures (GPRA, QMR, and senior management measures).
- Identify and endorse a limited set of "top tier" measures and integrate them in the FY 2008 National Program Managers Guidance, FY 2008 annual commitment process, and FY 2009 budget.
- Continue to promote and maintain ORBIT as a primary reporting tool for Agency budget, financial, and performance data.
- Expand the Agency's use of the state grant template to report on FY 2007 results, increasing transparency and ensuring that state grants are accountable for achieving EPA's mission.



## **16. Data Gaps/Environmental Information**

**Scope of Challenge:** *While noting EPA's progress in addressing critical data gaps in its environmental information, both OIG and GAO believe the Agency still lacks the data it needs to manage for environmental results. OIG notes that data needed to measure program success, to improve risk assessments, and to understand the effectiveness of specific controls are not always available and recommends that EPA continue efforts to set priorities for filling data gaps and that it develop new and strengthen existing outreach programs to leverage data collection efforts with states, tribes, territories, and industries. GAO cites challenges the Agency faces in filling critical data gaps to incorporate better scientific understanding into assessments of environmental trends and conditions and to develop better performance measures for managing programs and measuring program effectiveness. (OIG and GAO)*

As part of its strategic planning, EPA continues to implement and refine processes to identify data gaps and to set priorities for addressing them. For example, the Agency is coordinating the draft Report of the Environment (ROE) with its strategic planning and budgeting process. As part of developing EPA's 2006-2011 Strategic Plan, national program managers (NPMs) considered the suite of ROE questions and indicators to help develop better environmental performance goals and measures and to identify and set priorities for filling gaps in the information needed to manage programs. NPMs were also required to develop preliminary strategies for improving performance measures to make them more environmental-outcome oriented. Each strategy identified priorities for filling key data gaps to meet the most critical needs and provided a brief recommendation on how to address critical gaps in program data.

### **Highlights of progress include:**

- Developed a pilot (endorsed by Indicators Steering Committee) that assesses how the ROE and strategic planning efforts can best inform and support one another.
- Completed the Water pilot, as part of the ROE/Strategic Plan pilots.
- Briefed the Indicators Steering Committee on the preliminary accomplishments of the ROE/Strategic Plan Pilot.
- Implemented a comprehensive work plan to measure the performance of the Exchange Network.

### **Plans for further improvements include:**

- Continue to further refine the process to identify and prioritize data gaps identified in the ROE as part of the Agency's Strategic Plan and budgeting planning processes.

## **17. Data Standards and Data Quality**

**Scope of Challenge:** *OIG acknowledges that EPA has a substantive effort in place to develop data standards and guide their implementation but notes that standards are not yet incorporated into all information collections. OIG also notes the need for EPA and its partners to continue to focus on ensuring that data are of sufficient quality for decision-making (e.g., assess the integrity of laboratories' drinking water data and incorporate techniques into the laboratory oversight process to identify improper practices and fraud into the laboratory oversight process). OIG recommends EPA set protocols for data system training (e.g., data entry) to ensure that decision makers will have immediate access to reliable water quality data during an emergency. (OIG)*

EPA declared "Implementation of Data Standards" an Agency-level weakness under FMFIA in FY 2005, and has since made

progress in addressing challenges related to data standards and data quality. The Agency currently has in place a corrective action strategy that addresses issues identified by OIG. In response to OIG concerns regarding the integrity of laboratories, EPA continues to require laboratories to submit Quality Assurance Reports and Work Plans annually. In accordance with a February 2004 policy directive developed by the Agency's Science Policy Council, laboratories are to seek accreditation from independent accrediting organizations or conduct independent external assessments of their laboratory practices to demonstrate competency. As of April 2007, nine laboratories have achieved accreditation. While EPA has completed the milestones associated with correcting its "Implementation of Data Standards" weakness, we will continue to monitor and verify performance, promote awareness, and develop training modules to implement data standards.

As part of its strategic planning, EPA continues to implement and refine processes to identify data gaps and to set priorities for addressing them. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) directed the Office of Research and Development (ORD) to work with the Office of Environmental Information (OEI) and the Report on the Environment (ROE) Steering Committee to identify Agency priorities for environmental indicators, monitoring, and related information. This effort includes consideration of the Preliminary Strategies developed as part of the 2006-2011 strategic planning process and the ongoing ROE Pilots. In response to the CFO's direction, the ROE Steering Committee is working to identify the most strategic monitoring/data-development or informational priorities that should be taken into account in future Agency budget strategies as well as the next round of strategic planning.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Initiated a ranking process to identify the priorities for environmental indicators, monitoring and related information. Results from the ranking process will be reviewed by the ROE Steering Committee, the Science Policy Council Steering Committee, and the Regional Planners. A report will be completed in early 2008 and will be used to inform the FY 2010 planning and budgeting and the 2009-2014 strategic planning process.
- Developed a communications plan promoting implementation of upcoming standards and awareness of associated documentation, including implementation strategy, procedures, and best practices.
- Issued a semi-annual Data Standards "Report Card" designed to track program implementation of data standards.
- Reviewed data standards implementation for all systems managed under one prime contractor.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Continue to refine the process to identify and rank data gaps identified in the ROE as part of the Agency's *Strategic Plan* and budget and planning processes.
- Design and launch a new EPA data standards website that will provide data standards and implementation information for EPA program offices and system developers.
- Continue to monitor implementation of data standards within the Registry of EPA Application and Databases and publish the semi-annual Data Standards Report Card.

## **18. Information Technology Systems Development and Implementation**

**Scope of Challenge:** *While EPA has made some improvements in IT system development and implementation, the Agency needs more management controls and oversight to ensure that IT projects meet the performance standards established by OMB. OIG believes EPA needs to: (1) ensure high-risk IT projects do not exceed prescribed cost and schedule variances; (2) ensure that offices complete system life cycle documentation in a timely manner; and (3) finalize its draft November 2006 Earned Value Management Procedures, which are used to assist project managers in collecting and reporting on performance of major IT investments. (OIG)*

In its September 2005 report, "EPA Needs to Improve Oversight of Its Information Technology Projects," OIG noted that EPA has experienced system development and implementation problems and did not sufficiently oversee information technology (IT) projects to ensure they met planned budgets and schedules.

In response to OIG's audit findings, EPA developed an action plan to enhance management control and oversight. The action plan calls for formally delegating the responsibility for independent oversight review, adding a question in the Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process focusing on System Life Cycle documentation and approvals, and further emphasizing the importance of reviewing solutions architecture documents. It also calls for revising the System Life Cycle Management Procedures and continued outreach and education for senior management and Senior Information Officials. While EPA's Chief Information Officer (CIO) has the lead for ensuring effective IT project management, primary authority and responsibility lies with the senior manager in the office that owns the IT

project, with appropriate oversight by the CIO.

### **Highlights of progress include:**

- Received certification from program and regional Senior Information Officials that all IT acquisitions of \$2 million or more had undergone an E-Gov, Line of Business, and SmartBuy review.
- Ensured that program offices completed Earned Value Management (EVM) analysis and reporting for on-going development projects.
- Developed Enterprise Architecture Governance Procedures that require review, approval, and certification that solutions architectures are aligned with both federal and EPA enterprise architectures.
- Conducted outreach briefings for Agency Senior Information Officials, discussing CPIC and project management.
- Issued the draft *Enterprise Architecture Program 2007 Architecture Development Standard and Guidance*.

### **Plans for further improvements include:**

- Finalize the draft *Earned Value Management Procedures* by the end of FY 2008. The draft is currently being reviewed by program managers.
- Continue to conduct outreach briefings with senior management.
- Conduct annual EVM program reviews with project managers.
- Continue to work with the appropriate office to ensure that EVM systems are included in contracts and to establish guidelines for project/program compliance and system certification.

## 19. Privacy Programs

**Scope of Challenge:** *The protection of personally identifiable information (PII) has become the subject of recent oversight by OMB. Like many agencies, EPA is challenged in focusing on its privacy responsibilities and integrating privacy into E-Gov and other mandated privacy activities. EPA needs to update overarching policies outlining administration and management of the privacy program; complete plans to ensure compliance with privacy program policies and procedures and establish oversight; and continue to establish practices to help privacy program managers measure the success of the program. EPA program and regional offices must work together to ensure program success. EPA needs to complete and implement privacy program guidance and other planned activities. (OIG)*

EPA acknowledges that it faces challenges in establishing privacy programs, including revising and developing policies, establishing oversight and accountability, ensuring compliance, and measuring success. However, over the past year, EPA has made significant progress in integrating its privacy and security reporting responsibilities into its business processes.

In June 2006, the Agency established a Personal Identifiable Information (PII) Workgroup under the Quality Information Council to identify and implement short- and long-term actions to protect PII from unauthorized access and disclosure. The workgroup developed an action plan to ensure that key privacy initiatives are met and that the critical tenets of the privacy program are accomplished. The action plan, which includes milestones and expected outcomes, will help the Agency better understand its risks for PII breaches by knowing where its privacy collections are located, managed, and accessed and whether the Agency is storing and collecting

unnecessary PII. EPA has already completed several critical activities within the action plan and will continue to monitor progress in this area.

### **Highlights of progress include:**

- Reviewed the Agency's technical controls to ensure consistency with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and OMB requirements.
- Prepared System of Records for new system (on-going).
- Established and implemented guidance for preparing Privacy Impact Assessments on all new Agency systems (on-going).
- Reviewed Agency privacy policies to ensure they address the controls identified by NIST.
- Reviewed all Agency Privacy Act Systems of Records to determine which systems are remotely accessed, are downloaded, and/or collect sensitive PII, and whether stringent controls are required.
- Reviewed and submitted draft language for the Agency's new telework policy to ensure that employees are aware of their responsibilities to protect PII when working offsite.

### **Plans for further improvements include:**

- Develop a privacy intranet website that will make privacy documents available to employees.
- Continue to monitor progress to ensure the Agency is in compliance with NIST and OMB standards and/or requirements.

## 20. Agency Efforts in Support of Homeland Security

**Scope of Challenge:** *An OIG evaluation of the Agency's Emergency Response*

*Business Plan identified planning assumptions and aspects of the planning process that may challenge EPA's ability to rely on the Plan as a valid assessment of its readiness. OIG believes the plan does not: (1) provide the rationale for the incidents of national significance on which it is based; (2) document the methodology used to determine the required emergency response resources; (3) address the involvement of other federal or state and local emergency response agency resources; (4) incorporate lessons learned; and (5) address the criteria or responsible agencies for deciding when residents may return to an area impacted by an incident. GAO also raises concerns regarding EPA's communications about potential health risks residents may face and protective gear they should have when returning to their homes after an emergency. (OIG and GAO)*

EPA developed an Emergency Response Business (ER) Plan to increase the Agency's preparedness in responding to environmental and homeland security related disasters. The plan provides a framework for the Agency to address simultaneous incidents of national significance while maintaining effective day-to-day emergency response and removal operations. In preparing the plan, headquarters and regions use five simultaneous incidents in a "worst case" planning scenario around which to develop detailed assessments, gap analyses, and program activities.

EPA is currently working on an agency wide National Approach to Response (NAR) Implementation Plan to address the overall preparedness framework for five simultaneous incidents of national significance. This plan will build on the 2006 ER Business Plan. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has developed 15 nationally significant scenarios, many of which will require a substantial response effort by EPA. The five DHS scenarios selected for agency planning are: a chemical incident (blister agent), a radiation incident

(RDD), a biological incident (anthrax), and two natural disasters (earthquake and hurricane). A workgroup is currently preparing resource estimates for each of the scenarios.

These estimates will then be used by regional groupings to develop response plans that consider among other things, state and local relationships, unique challenges and regional response assets. The development of the NAR Implementation Plan will be an iterative process. It will identify any gaps and be used to prioritize future preparedness activities.

#### **Highlights of progress include:**

- Developed an *Incident Management Handbook* that provides guidance on organizational structure and outlines the communications flow during an incident of national significance.
- Developed and implemented an *Information Technology Strategy* that allows EPA to share information with its partners through the Emergency Management Portal and with the general public from its public web site.
- Formed an *Administrative and Finance Workgroup* to address procurement, property tracking, and pay issues.
- Developed a draft plan for acquiring and maintaining field communications equipment for EPA's emergency response programs.
- Issued the final version of EPA's National Approach to Response (NAR) Crisis Communication Plan. The plan addresses roles and responsibilities for incidents of national significance.
- Developed draft guidance for the Response Support Corps which will support the emergency response staff.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Implement the Emergency Response Business Plan's approach for making the necessary changes in the management of personnel, financial, and other resources through NAR priority projects.
- Continue to develop training courses related to weapons of mass destruction and pandemic and avian influenza.

## **21. Voluntary Programs**

**Scope of Challenge:** *EPA supports and advocates a range of voluntary programs addressing a wide variety of environmental challenges. However, the growth of these programs has not been matched by appropriate organization and oversight. OIG work has found that EPA does not have (1) Agency-wide policies on key evaluative elements; (2) consistent and reliable data; (3) operational guidelines that allow for comparative assessments; (4) definitions that help staff categorize or identify voluntary programs; and (5) a systematic process to develop, test, market, and evaluate the effectiveness of voluntary programs. (OIG)*

EPA programs and regions support a range of voluntary/partnership programs, which function as an adjunct to regulatory programs or fill in where a regulatory approach is not practicable. These programs are diverse in size, scope, environmental media, target environmental issue, and stakeholder base. They range from high-profile programs such as ENERGY STAR and Performance Track to smaller, more targeted programs such as Sunwise or Natural Gas STAR. There are more than 50 partnership programs Agency-wide which are managed by many different program offices and regions, each of which is responsible for ensuring that programs are well designed and well run. Thus, it is difficult for any single office response to

address such a broadly-defined management challenge.

However, the Agency's Innovation Action Council (IAC), which directs and oversees the Agency's innovation agenda, has initiated a number of efforts to clarify the goals and measures and evaluate the results of innovative and "voluntary" partnership programs. As part of this initiative, a Partnership Program Coordination Team has been formed within OPEI's National Center for Environmental Innovation.

**Highlights of progress include:**

- Issued guidelines on optimal program design, performance measurement, and marketing.
- Implemented a notification system for new and expanding programs.
- Established a charter that includes an Agency-wide workgroup and network to maximize uniform understanding of and compliance with relevant policies and procedures.
- Established a coordination function in the Office of the Administrator to encourage sound program design and management, with a special emphasis on performance measurement.
- Finalized guidelines for marketing partnership programs, and issued a compilation of previous guidelines. Guidelines are available on the Partners intranet website at: <http://www.epa.gov/partners>.
- Formed a cross-agency Partnership Program Review Workgroup, charged with developing a framework for the systematic evaluation and assessment of partnership programs.

**Plans for further improvements include:**

- Initiate the development of a new set of Guidelines on Program Evaluation for partnership programs.
- Finalize a Progress/Accomplishments Report that will compile the environmental results reported by programs across the Agency.
- Conduct training on best practices and procedures, and arrange seminars and discussion groups on new research on trends and strategies.

## EPA USER FEE PROGRAM

In FY 2009, EPA will have several user fee programs in operation. These user fee programs and proposals are as follows:

### **Current Fees: Pesticides**

The FY 2009 President's Budget reflects the continued collection of Maintenance fees for review of existing pesticide registrations, and Enhanced Registration Service Fees for the accelerated review of new pesticide registration applications.

- **Pesticides Maintenance Fee Extension**

The Maintenance fee provides funding for the Reregistration program and a certain percentage supports the processing of applications involving "me-too" or inert ingredients. In FY 2009, the Agency expects to collect \$22 million in Maintenance fees under current law.

- **Enhanced Registration Services**

Entities seeking to register pesticides for use in the United States pay a fee at the time the registration action request is submitted to EPA specifically for accelerated pesticide registration decision service. This process has introduced new pesticides to the market more quickly. In FY 2009, the Agency expects to collect \$6 million in Enhanced Registration Service fees under current law.

### **Current Fees: Other**

- **Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee**

Since 1989, the Pre-Manufacturing Notifications (PMN) fee has been collected for the review and processing of new chemical pre-manufacturing notifications submitted to EPA by the chemical industry.

These fees are paid at the time of submission of the PMN for review by EPA's Toxic Substances program. PMN fees are authorized by the Toxic Substances Control Act and contain a cap on the amount the Agency may charge for a PMN review. EPA is authorized to collect up to \$1.8 million in PMN fees in FY 2009 under current law.

- **Lead Accreditation and Certification Fee**

The Toxic Substances Control Act, Title IV, Section 402(a)(3), mandates the development of a schedule of fees for persons operating lead training programs accredited under the 402/404 rule and for lead-based paint contractors certified under this rule. The training programs ensure that lead paint abatement is done safely. Fees collected for this activity are deposited in the U.S. Treasury. EPA estimates that \$1 million will be deposited in FY 2009.

- **Motor Vehicle and Engine Compliance Program Fee**

This fee is authorized by the Clean Air Act of 1990 and is managed by the Air and Radiation program. Fee collections began in August 1992. This fee is imposed on manufacturers of light-duty vehicles, light and heavy trucks and motorcycles. The fees cover EPA's cost of certifying new engines and vehicles and monitoring compliance of in-use engines and vehicles.

In 2004, EPA promulgated a rule that updated existing fees and established fees for newly-regulated vehicles and engines. In addition to cars and trucks, the fees for new compliance programs are also imposed on heavy-duty, in-use, and nonroad industries, including large diesel and gas



equipment (earthmovers, tractors, forklifts, compressors, etc), handheld and non-handheld utility engines (chainsaws, weed-whackers, leaf-blowers, lawnmowers, tillers, etc.), marine (boat motors, watercraft, jet-skis), locomotive, aircraft and recreational vehicles (off-road motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles). Since then, EPA has added or proposed to apply certification fees to additional industry sectors as new programs are developed, such as for stationary engines and for evaporative requirements for nonroad engines. In FY 2009, EPA expects to collect \$19.4 million from this fee.

### **Fee Proposals: Pesticides**

- **Pesticides Tolerance Fee**

A tolerance is the maximum legal limit of a pesticide residue in and on food commodities and animal feed. In 1954, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) authorized the collection of fees for the establishment of tolerances on raw agricultural commodities and in food commodities. The collection of this fee has been blocked by the Pesticides Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) through 2012. Legislative language will be submitted to allow for the collection of Pesticide Tolerance fees in FY 2009 and the Administration will submit legislative language proposing to collect \$13 million in Pesticide Tolerance fees in FY 2009.

- **Enhanced Registration Services**

Legislative language will be submitted proposing to publish a new fee schedule to collect an additional \$12 million in FY 2009 to better align fee collections with program costs. Currently those who directly benefit from EPA's registration services cover only a fraction of the costs to operate the

program, leaving the general taxpayer to shoulder the remaining burden.

- **Pesticides Maintenance Fee Extension**

Under current law, the Agency expects to collect \$22 million in Maintenance fees in FY 2009. Legislative language will be submitted to allow the collection of an additional \$23 million in order to more closely align fee collections with program costs. The President's Budget proposes to relieve the burden on the general taxpayer and finance the costs of operating the Reregistration program from those who directly benefit from EPA's reregistration activities.

### **Fee Proposals: Other**

- **Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee**

Under the current fee structure, the Agency would collect \$1.8 million in FY 2009. Legislative language will be submitted to remove the statutory cap in the Toxic Substances Control Act on Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fees. In FY 2009, EPA expects to collect an additional \$4 million by removing the statutory cap.

## **WORKING CAPITAL FUND**

In FY 2009, the Agency begins its thirteenth year of operation of the Working Capital Fund (WCF). It is a revolving fund authorized by law to finance a cycle of operations, where the costs of goods and services provided are charged to users on a fee-for-service basis. The funds received are available without fiscal year limitation, to continue operations and to replace capital equipment. EPA's WCF was implemented under the authority of Section 403 of the Government Management Reform Act of 1994 and EPA's FY 1997 Appropriations Act. Permanent WCF authority was contained in the Agency's FY 1998 Appropriations Act.

The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) initiated the WCF in FY 1997 as part of an effort to: (1) be accountable to Agency offices, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congress; (2) increase the efficiency of the administrative services provided to program offices; and (3) increase customer service and responsiveness. The Agency has a WCF Board which provides policy and planning oversight and advises the CFO regarding the WCF financial position. The Board, chaired by the Associate Chief Financial Officer, is composed of eighteen permanent members from the program and regional offices.

Four Agency activities provided in FY 2008 will continue into FY 2009. These are the Agency's information technology and telecommunications operations, managed by the Office of Environmental Information, Agency postage costs, managed by the Office of Administration, and the Agency's core accounting system and relocation services, which are both managed by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

The Agency's FY 2009 budget request includes resources for these four activities in each National Program Manager's submission, totaling approximately \$185.0 million. These estimated resources may be increased to incorporate the additional service needs of program offices during the operating year. To the extent that these increases are subject to Congressional reprogramming notifications, the Agency will comply with all applicable requirements. In FY 2009, the Agency will continue to market its information technology and relocation services to other Federal agencies in an effort to deliver high quality services external to EPA, which will result in lower costs to EPA customers.

## **ACRONYMS FOR STATUTORY AUTHORITIES**

**AEA:** Atomic Energy Act, as amended, and Reorganization Plan #3

**ADA:** Americans with Disabilities Act

**ADEA:** Age Discrimination in Employment Act

**AHERA:** Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act

**AHPA:** Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act

**ASHAA:** Asbestos in Schools Hazard Abatement Act

**APA:** Administrative Procedures Act

**ASTCA:** Antarctic Science, Tourism, and Conservation Act

**BEACH Act of 2000:** Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act

**BRERA:** Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act

**CAA:** Clean Air Act

**CAAA:** Clean Air Act Amendments

**CCA:** Clinger Cohen Act

**CCAA:** Canadian Clean Air Act

**CEPA:** Canadian Environmental Protection Act

**CERCLA:** Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (1980)

**CFOA:** Chief Financial Officers Act

**CFR:** Code of Federal Regulations

**CICA:** Competition in Contracting Act

**CRA:** Civil Rights Act

**CSA:** Computer Security Act

**CWPPR:** Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act of 1990

**CWA:** Clean Water Act

**CZARA:** Coastal Zone Management Act Reauthorization Amendments

**CZMA:** Coastal Zone Management Act

**DPA:** Deepwater Ports Act

**DREAA:** Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act

**ECRA:** Economic Cleanup Responsibility Act

**EFOIA:** Electronic Freedom of Information Act

**EPAA:** Environmental Programs Assistance Act

**EPAAR:** EPA Acquisition Regulations

**EPCA:** Energy Policy and Conservation Act

**EPACT:** Energy Policy Act

**EPCRA:** Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act

**ERD&DAA:** Environmental Research, Development and Demonstration Authorization Act

**ESA:** Endangered Species Act

**ESECA:** Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act

**FACA:** Federal Advisory Committee Act

**FAIR:** Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act

**FCMA:** Fishery Conservation and Management Act

**FEPCA:** Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act; enacted as amendments to FIFRA.

**FFDCA:** Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act

**FGCAA:** Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act

**FIFRA:** Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

**FLPMA:** Federal Land Policy and Management Act

**FMFIA:** Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act

**FOIA:** Freedom of Information Act

**FPAS:** Federal Property and Administration Services Act

**FPA:** Federal Pesticide Act

**FPPA:** Federal Pollution Prevention Act

**FPR:** Federal Procurement Regulation

**FQPA:** Food Quality Protection Act

**FRA:** Federal Register Act

**FSA:** Food Security Act

**FUA:** Fuel Use Act

**FWCA:** Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

**FWPCA:** Federal Water Pollution and Control Act (aka CWA)

**GISRA:** Government Information Security Reform Act

**GMRA:** Government Management Reform Act

**GPRA:** Government Performance and Results Act

**HMTA:** Hazardous Materials Transportation Act

**HSWA:** Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments

**IGA:** Inspector General Act

**IPA:** Intergovernmental Personnel Act

**IPIA:** Improper Payments Information Act

**ISTEA:** Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act

**LPA-US/MX-BR:** 1983 La Paz Agreement on US/Mexico Border Region

**MPPRCA:** Marine Plastic Pollution, Research and Control Act of 1987

**MPRSA:** Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act

**NAAEC:** North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation

**NAAQS:** National Ambient Air Quality Standard

**NAWCA:** North American Wetlands Conservation Act,

**NEPA:** National Environmental Policy Act

**NHPA:** National Historic Preservation Act

**NIPDWR:** National Interim Primary Drinking Water Regulations

**NISA:** National Invasive Species Act of 1996

**ODA:** Ocean Dumping Act

**OPA:** The Oil Pollution Act

**OWBPA:** Older Workers Benefit Protection Act

**PBA:** Public Building Act

**PFCRA:** Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act

**PHSA:** Public Health Service Act

**PLIRRA:** Pollution Liability Insurance and Risk Retention Act

**PR:** Privacy Act

**PRA:** Paperwork Reduction Act

**QCA:** Quiet Communities Act

**RCRA:** Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

**RLBPHRA:** Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act

**RFA:** Regulatory Flexibility Act

**RICO:** Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act

**SARA:** Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986

**SBREFA:** Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

**SBLRBRERA:** Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act

**SDWA:** Safe Drinking Water Act

**SICEA:** Steel Industry Compliance Extension Act

**SMCRA:** Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act

**SPA:** Shore Protection Act of 1988

**SWDA:** Solid Waste Disposal Act

**TCA:** Tribal Cooperative Agreement

**TSCA:** Toxic Substances Control Act

**UMRA:** Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

**UMTRLWA:** Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Land Withdrawal Act

**USC:** United States Code

**USTCA:** Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act

**WQA:** Water Quality Act of 1987

**WRDA:** Water Resources Development Act

**WSRA:** Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

**WWWQA:** Wet Weather Water Quality Act of 2000

## FY 2009 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS

### Statutory Authority and Eligible Uses (Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Section 103	Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and Tribal representatives and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states)	Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to addressing regional haze.	\$1,000.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	\$0.0



Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Sections 103, 105, 106	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA; Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states); Interstate air quality control region designated pursuant to section 107 of the CAA or of implementing section 176A, or section 184 NOTE: only the Ozone Transport Commission is eligible	Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program support costs, including monitoring activities (section 105); Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA (sections 103 and 106); Supporting training for CAA section 302(b) air pollution control agency staff (sections 103 and 105); Supporting research, investigative and demonstration projects(section 103)	\$215,825.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	\$185,580.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Tribal Air Quality Management	CAA, Sections 103 and 105; Tribal Cooperative Agreements (TCA) in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribes; Intertribal Consortia; State/ Tribal College or University	Conducting air quality assessment activities to determine a Tribe's need to develop a CAA program; Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program costs; Supporting training for CAA for Federally-recognized Tribes	\$10,769.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	\$13,300.0
Radon	TSCA, Sections 10 and 306; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	State Agencies, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in the development and implementation of programs for the assessment and mitigation of radon	\$7,948.0	Goal 1, Obj. 2	\$8,074.0
Water Pollution Control (Section 106)	FWPCA, as amended, Section 106; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Interstate Agencies	Develop and carry out surface and ground water pollution control programs, including NPDES permits, TMDL's, WQ standards, monitoring, and NPS control activities.	\$218,206.0	Goal 2, Obj. 2	\$221,664.0
Nonpoint Source (NPS – Section 319)	FWPCA, as amended, Section 319(h); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement EPA-approved state and Tribal nonpoint source management programs and fund priority projects as selected by the state.	\$200,857.0	Goal 2, Obj. 2	\$184,540.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Wetlands Program Development	FWPCA, as amended, Section 104 (b)(3); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Interstate Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, Non-Profit Organizations	To develop new wetland programs or enhance existing programs for the protection, management and restoration of wetland resources.	\$16,567.0	Goal 4, Obj. 3	\$16,830.0
Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	SDWA, Section 1443(a); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assistance to implement and enforce National Primary Drinking Water Regulations to ensure the safety of the Nation's drinking water resources and to protect public health.	\$97,554.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	\$99,100.0
Homeland Security Grants	SDWA, Section 1442; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	To assist states and Tribes in coordinating their water security activities with other homeland security efforts.	\$4,873.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	\$4,950.0
Underground Injection Control (UIC)	SDWA, Section 1443(b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement and enforce regulations that protect underground sources of drinking water by controlling Class I-V underground injection wells.	\$10,721.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	\$10,891.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Beaches Protection	BEACH Act of 2000; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Local Governments	Develop and implement programs for monitoring and notification of conditions for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public.	\$9,746.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	\$9,900.0
Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	RCRA, Section 3011; FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Development & Implementation of Hazardous Waste Programs	\$101,734.0	Goal 3, Obj. 1 Obj. 2	\$103,346.0
Brownfields	CERCLA, as amended by the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (P.L. 107-118); GMRA (1990); FGCAA.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Build and support Brownfields programs which will assess contaminated properties, oversee private party cleanups, provide cleanup support through low interest loans, and provide certainty for liability related issues.	\$48,723.0	Goal 4, Obj. 2	\$49,495.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Underground Storage Tanks (UST)	SWDA, as amended by the Superfund Reauthorization Amendments of 1986 (Subtitle I), Section 2007(f), 42 U.S.C. 6916(f)(2); EPCRA of 2005, Title XV – Ethanol and Motor Fuels, Subtitle B – Underground Storage Tank Compliance, Sections 1521-1533, P.L. 109-58, 42 U.S.C. 15801; Tribal Grants -P.L. 105-276.	States, Federally-Recognized Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Develop and/or implement state or Indian UST program; provide funding for SEE enrollees to work on the states' underground storage tanks and to support direct UST implementation programs.	\$2,461.0	Goal 3, Obj. 1	\$22,800.0
Pesticides Program Implementation	FIFRA, Sections 20 and 23; the FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement the following programs through grants to states, Tribes, partners, and supporters: Certification and Training / Worker Protection, Endangered Species Protection Program (ESPP) Field Activities, Tribal Program, and Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program.	\$12,768.0	Goal 4, Obj. 1	\$12,970.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Lead	TSCA, Sections 10 and 404 (g); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement the lead-based paint activities in the Training and Certification program through EPA-authorized state, territorial and Tribal programs and, in areas without authorization, through direct implementation by the Agency. Activities conducted as part of this program include issuing grants for the training and certification of individuals and firms engaged in lead-based paint abatement and inspection activities and the accreditation of qualified training providers.	\$13,352.0	Goal 4, Obj. 1	\$13,564.0
Toxic Substances Compliance	TSCA, Sections 28(a) and 404 (g); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in developing and implementing toxic substances enforcement programs for PCBs, asbestos, and lead-based paint	\$5,019.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	\$5,099.0
Pesticide Enforcement	FIFRA § 23(a)(1); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in implementing cooperative pesticide enforcement programs	\$18,419.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	\$18,711.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN, aka "the Exchange Network")	As appropriate, CAA, Section 103; CWA, Section 104; RCRA, Section 8001; FIFRA, Section 20; TSCA, Sections 10 and 28; MPRSA, Section 203; SDWA, Section 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, Section 6605; FY 2002 Appropriations Act and FY 2003 Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Interstate Agencies, Tribal Consortium, Other Agencies with Related Environmental Information Activities	Helps states, territories, tribes, and intertribal consortia develop the information management and technology (IM/IT) capabilities they need to participate in the Exchange Network, to continue and expand data-sharing programs, and to improve access to environmental information.	\$9,844.0	Goal 5, Obj. 2	\$11,000.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Pollution Prevention	Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, Section 6605; TSCA Section 10; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Provides assistance to states and state entities (i.e., colleges and universities) and Federally-recognized Tribes and intertribal consortia in order to deliver pollution prevention technical assistance to small and medium-sized businesses. A goal of the program is to assist businesses and industries with identifying improved environmental strategies and solutions for reducing waste at the source.	\$4,863.0	Goal 5, Obj. 2	\$4,940.0
Sector Program (previously Enforcement & Compliance Assurance)	As appropriate, CAA, Section 103; CWA, Section 104; FIFRA, Section 20; TSCA, Sections 10 and 28; MPRSA, Section 203; SDWA, Section 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	State, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Multi-Jurisdictional Organizations, Universities, Associations of Environmental Regulatory Personnel	Assist in developing innovative sector-based, multi-media, or single-media approaches to enforcement and compliance assurance. Provide training on sectors, compliance and enforcement, and single or multi-media programs.	\$1,209.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	\$1,828.0



Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Tribal General Assistance Program	Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act (42 U.S.C. 4368b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribal Governments, Intertribal Consortia	Plan and develop Tribal environmental protection programs.	\$56,037.0	Goal 5, Obj. 3	\$57,925.0

**PROGRAM PROJECTS BY APPROPRIATION**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Acquisition Management</b>	<b>\$54,802.0</b>	<b>\$53,118.0</b>	<b>\$56,345.0</b>	<b>\$3,227.0</b>
EPM	\$29,992.0	\$28,629.0	\$31,195.0	\$2,566.0
LUST	\$165.0	\$162.0	\$165.0	\$3.0
Superfund	\$24,645.0	\$24,327.0	\$24,985.0	\$658.0
<b>Administrative Law</b>	<b>\$5,260.0</b>	<b>\$5,178.0</b>	<b>\$4,949.0</b>	<b>(\$229.0)</b>
EPM	\$5,260.0	\$5,178.0	\$4,949.0	(\$229.0)
<b>Alternative Dispute Resolution</b>	<b>\$2,012.0</b>	<b>\$1,985.0</b>	<b>\$2,110.0</b>	<b>\$125.0</b>
EPM	\$1,175.0	\$1,160.0	\$1,264.0	\$104.0
Superfund	\$837.0	\$825.0	\$846.0	\$21.0
<b>Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations</b>	<b>\$45,157.0</b>	<b>\$52,585.0</b>	<b>\$46,647.0</b>	<b>(\$5,938.0)</b>
IG	\$38,008.0	\$41,099.0	\$39,483.0	(\$1,616.0)
Superfund	\$7,149.0	\$11,486.0	\$7,164.0	(\$4,322.0)
<b>Beach / Fish Programs</b>	<b>\$2,830.0</b>	<b>\$2,789.0</b>	<b>\$2,795.0</b>	<b>\$6.0</b>
EPM	\$2,830.0	\$2,789.0	\$2,795.0	\$6.0
<b>Brownfields</b>	<b>\$23,450.0</b>	<b>\$23,665.0</b>	<b>\$22,732.0</b>	<b>(\$933.0)</b>
EPM	\$23,450.0	\$23,665.0	\$22,732.0	(\$933.0)
<b>Brownfields Projects</b>	<b>\$89,258.0</b>	<b>\$93,518.0</b>	<b>\$93,558.0</b>	<b>\$40.0</b>
STAG	\$89,258.0	\$93,518.0	\$93,558.0	\$40.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Beaches Protection</b>	<b>\$9,900.0</b>	<b>\$9,746.0</b>	<b>\$9,900.0</b>	<b>\$154.0</b>
STAG	\$9,900.0	\$9,746.0	\$9,900.0	\$154.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Brownfields</b>	<b>\$49,495.0</b>	<b>\$48,723.0</b>	<b>\$49,495.0</b>	<b>\$772.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
STAG	\$49,495.0	\$48,723.0	\$49,495.0	\$772.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Environmental Information</b>	<b>\$12,850.0</b>	<b>\$9,844.0</b>	<b>\$11,000.0</b>	<b>\$1,156.0</b>
STAG	\$12,850.0	\$9,844.0	\$11,000.0	\$1,156.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance</b>	<b>\$103,346.0</b>	<b>\$101,734.0</b>	<b>\$103,346.0</b>	<b>\$1,612.0</b>
STAG	\$103,346.0	\$101,734.0	\$103,346.0	\$1,612.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$4,950.0</b>	<b>\$4,873.0</b>	<b>\$4,950.0</b>	<b>\$77.0</b>
STAG	\$4,950.0	\$4,873.0	\$4,950.0	\$77.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Lead</b>	<b>\$13,564.0</b>	<b>\$13,352.0</b>	<b>\$13,564.0</b>	<b>\$212.0</b>
STAG	\$13,564.0	\$13,352.0	\$13,564.0	\$212.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)</b>	<b>\$194,040.0</b>	<b>\$200,857.0</b>	<b>\$184,540.0</b>	<b>(\$16,317.0)</b>
STAG	\$194,040.0	\$200,857.0	\$184,540.0	(\$16,317.0)
<b>Categorical Grant: Pesticides Enforcement</b>	<b>\$18,711.0</b>	<b>\$18,419.0</b>	<b>\$18,711.0</b>	<b>\$292.0</b>
STAG	\$18,711.0	\$18,419.0	\$18,711.0	\$292.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Pesticides Program Implementation</b>	<b>\$12,970.0</b>	<b>\$12,768.0</b>	<b>\$12,970.0</b>	<b>\$202.0</b>
STAG	\$12,970.0	\$12,768.0	\$12,970.0	\$202.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)</b>	<b>\$221,664.0</b>	<b>\$218,206.0</b>	<b>\$221,664.0</b>	<b>\$3,458.0</b>
STAG	\$221,664.0	\$218,206.0	\$221,664.0	\$3,458.0

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention</b>	<b>\$5,940.0</b>	<b>\$4,863.0</b>	<b>\$4,940.0</b>	<b>\$77.0</b>
STAG	\$5,940.0	\$4,863.0	\$4,940.0	\$77.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)</b>	<b>\$99,100.0</b>	<b>\$97,554.0</b>	<b>\$99,100.0</b>	<b>\$1,546.0</b>
STAG	\$99,100.0	\$97,554.0	\$99,100.0	\$1,546.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Radon</b>	<b>\$8,074.0</b>	<b>\$7,948.0</b>	<b>\$8,074.0</b>	<b>\$126.0</b>
STAG	\$8,074.0	\$7,948.0	\$8,074.0	\$126.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Sector Program</b>	<b>\$2,228.0</b>	<b>\$1,209.0</b>	<b>\$1,828.0</b>	<b>\$619.0</b>
STAG	\$2,228.0	\$1,209.0	\$1,828.0	\$619.0
<b>Categorical Grant: State and Local Air Quality Management</b>	<b>\$185,180.0</b>	<b>\$216,825.0</b>	<b>\$185,580.0</b>	<b>(\$31,245.0)</b>
STAG	\$185,180.0	\$216,825.0	\$185,580.0	(\$31,245.0)
<b>Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$9,844.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$9,844.0)</b>
STAG	\$0.0	\$9,844.0	\$0.0	(\$9,844.0)
<b>Categorical Grant: Toxics Substances Compliance</b>	<b>\$5,099.0</b>	<b>\$5,019.0</b>	<b>\$5,099.0</b>	<b>\$80.0</b>
STAG	\$5,099.0	\$5,019.0	\$5,099.0	\$80.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Tribal Air Quality Management</b>	<b>\$10,940.0</b>	<b>\$10,769.0</b>	<b>\$13,300.0</b>	<b>\$2,531.0</b>
STAG	\$10,940.0	\$10,769.0	\$13,300.0	\$2,531.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Tribal General Assistance</b>	<b>\$56,925.0</b>	<b>\$56,037.0</b>	<b>\$57,925.0</b>	<b>\$1,888.0</b>

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
<b>Program</b>				
STAG	\$56,925.0	\$56,037.0	\$57,925.0	\$1,888.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Underground Injection Control (UIC)</b>	<b>\$10,891.0</b>	<b>\$10,721.0</b>	<b>\$10,891.0</b>	<b>\$170.0</b>
STAG	\$10,891.0	\$10,721.0	\$10,891.0	\$170.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks</b>	<b>\$22,274.0</b>	<b>\$2,461.0</b>	<b>\$22,800.0</b>	<b>\$20,339.0</b>
STAG	\$22,274.0	\$2,461.0	\$22,800.0	\$20,339.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Wetlands Program Development</b>	<b>\$16,830.0</b>	<b>\$16,567.0</b>	<b>\$16,830.0</b>	<b>\$263.0</b>
STAG	\$16,830.0	\$16,567.0	\$16,830.0	\$263.0
<b>Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance</b>	<b>\$100,368.0</b>	<b>\$99,042.0</b>	<b>\$107,856.0</b>	<b>\$8,814.0</b>
EPM	\$74,960.0	\$73,949.0	\$80,623.0	\$6,674.0
LUST	\$1,102.0	\$1,085.0	\$1,131.0	\$46.0
Superfund	\$24,306.0	\$24,008.0	\$26,102.0	\$2,094.0
<b>Children and Other Sensitive Populations: Agency Coordination</b>	<b>\$6,203.0</b>	<b>\$6,144.0</b>	<b>\$6,309.0</b>	<b>\$165.0</b>
EPM	\$6,203.0	\$6,144.0	\$6,309.0	\$165.0
<b>Civil Enforcement</b>	<b>\$129,594.0</b>	<b>\$132,828.0</b>	<b>\$135,250.0</b>	<b>\$2,422.0</b>
EPM	\$126,645.0	\$129,886.0	\$133,017.0	\$3,131.0
Oil Spills	\$2,065.0	\$2,072.0	\$2,233.0	\$161.0
Superfund	\$884.0	\$870.0	\$0.0	(\$870.0)
<b>Civil Rights / Title VI Compliance</b>	<b>\$11,240.0</b>	<b>\$11,065.0</b>	<b>\$11,097.0</b>	<b>\$32.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
EPM	\$11,240.0	\$11,065.0	\$11,097.0	\$32.0
<b>Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs</b>	<b>\$27,647.0</b>	<b>\$28,246.0</b>	<b>\$28,157.0</b>	<b>(\$89.0)</b>
EPM	\$19,388.0	\$19,131.0	\$19,898.0	\$767.0
S&T	\$8,259.0	\$9,115.0	\$8,259.0	(\$856.0)
<b>Climate Protection Program</b>	<b>\$101,031.0</b>	<b>\$108,705.0</b>	<b>\$98,410.0</b>	<b>(\$10,295.0)</b>
EPM	\$87,927.0	\$90,374.0	\$87,008.0	(\$3,366.0)
S&T	\$13,104.0	\$18,331.0	\$11,402.0	(\$6,929.0)
<b>Commission for Environmental Cooperation</b>	<b>\$4,022.0</b>	<b>\$3,962.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$3,962.0)</b>
EPM	\$4,022.0	\$3,962.0	\$0.0	(\$3,962.0)
<b>Compliance Assistance and Centers</b>	<b>\$30,548.0</b>	<b>\$28,742.0</b>	<b>\$27,513.0</b>	<b>(\$1,229.0)</b>
EPM	\$29,547.0	\$27,725.0	\$26,435.0	(\$1,290.0)
LUST	\$688.0	\$709.0	\$753.0	\$44.0
Oil Spills	\$291.0	\$286.0	\$303.0	\$17.0
Superfund	\$22.0	\$22.0	\$22.0	\$0.0
<b>Compliance Incentives</b>	<b>\$9,930.0</b>	<b>\$10,777.0</b>	<b>\$10,409.0</b>	<b>(\$368.0)</b>
EPM	\$9,786.0	\$10,618.0	\$10,263.0	(\$355.0)
Superfund	\$144.0	\$159.0	\$146.0	(\$13.0)
<b>Compliance Monitoring</b>	<b>\$94,610.0</b>	<b>\$89,891.0</b>	<b>\$97,217.0</b>	<b>\$7,326.0</b>
EPM	\$93,428.0	\$88,726.0	\$96,025.0	\$7,299.0
Superfund	\$1,182.0	\$1,165.0	\$1,192.0	\$27.0
<b>Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations</b>	<b>\$49,902.0</b>	<b>\$49,125.0</b>	<b>\$49,756.0</b>	<b>\$631.0</b>
EPM	\$49,747.0	\$48,971.0	\$49,756.0	\$785.0
Superfund	\$155.0	\$154.0	\$0.0	(\$154.0)

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Congressionally Mandated Projects</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$162,476.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$162,476.0)</b>
EPM	\$0.0	\$13,437.0	\$0.0	(\$13,437.0)
S&T	\$0.0	\$5,316.0	\$0.0	(\$5,316.0)
STAG	\$0.0	\$143,723.0	\$0.0	(\$143,723.0)
<b>Criminal Enforcement</b>	<b>\$48,855.0</b>	<b>\$49,795.0</b>	<b>\$52,214.0</b>	<b>\$2,419.0</b>
EPM	\$39,688.0	\$40,742.0	\$44,384.0	\$3,642.0
Superfund	\$9,167.0	\$9,053.0	\$7,830.0	(\$1,223.0)
<b>Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program</b>	<b>\$35,000.0</b>	<b>\$59,064.0</b>	<b>\$49,220.0</b>	<b>(\$9,844.0)</b>
STAG	\$35,000.0	\$59,064.0	\$49,220.0	(\$9,844.0)
<b>Drinking Water Programs</b>	<b>\$100,383.0</b>	<b>\$100,097.0</b>	<b>\$103,035.0</b>	<b>\$2,938.0</b>
EPM	\$96,967.0	\$96,722.0	\$99,476.0	\$2,754.0
S&T	\$3,416.0	\$3,375.0	\$3,559.0	\$184.0
<b>Endocrine Disruptors</b>	<b>\$5,890.0</b>	<b>\$8,663.0</b>	<b>\$5,847.0</b>	<b>(\$2,816.0)</b>
EPM	\$5,890.0	\$8,663.0	\$5,847.0	(\$2,816.0)
<b>Enforcement Training</b>	<b>\$3,985.0</b>	<b>\$3,923.0</b>	<b>\$3,901.0</b>	<b>(\$22.0)</b>
EPM	\$3,145.0	\$3,096.0	\$3,043.0	(\$53.0)
Superfund	\$840.0	\$827.0	\$858.0	\$31.0
<b>Environment and Trade</b>	<b>\$1,945.0</b>	<b>\$1,920.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$1,920.0)</b>
EPM	\$1,945.0	\$1,920.0	\$0.0	(\$1,920.0)
<b>Environmental Education</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$8,860.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$8,860.0)</b>
EPM	\$0.0	\$8,860.0	\$0.0	(\$8,860.0)
<b>Environmental Justice</b>	<b>\$4,579.0</b>	<b>\$7,144.0</b>	<b>\$4,568.0</b>	<b>(\$2,576.0)</b>
EPM	\$3,822.0	\$6,399.0	\$3,811.0	(\$2,588.0)
Superfund	\$757.0	\$745.0	\$757.0	\$12.0
<b>Exchange Network</b>	<b>\$16,797.0</b>	<b>\$16,548.0</b>	<b>\$19,491.0</b>	<b>\$2,943.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
EPM	\$15,364.0	\$15,137.0	\$18,058.0	\$2,921.0
Superfund	\$1,433.0	\$1,411.0	\$1,433.0	\$22.0
<b>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations</b>	<b>\$480,865.0</b>	<b>\$471,569.0</b>	<b>\$490,551.0</b>	<b>\$18,982.0</b>
B&F	\$26,931.0	\$26,511.0	\$26,931.0	\$420.0
EPM	\$303,728.0	\$297,189.0	\$311,068.0	\$13,879.0
LUST	\$901.0	\$887.0	\$902.0	\$15.0
Oil Spills	\$490.0	\$488.0	\$496.0	\$8.0
S&T	\$73,859.0	\$72,707.0	\$74,884.0	\$2,177.0
Superfund	\$74,956.0	\$73,787.0	\$76,270.0	\$2,483.0
<b>Federal Stationary Source Regulations</b>	<b>\$26,504.0</b>	<b>\$26,091.0</b>	<b>\$26,787.0</b>	<b>\$696.0</b>
EPM	\$26,504.0	\$26,091.0	\$26,787.0	\$696.0
<b>Federal Support for Air Quality Management</b>	<b>\$101,376.0</b>	<b>\$101,582.0</b>	<b>\$106,624.0</b>	<b>\$5,042.0</b>
EPM	\$90,490.0	\$89,464.0	\$95,538.0	\$6,074.0
S&T	\$10,886.0	\$12,118.0	\$11,086.0	(\$1,032.0)
<b>Federal Support for Air Toxics Program</b>	<b>\$26,963.0</b>	<b>\$26,610.0</b>	<b>\$24,996.0</b>	<b>(\$1,614.0)</b>
EPM	\$24,711.0	\$24,390.0	\$22,693.0	(\$1,697.0)
S&T	\$2,252.0	\$2,220.0	\$2,303.0	\$83.0
<b>Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification</b>	<b>\$65,722.0</b>	<b>\$66,796.0</b>	<b>\$69,543.0</b>	<b>\$2,747.0</b>
S&T	\$65,722.0	\$66,796.0	\$69,543.0	\$2,747.0
<b>Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management</b>	<b>\$26,488.0</b>	<b>\$26,243.0</b>	<b>\$29,093.0</b>	<b>\$2,850.0</b>
EPM	\$23,439.0	\$23,242.0	\$25,977.0	\$2,735.0
Superfund	\$3,049.0	\$3,001.0	\$3,116.0	\$115.0
<b>Forensics Support</b>	<b>\$17,385.0</b>	<b>\$18,632.0</b>	<b>\$17,998.0</b>	<b>(\$634.0)</b>



	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
S&T	\$15,075.0	\$14,882.0	\$15,557.0	\$675.0
Superfund	\$2,310.0	\$3,750.0	\$2,441.0	(\$1,309.0)
<b>Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay</b>	<b>\$28,768.0</b>	<b>\$30,528.0</b>	<b>\$29,001.0</b>	<b>(\$1,527.0)</b>
EPM	\$28,768.0	\$30,528.0	\$29,001.0	(\$1,527.0)
<b>Geographic Program: Great Lakes</b>	<b>\$21,757.0</b>	<b>\$21,686.0</b>	<b>\$22,261.0</b>	<b>\$575.0</b>
EPM	\$21,757.0	\$21,686.0	\$22,261.0	\$575.0
<b>Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico</b>	<b>\$4,457.0</b>	<b>\$5,618.0</b>	<b>\$4,578.0</b>	<b>(\$1,040.0)</b>
EPM	\$4,457.0	\$5,618.0	\$4,578.0	(\$1,040.0)
<b>Geographic Program: Lake Champlain</b>	<b>\$934.0</b>	<b>\$2,707.0</b>	<b>\$934.0</b>	<b>(\$1,773.0)</b>
EPM	\$934.0	\$2,707.0	\$934.0	(\$1,773.0)
<b>Geographic Program: Long Island Sound</b>	<b>\$467.0</b>	<b>\$4,922.0</b>	<b>\$467.0</b>	<b>(\$4,455.0)</b>
EPM	\$467.0	\$4,922.0	\$467.0	(\$4,455.0)
<b>Geographic Program: Other</b>	<b>\$8,575.0</b>	<b>\$32,072.0</b>	<b>\$7,715.0</b>	<b>(\$24,357.0)</b>
EPM	\$8,575.0	\$32,072.0	\$7,715.0	(\$24,357.0)
<b>Great Lakes Legacy Act</b>	<b>\$35,000.0</b>	<b>\$34,454.0</b>	<b>\$35,000.0</b>	<b>\$546.0</b>
EPM	\$35,000.0	\$34,454.0	\$35,000.0	\$546.0
<b>Homeland Security: Communication and Information</b>	<b>\$6,906.0</b>	<b>\$6,822.0</b>	<b>\$6,940.0</b>	<b>\$118.0</b>
EPM	\$6,906.0	\$6,822.0	\$6,940.0	\$118.0
<b>Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection</b>	<b>\$35,230.0</b>	<b>\$24,850.0</b>	<b>\$35,569.0</b>	<b>\$10,719.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
EPM	\$7,787.0	\$7,665.0	\$6,759.0	(\$906.0)
S&T	\$25,586.0	\$15,357.0	\$27,131.0	\$11,774.0
Superfund	\$1,857.0	\$1,828.0	\$1,679.0	(\$149.0)
<b>Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery</b>	<b>\$89,429.0</b>	<b>\$86,151.0</b>	<b>\$106,298.0</b>	<b>\$20,147.0</b>
EPM	\$3,381.0	\$3,329.0	\$3,412.0	\$83.0
S&T	\$40,768.0	\$38,193.0	\$46,210.0	\$8,017.0
Superfund	\$45,280.0	\$44,629.0	\$56,676.0	\$12,047.0
<b>Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure</b>	<b>\$15,403.0</b>	<b>\$15,165.0</b>	<b>\$16,273.0</b>	<b>\$1,108.0</b>
B&F	\$7,870.0	\$7,747.0	\$8,070.0	\$323.0
EPM	\$6,345.0	\$6,248.0	\$6,415.0	\$167.0
S&T	\$594.0	\$585.0	\$594.0	\$9.0
Superfund	\$594.0	\$585.0	\$1,194.0	\$609.0
<b>Human Health Risk Assessment</b>	<b>\$42,828.0</b>	<b>\$42,244.0</b>	<b>\$42,648.0</b>	<b>\$404.0</b>
S&T	\$38,856.0	\$38,334.0	\$39,323.0	\$989.0
Superfund	\$3,972.0	\$3,910.0	\$3,325.0	(\$585.0)
<b>Human Resources Management</b>	<b>\$45,214.0</b>	<b>\$44,732.0</b>	<b>\$48,712.0</b>	<b>\$3,980.0</b>
EPM	\$40,175.0	\$39,760.0	\$43,646.0	\$3,886.0
LUST	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$0.0
Superfund	\$5,036.0	\$4,969.0	\$5,063.0	\$94.0
<b>IT / Data Management</b>	<b>\$111,067.0</b>	<b>\$110,496.0</b>	<b>\$115,277.0</b>	<b>\$4,781.0</b>
EPM	\$91,019.0	\$90,753.0	\$94,360.0	\$3,607.0
LUST	\$177.0	\$174.0	\$162.0	(\$12.0)
Oil Spills	\$34.0	\$33.0	\$24.0	(\$9.0)
S&T	\$3,499.0	\$3,453.0	\$3,859.0	\$406.0
Superfund	\$16,338.0	\$16,083.0	\$16,872.0	\$789.0

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Indoor Air: Radon Program</b>	<b>\$5,857.0</b>	<b>\$5,785.0</b>	<b>\$5,929.0</b>	<b>\$144.0</b>
EPM	\$5,429.0	\$5,363.0	\$5,488.0	\$125.0
S&T	\$428.0	\$422.0	\$441.0	\$19.0
<b>Information Security</b>	<b>\$6,375.0</b>	<b>\$6,284.0</b>	<b>\$6,591.0</b>	<b>\$307.0</b>
EPM	\$5,583.0	\$5,504.0	\$5,790.0	\$286.0
Superfund	\$792.0	\$780.0	\$801.0	\$21.0
<b>Infrastructure Assistance: Alaska Native Villages</b>	<b>\$15,500.0</b>	<b>\$24,610.0</b>	<b>\$15,500.0</b>	<b>(\$9,110.0)</b>
STAG	\$15,500.0	\$24,610.0	\$15,500.0	(\$9,110.0)
<b>Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water SRF</b>	<b>\$687,554.0</b>	<b>\$689,080.0</b>	<b>\$555,000.0</b>	<b>(\$134,080.0)</b>
STAG	\$687,554.0	\$689,080.0	\$555,000.0	(\$134,080.0)
<b>Infrastructure Assistance: Drinking Water SRF</b>	<b>\$842,167.0</b>	<b>\$829,029.0</b>	<b>\$842,167.0</b>	<b>\$13,138.0</b>
STAG	\$842,167.0	\$829,029.0	\$842,167.0	\$13,138.0
<b>Infrastructure Assistance: Mexico Border</b>	<b>\$10,000.0</b>	<b>\$19,688.0</b>	<b>\$10,000.0</b>	<b>(\$9,688.0)</b>
STAG	\$10,000.0	\$19,688.0	\$10,000.0	(\$9,688.0)
<b>International Capacity Building</b>	<b>\$5,311.0</b>	<b>\$5,228.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$5,228.0)</b>
EPM	\$5,311.0	\$5,228.0	\$0.0	(\$5,228.0)
<b>International Sources of Pollution</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$12,408.0</b>	<b>\$12,408.0</b>
EPM	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$12,408.0	\$12,408.0
<b>LUST / UST</b>	<b>\$22,277.0</b>	<b>\$23,540.0</b>	<b>\$22,804.0</b>	<b>(\$736.0)</b>
EPM	\$11,719.0	\$11,572.0	\$12,256.0	\$684.0

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
LUST	\$10,558.0	\$11,968.0	\$10,548.0	(\$1,420.0)
<b>LUST Cooperative Agreements</b>	<b>\$58,207.0</b>	<b>\$90,178.0</b>	<b>\$58,207.0</b>	<b>(\$31,971.0)</b>
LUST	\$58,207.0	\$90,178.0	\$58,207.0	(\$31,971.0)
<b>Legal Advice: Environmental Program</b>	<b>\$39,972.0</b>	<b>\$40,220.0</b>	<b>\$40,556.0</b>	<b>\$336.0</b>
EPM	\$39,366.0	\$39,480.0	\$39,925.0	\$445.0
Superfund	\$606.0	\$740.0	\$631.0	(\$109.0)
<b>Legal Advice: Support Program</b>	<b>\$13,986.0</b>	<b>\$14,117.0</b>	<b>\$14,442.0</b>	<b>\$325.0</b>
EPM	\$13,986.0	\$14,117.0	\$14,442.0	\$325.0
<b>Marine Pollution</b>	<b>\$12,851.0</b>	<b>\$12,674.0</b>	<b>\$13,185.0</b>	<b>\$511.0</b>
EPM	\$12,851.0	\$12,674.0	\$13,185.0	\$511.0
<b>NEPA Implementation</b>	<b>\$14,366.0</b>	<b>\$14,142.0</b>	<b>\$16,295.0</b>	<b>\$2,153.0</b>
EPM	\$14,366.0	\$14,142.0	\$16,295.0	\$2,153.0
<b>National Estuary Program / Coastal Waterways</b>	<b>\$17,203.0</b>	<b>\$26,779.0</b>	<b>\$17,239.0</b>	<b>(\$9,540.0)</b>
EPM	\$17,203.0	\$26,779.0	\$17,239.0	(\$9,540.0)
<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>(\$5,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$5,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$10,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$5,000.0)</b>
Rescissions	(\$5,000.0)	(\$5,000.0)	(\$10,000.0)	(\$5,000.0)
<b>Oil Spill: Prevention, Preparedness and Response</b>	<b>\$13,499.0</b>	<b>\$13,290.0</b>	<b>\$13,927.0</b>	<b>\$637.0</b>
Oil Spills	\$13,499.0	\$13,290.0	\$13,927.0	\$637.0
<b>POPs Implementation</b>	<b>\$1,831.0</b>	<b>\$1,808.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$1,808.0)</b>
EPM	\$1,831.0	\$1,808.0	\$0.0	(\$1,808.0)
<b>Pesticides: Protect Human</b>	<b>\$65,808.0</b>	<b>\$65,069.0</b>	<b>\$64,059.0</b>	<b>(\$1,010.0)</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Health from Pesticide Risk</b>				
EPM	\$62,514.0	\$61,819.0	\$60,606.0	(\$1,213.0)
S&T	\$3,294.0	\$3,250.0	\$3,453.0	\$203.0
<b>Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk</b>	<b>\$43,865.0</b>	<b>\$43,301.0</b>	<b>\$43,431.0</b>	<b>\$130.0</b>
EPM	\$41,750.0	\$41,214.0	\$41,215.0	\$1.0
S&T	\$2,115.0	\$2,087.0	\$2,216.0	\$129.0
<b>Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability</b>	<b>\$12,586.0</b>	<b>\$12,424.0</b>	<b>\$13,365.0</b>	<b>\$941.0</b>
EPM	\$12,114.0	\$11,959.0	\$12,870.0	\$911.0
S&T	\$472.0	\$465.0	\$495.0	\$30.0
<b>Pollution Prevention Program</b>	<b>\$19,935.0</b>	<b>\$16,362.0</b>	<b>\$18,398.0</b>	<b>\$2,036.0</b>
EPM	\$19,935.0	\$16,362.0	\$18,398.0	\$2,036.0
<b>RCRA: Corrective Action</b>	<b>\$39,573.0</b>	<b>\$39,076.0</b>	<b>\$39,018.0</b>	<b>(\$58.0)</b>
EPM	\$39,573.0	\$39,076.0	\$39,018.0	(\$58.0)
<b>RCRA: Waste Management</b>	<b>\$69,158.0</b>	<b>\$66,297.0</b>	<b>\$67,111.0</b>	<b>\$814.0</b>
EPM	\$69,158.0	\$66,297.0	\$67,111.0	\$814.0
<b>RCRA: Waste Minimization &amp; Recycling</b>	<b>\$13,666.0</b>	<b>\$13,495.0</b>	<b>\$14,397.0</b>	<b>\$902.0</b>
EPM	\$13,666.0	\$13,495.0	\$14,397.0	\$902.0
<b>Radiation: Protection</b>	<b>\$14,679.0</b>	<b>\$14,486.0</b>	<b>\$15,056.0</b>	<b>\$570.0</b>
EPM	\$10,186.0	\$10,057.0	\$10,533.0	\$476.0
S&T	\$2,120.0	\$2,087.0	\$2,109.0	\$22.0
Superfund	\$2,373.0	\$2,342.0	\$2,414.0	\$72.0

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Radiation: Response Preparedness</b>	<b>\$6,649.0</b>	<b>\$6,561.0</b>	<b>\$6,957.0</b>	<b>\$396.0</b>
EPM	\$2,928.0	\$2,882.0	\$2,941.0	\$59.0
S&T	\$3,721.0	\$3,679.0	\$4,016.0	\$337.0
<b>Reduce Risks from Indoor Air</b>	<b>\$22,228.0</b>	<b>\$22,409.0</b>	<b>\$19,970.0</b>	<b>(\$2,439.0)</b>
EPM	\$21,440.0	\$21,632.0	\$19,180.0	(\$2,452.0)
S&T	\$788.0	\$777.0	\$790.0	\$13.0
<b>Regional Geographic Initiatives</b>	<b>\$9,553.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$4,844.0</b>	<b>\$4,844.0</b>
EPM	\$9,553.0	\$0.0	\$4,844.0	\$4,844.0
<b>Regional Science and Technology</b>	<b>\$3,574.0</b>	<b>\$3,518.0</b>	<b>\$3,318.0</b>	<b>(\$200.0)</b>
EPM	\$3,574.0	\$3,518.0	\$3,318.0	(\$200.0)
<b>Regulatory Innovation</b>	<b>\$23,866.0</b>	<b>\$21,327.0</b>	<b>\$24,405.0</b>	<b>\$3,078.0</b>
EPM	\$23,866.0	\$21,327.0	\$24,405.0	\$3,078.0
<b>Regulatory/Economic- Management and Analysis</b>	<b>\$20,104.0</b>	<b>\$16,381.0</b>	<b>\$20,588.0</b>	<b>\$4,207.0</b>
EPM	\$20,104.0	\$16,381.0	\$20,588.0	\$4,207.0
<b>Research: Computational Toxicology</b>	<b>\$15,103.0</b>	<b>\$12,135.0</b>	<b>\$14,863.0</b>	<b>\$2,728.0</b>
S&T	\$15,103.0	\$12,135.0	\$14,863.0	\$2,728.0
<b>Research: Drinking Water</b>	<b>\$48,548.0</b>	<b>\$48,775.0</b>	<b>\$45,283.0</b>	<b>(\$3,492.0)</b>
S&T	\$48,548.0	\$48,775.0	\$45,283.0	(\$3,492.0)
<b>Research: Endocrine Disruptor</b>	<b>\$10,131.0</b>	<b>\$10,317.0</b>	<b>\$9,502.0</b>	<b>(\$815.0)</b>
S&T	\$10,131.0	\$10,317.0	\$9,502.0	(\$815.0)
<b>Research: Fellowships</b>	<b>\$8,438.0</b>	<b>\$9,845.0</b>	<b>\$8,887.0</b>	<b>(\$958.0)</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
S&T	\$8,438.0	\$9,845.0	\$8,887.0	(\$958.0)
<b>Research: Global Change</b>	<b>\$16,908.0</b>	<b>\$19,688.0</b>	<b>\$16,365.0</b>	<b>(\$3,323.0)</b>
S&T	\$16,908.0	\$19,688.0	\$16,365.0	(\$3,323.0)
<b>Research: Human Health and Ecosystems</b>	<b>\$145,046.0</b>	<b>\$153,032.0</b>	<b>\$144,742.0</b>	<b>(\$8,290.0)</b>
S&T	\$145,046.0	\$153,032.0	\$144,742.0	(\$8,290.0)
<b>Research: Land Protection and Restoration</b>	<b>\$32,379.0</b>	<b>\$31,896.0</b>	<b>\$35,488.0</b>	<b>\$3,592.0</b>
LUST	\$660.0	\$650.0	\$413.0	(\$237.0)
Oil Spills	\$901.0	\$887.0	\$704.0	(\$183.0)
S&T	\$10,737.0	\$10,591.0	\$13,350.0	\$2,759.0
Superfund	\$20,081.0	\$19,768.0	\$21,021.0	\$1,253.0
<b>Research: Pesticides and Toxics</b>	<b>\$24,795.0</b>	<b>\$24,459.0</b>	<b>\$26,568.0</b>	<b>\$2,109.0</b>
S&T	\$24,795.0	\$24,459.0	\$26,568.0	\$2,109.0
<b>Research: Water Quality</b>	<b>\$56,454.0</b>	<b>\$55,573.0</b>	<b>\$56,179.0</b>	<b>\$606.0</b>
S&T	\$56,454.0	\$55,573.0	\$56,179.0	\$606.0
<b>Research: Clean Air</b>	<b>\$81,054.0</b>	<b>\$79,993.0</b>	<b>\$80,588.0</b>	<b>\$595.0</b>
S&T	\$81,054.0	\$79,993.0	\$80,588.0	\$595.0
<b>Research: Sustainability</b>	<b>\$22,478.0</b>	<b>\$22,127.0</b>	<b>\$19,970.0</b>	<b>(\$2,157.0)</b>
S&T	\$22,478.0	\$22,127.0	\$19,970.0	(\$2,157.0)
<b>Science Advisory Board</b>	<b>\$4,790.0</b>	<b>\$4,727.0</b>	<b>\$5,083.0</b>	<b>\$356.0</b>
EPM	\$4,790.0	\$4,727.0	\$5,083.0	\$356.0
<b>Science Policy and Biotechnology</b>	<b>\$1,780.0</b>	<b>\$1,752.0</b>	<b>\$1,675.0</b>	<b>(\$77.0)</b>
EPM	\$1,780.0	\$1,752.0	\$1,675.0	(\$77.0)
<b>Small Business</b>	<b>\$3,261.0</b>	<b>\$3,210.0</b>	<b>\$3,217.0</b>	<b>\$7.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Ombudsman</b>				
EPM	\$3,261.0	\$3,210.0	\$3,217.0	\$7.0
<b>Small Minority Business Assistance</b>	<b>\$2,466.0</b>	<b>\$2,428.0</b>	<b>\$2,411.0</b>	<b>(\$17.0)</b>
EPM	\$2,466.0	\$2,428.0	\$2,411.0	(\$17.0)
<b>State and Local Prevention and Preparedness</b>	<b>\$12,960.0</b>	<b>\$12,784.0</b>	<b>\$13,298.0</b>	<b>\$514.0</b>
EPM	\$12,960.0	\$12,784.0	\$13,298.0	\$514.0
<b>Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic Programs</b>	<b>\$4,489.0</b>	<b>\$5,119.0</b>	<b>\$4,696.0</b>	<b>(\$423.0)</b>
EPM	\$4,489.0	\$5,119.0	\$4,696.0	(\$423.0)
<b>Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund</b>	<b>\$9,865.0</b>	<b>\$9,711.0</b>	<b>\$9,865.0</b>	<b>\$154.0</b>
EPM	\$9,865.0	\$9,711.0	\$9,865.0	\$154.0
<b>Superfund: EPA Emergency Preparedness</b>	<b>\$9,318.0</b>	<b>\$9,195.0</b>	<b>\$9,504.0</b>	<b>\$309.0</b>
Superfund	\$9,318.0	\$9,195.0	\$9,504.0	\$309.0
<b>Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal</b>	<b>\$191,880.0</b>	<b>\$190,011.0</b>	<b>\$193,853.0</b>	<b>\$3,842.0</b>
Superfund	\$191,880.0	\$190,011.0	\$193,853.0	\$3,842.0
<b>Superfund: Enforcement</b>	<b>\$161,610.0</b>	<b>\$164,845.0</b>	<b>\$163,678.0</b>	<b>(\$1,167.0)</b>
Superfund	\$161,610.0	\$164,845.0	\$163,678.0	(\$1,167.0)
<b>Superfund: Federal Facilities</b>	<b>\$31,879.0</b>	<b>\$31,447.0</b>	<b>\$31,440.0</b>	<b>(\$7.0)</b>
Superfund	\$31,879.0	\$31,447.0	\$31,440.0	(\$7.0)
<b>Superfund: Remedial</b>	<b>\$584,836.0</b>	<b>\$591,078.0</b>	<b>\$586,120.0</b>	<b>(\$4,958.0)</b>
Superfund	\$584,836.0	\$591,078.0	\$586,120.0	(\$4,958.0)



	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Superfund: Support to Other Federal Agencies</b>	<b>\$6,575.0</b>	<b>\$6,472.0</b>	<b>\$6,575.0</b>	<b>\$103.0</b>
Superfund	\$6,575.0	\$6,472.0	\$6,575.0	\$103.0
<b>Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement</b>	<b>\$9,843.0</b>	<b>\$9,726.0</b>	<b>\$10,225.0</b>	<b>\$499.0</b>
Superfund	\$9,843.0	\$9,726.0	\$10,225.0	\$499.0
<b>Surface Water Protection</b>	<b>\$196,092.0</b>	<b>\$193,546.0</b>	<b>\$198,706.0</b>	<b>\$5,160.0</b>
EPM	\$196,092.0	\$193,546.0	\$198,706.0	\$5,160.0
<b>TRI / Right to Know</b>	<b>\$15,728.0</b>	<b>\$15,504.0</b>	<b>\$15,109.0</b>	<b>(\$395.0)</b>
EPM	\$15,728.0	\$15,504.0	\$15,109.0	(\$395.0)
<b>Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Management</b>	<b>\$5,654.0</b>	<b>\$5,585.0</b>	<b>\$6,027.0</b>	<b>\$442.0</b>
EPM	\$5,654.0	\$5,585.0	\$6,027.0	\$442.0
<b>Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction</b>	<b>\$45,046.0</b>	<b>\$45,672.0</b>	<b>\$46,477.0</b>	<b>\$805.0</b>
EPM	\$45,046.0	\$45,672.0	\$46,477.0	\$805.0
<b>Toxic Substances: Lead Risk Reduction Program</b>	<b>\$13,546.0</b>	<b>\$13,335.0</b>	<b>\$13,652.0</b>	<b>\$317.0</b>
EPM	\$13,546.0	\$13,335.0	\$13,652.0	\$317.0
<b>Trade and Governance</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$6,216.0</b>	<b>\$6,216.0</b>
EPM	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$6,216.0	\$6,216.0
<b>Tribal - Capacity Building</b>	<b>\$11,477.0</b>	<b>\$11,328.0</b>	<b>\$11,710.0</b>	<b>\$382.0</b>
EPM	\$11,477.0	\$11,328.0	\$11,710.0	\$382.0

	<b>FY 2008 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2008 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2009 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>US Mexico Border</b>	<b>\$4,646.0</b>	<b>\$5,439.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$5,439.0)</b>
EPM	\$4,646.0	\$5,439.0	\$0.0	(\$5,439.0)
<b>Wetlands</b>	<b>\$21,518.0</b>	<b>\$21,248.0</b>	<b>\$22,223.0</b>	<b>\$975.0</b>
EPM	\$21,518.0	\$21,248.0	\$22,223.0	\$975.0
<b>TOTAL, EPA</b>	<b>\$7,199,400.0</b>	<b>\$7,472,324.0</b>	<b>\$7,142,520.0</b>	<b>(\$329,804.0)</b>

## PROGRAM PROJECTS BY PROGRAM AREA

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
<b>SCIENCE &amp; TECHNOLOGY</b>					
<b>Air Toxics and Quality</b>					
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	\$8,661.1	\$8,259.0	\$9,115.0	\$8,259.0	(\$856.0)
Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$9,104.1	\$10,886.0	\$12,118.0	\$11,086.0	(\$1,032.0)
Federal Support for Air Toxics Program	\$1,804.1	\$2,252.0	\$2,220.0	\$2,303.0	\$83.0
Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification	\$58,196.0	\$65,722.0	\$66,796.0	\$69,543.0	\$2,747.0
Radiation: Protection	\$2,126.1	\$2,120.0	\$2,087.0	\$2,109.0	\$22.0
Radiation: Response Preparedness	\$3,375.6	\$3,721.0	\$3,679.0	\$4,016.0	\$337.0
<b>Subtotal, Air Toxics and Quality</b>	<b>\$83,267.0</b>	<b>\$92,960.0</b>	<b>\$96,015.0</b>	<b>\$97,316.0</b>	<b>\$1,301.0</b>
<b>Climate Protection Program</b>					
Climate Protection Program	\$14,624.1	\$13,104.0	\$18,331.0	\$11,402.0	(\$6,929.0)
<b>Enforcement</b>					
Forensics Support	\$13,949.3	\$15,075.0	\$14,882.0	\$15,557.0	\$675.0
<b>Homeland Security</b>					
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection					
<i>Water Sentinel</i>	\$3,183.6	\$21,884.0	\$11,705.0	\$22,637.0	\$10,932.0
<i>Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)</i>	\$7,391.8	\$3,702.0	\$3,652.0	\$4,494.0	\$842.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	\$10,575.4	\$25,586.0	\$15,357.0	\$27,131.0	\$11,774.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery					
<i>Decontamination</i>	\$21,025.2	\$20,738.0	\$20,444.0	\$28,805.0	\$8,361.0
<i>Laboratory Preparedness and Response</i>	\$618.6	\$600.0	\$591.0	\$500.0	(\$91.0)
<i>Safe Buildings</i>	\$4,242.2	\$4,000.0	\$1,969.0	\$2,000.0	\$31.0
<i>Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)</i>	\$13,117.6	\$15,430.0	\$15,189.0	\$14,905.0	(\$284.0)
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	\$39,003.6	\$40,768.0	\$38,193.0	\$46,210.0	\$8,017.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$2,023.9	\$594.0	\$585.0	\$594.0	\$9.0
<b>Subtotal, Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$51,602.9</b>	<b>\$66,948.0</b>	<b>\$54,135.0</b>	<b>\$73,935.0</b>	<b>\$19,800.0</b>
<b>Indoor Air</b>					

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Indoor Air: Radon Program	\$434.1	\$428.0	\$422.0	\$441.0	\$19.0
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	\$791.2	\$788.0	\$777.0	\$790.0	\$13.0
<b>Subtotal, Indoor Air</b>	<b>\$1,225.3</b>	<b>\$1,216.0</b>	<b>\$1,199.0</b>	<b>\$1,231.0</b>	<b>\$32.0</b>
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>					
IT / Data Management	\$4,522.1	\$3,499.0	\$3,453.0	\$3,859.0	\$406.0
<b>Operations and Administration</b>					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations					
<i>Rent</i>	\$13,085.0	\$35,521.0	\$34,967.0	\$35,521.0	\$554.0
<i>Utilities</i>	\$9,110.1	\$18,392.0	\$18,105.0	\$18,547.0	\$442.0
<i>Security</i>	\$3,403.6	\$11,179.0	\$11,005.0	\$11,989.0	\$984.0
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations     (other activities)</i>	\$7,287.5	\$8,767.0	\$8,630.0	\$8,827.0	\$197.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$32,886.2	\$73,859.0	\$72,707.0	\$74,884.0	\$2,177.0
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$32,886.2</b>	<b>\$73,859.0</b>	<b>\$72,707.0</b>	<b>\$74,884.0</b>	<b>\$2,177.0</b>
<b>Pesticides Licensing</b>					
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	\$0.0	\$3,294.0	\$3,250.0	\$3,453.0	\$203.0
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	\$0.0	\$2,115.0	\$2,087.0	\$2,216.0	\$129.0
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	\$0.0	\$472.0	\$465.0	\$495.0	\$30.0
Pesticides: Registration of New Pesticides	\$2,570.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Pesticides: Review / Reregistration of Existing Pesticides	\$2,885.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing</b>	<b>\$5,456.1</b>	<b>\$5,881.0</b>	<b>\$5,802.0</b>	<b>\$6,164.0</b>	<b>\$362.0</b>
<b>Research: Clean Air</b>					
Research: Air Toxics	\$13,521.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Research: Clean Air	\$0.0	\$81,054.0	\$79,993.0	\$80,588.0	\$595.0
Research: Global Change	\$20,449.9	\$16,908.0	\$19,688.0	\$16,365.0	(\$3,323.0)
Research: NAAQS	\$61,664.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Research: Clean Air</b>	<b>\$95,635.2</b>	<b>\$97,962.0</b>	<b>\$99,681.0</b>	<b>\$96,953.0</b>	<b>(\$2,728.0)</b>
<b>Research: Clean Water</b>					
Research: Drinking Water	\$44,342.9	\$48,548.0	\$48,775.0	\$45,283.0	(\$3,492.0)
Research: Water Quality	\$54,428.5	\$56,454.0	\$55,573.0	\$56,179.0	\$606.0
<b>Subtotal, Research: Clean Water</b>	<b>\$98,771.4</b>	<b>\$105,002.0</b>	<b>\$104,348.0</b>	<b>\$101,462.0</b>	<b>(\$2,886.0)</b>
<b>Research / Congressional Priorities</b>					

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Congressionally Mandated Projects	\$16,456.4	\$0.0	\$5,316.0	\$0.0	(\$5,316.0)
<b>Research: Human Health and Ecosystems</b>					
Human Health Risk Assessment	\$35,018.0	\$38,856.0	\$38,334.0	\$39,323.0	\$989.0
Research: Computational Toxicology	\$12,159.5	\$15,103.0	\$12,135.0	\$14,863.0	\$2,728.0
Research: Endocrine Disruptor	\$10,476.7	\$10,131.0	\$10,317.0	\$9,502.0	(\$815.0)
Research: Fellowships	\$12,231.1	\$8,438.0	\$9,845.0	\$8,887.0	(\$958.0)
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems					
<i>Human Health</i>	\$0.0	\$72,285.0	\$77,260.0	\$74,752.0	(\$2,508.0)
<i>Ecosystems</i>	\$0.0	\$72,761.0	\$75,772.0	\$69,990.0	(\$5,782.0)
<i>Research: Human Health and Ecosystems (other activities)</i>	\$167,910.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, Research: Human Health and Ecosystems	\$167,910.0	\$145,046.0	\$153,032.0	\$144,742.0	(\$8,290.0)
<b>Subtotal, Research: Human Health and Ecosystems</b>	<b>\$237,795.3</b>	<b>\$217,574.0</b>	<b>\$223,663.0</b>	<b>\$217,317.0</b>	<b>(\$6,346.0)</b>
<b>Research: Land Protection</b>					
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	\$10,907.3	\$10,737.0	\$10,591.0	\$13,350.0	\$2,759.0
<b>Research: Sustainability</b>					
Research: Economics and Decision Science(EDS)	\$2,284.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Research: Environmental Technology Verification (ETV)	\$1,410.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Research: Sustainability	\$24,864.5	\$22,478.0	\$22,127.0	\$19,970.0	(\$2,157.0)
<b>Subtotal, Research: Sustainability</b>	<b>\$28,559.5</b>	<b>\$22,478.0</b>	<b>\$22,127.0</b>	<b>\$19,970.0</b>	<b>(\$2,157.0)</b>
<b>Toxic Research and Prevention</b>					
Research: Pesticides and Toxics	\$29,425.2	\$24,795.0	\$24,459.0	\$26,568.0	\$2,109.0
<b>Water: Human Health Protection</b>					
Drinking Water Programs	\$3,256.6	\$3,416.0	\$3,375.0	\$3,559.0	\$184.0
<b>Total, Science &amp; Technology</b>	<b>\$728,339.9</b>	<b>\$754,506.0</b>	<b>\$760,084.0</b>	<b>\$763,527.0</b>	<b>\$3,443.0</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM &amp; MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>Air Toxics and Quality</b>					
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	\$18,621.2	\$19,388.0	\$19,131.0	\$19,898.0	\$767.0
Federal Stationary Source Regulations	\$22,744.8	\$26,504.0	\$26,091.0	\$26,787.0	\$696.0
Federal Support for Air Quality Management					
<i>Clean Diesel Initiative</i>	\$97.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Federal Support for Air Quality Management (other activities)</i>	\$95,478.1	\$90,490.0	\$89,464.0	\$95,538.0	\$6,074.0

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Subtotal, Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$95,576.0	\$90,490.0	\$89,464.0	\$95,538.0	\$6,074.0
Federal Support for Air Toxics Program	\$25,081.8	\$24,711.0	\$24,390.0	\$22,693.0	(\$1,697.0)
Radiation: Protection	\$10,172.7	\$10,186.0	\$10,057.0	\$10,533.0	\$476.0
Radiation: Response Preparedness	\$2,809.7	\$2,928.0	\$2,882.0	\$2,941.0	\$59.0
Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic Programs	\$5,280.0	\$4,489.0	\$5,119.0	\$4,696.0	(\$423.0)
Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund	\$11,315.0	\$9,865.0	\$9,711.0	\$9,865.0	\$154.0
<b>Subtotal, Air Toxics and Quality</b>	<b>\$191,601.2</b>	<b>\$188,561.0</b>	<b>\$186,845.0</b>	<b>\$192,951.0</b>	<b>\$6,106.0</b>
<b>Brownfields</b>					
Brownfields	\$25,838.4	\$23,450.0	\$23,665.0	\$22,732.0	(\$933.0)
<b>Climate Protection Program</b>					
Climate Protection Program					
<i>Energy STAR</i>	\$38,573.4	\$43,926.0	\$48,236.0	\$44,221.0	(\$4,015.0)
<i>Methane to markets</i>	\$2,351.1	\$4,436.0	\$4,369.0	\$4,546.6	\$177.6
<i>Asian Pacific Partnership</i>	\$3,203.0	\$5,000.0	\$0.0	\$5,000.0	\$5,000.0
<i>Greenhouse Gas Reporting Registry</i>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$3,445.0	\$0.0	(\$3,445.0)
<i>Climate Protection Program (other activities)</i>	\$47,124.6	\$34,565.0	\$34,324.0	\$33,240.4	(\$1,083.6)
Subtotal, Climate Protection Program	\$91,252.1	\$87,927.0	\$90,374.0	\$87,008.0	(\$3,366.0)
<b>Subtotal, Climate Protection Program</b>	<b>\$91,252.1</b>	<b>\$87,927.0</b>	<b>\$90,374.0</b>	<b>\$87,008.0</b>	<b>(\$3,366.0)</b>
<b>Compliance</b>					
Compliance Assistance and Centers	\$28,226.9	\$29,547.0	\$27,725.0	\$26,435.0	(\$1,290.0)
Compliance Incentives	\$9,448.8	\$9,786.0	\$10,618.0	\$10,263.0	(\$355.0)
Compliance Monitoring	\$90,724.6	\$93,428.0	\$88,726.0	\$96,025.0	\$7,299.0
<b>Subtotal, Compliance</b>	<b>\$128,400.3</b>	<b>\$132,761.0</b>	<b>\$127,069.0</b>	<b>\$132,723.0</b>	<b>\$5,654.0</b>
<b>Enforcement</b>					
Civil Enforcement	\$123,003.7	\$126,645.0	\$129,886.0	\$133,017.0	\$3,131.0
Criminal Enforcement	\$39,721.6	\$39,688.0	\$40,742.0	\$44,384.0	\$3,642.0
Enforcement Training	\$2,668.3	\$3,145.0	\$3,096.0	\$3,043.0	(\$53.0)
Environmental Justice	\$6,319.2	\$3,822.0	\$6,399.0	\$3,811.0	(\$2,588.0)
NEPA Implementation	\$13,863.5	\$14,366.0	\$14,142.0	\$16,295.0	\$2,153.0
<b>Subtotal, Enforcement</b>	<b>\$185,576.3</b>	<b>\$187,666.0</b>	<b>\$194,265.0</b>	<b>\$200,550.0</b>	<b>\$6,285.0</b>
<b>Environmental Protection / Congressional Priorities</b>					
Congressionally Mandated Projects	\$25,478.3	\$0.0	\$13,437.0	\$0.0	(\$13,437.0)
<b>Geographic Programs</b>					

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay	\$20,274.1	\$28,768.0	\$30,528.0	\$29,001.0	(\$1,527.0)
Geographic Program: Great Lakes	\$23,522.7	\$21,757.0	\$21,686.0	\$22,261.0	\$575.0
Geographic Program: Long Island Sound	\$1,361.4	\$467.0	\$4,922.0	\$467.0	(\$4,455.0)
Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico	\$4,407.4	\$4,457.0	\$5,618.0	\$4,578.0	(\$1,040.0)
Geographic Program: Lake Champlain	\$997.0	\$934.0	\$2,707.0	\$934.0	(\$1,773.0)
Geographic Program: Other					
<i>San Francisco Bay</i>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$4,922.0	\$0.0	(\$4,922.0)
<i>Geographic Program: Puget Sound</i>	\$1,162.3	\$1,000.0	\$19,688.0	\$1,000.0	(\$18,688.0)
<i>Lake Pontchartrain</i>	\$969.4	\$978.0	\$963.0	\$978.0	\$15.0
<i>Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE)</i>	\$2,515.0	\$3,448.0	\$3,394.0	\$2,448.0	(\$946.0)
<i>Geographic Program: Other (other activities)</i>	\$5,057.5	\$3,149.0	\$3,105.0	\$3,289.0	\$184.0
Subtotal, Geographic Program: Other	\$9,704.2	\$8,575.0	\$32,072.0	\$7,715.0	(\$24,357.0)
Regional Geographic Initiatives	\$6,302.5	\$9,553.0	\$0.0	\$4,844.0	\$4,844.0
<b>Subtotal, Geographic Programs</b>	<b>\$66,569.3</b>	<b>\$74,511.0</b>	<b>\$97,533.0</b>	<b>\$69,800.0</b>	<b>(\$27,733.0)</b>
<b>Homeland Security</b>					
Homeland Security: Communication and Information					
<i>Laboratory Preparedness and Response</i>	\$888.7	\$500.0	\$492.0	\$0.0	(\$492.0)
<i>Homeland Security: Communication and Information (other activities)</i>	\$7,230.3	\$6,406.0	\$6,330.0	\$6,940.0	\$610.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Communication and Information	\$8,119.0	\$6,906.0	\$6,822.0	\$6,940.0	\$118.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection					
<i>Decontamination</i>	\$52.8	\$99.0	\$97.0	\$99.0	\$2.0
<i>Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)</i>	\$9,502.7	\$7,688.0	\$7,568.0	\$6,660.0	(\$908.0)
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	\$9,555.5	\$7,787.0	\$7,665.0	\$6,759.0	(\$906.0)
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery					
<i>Decontamination</i>	(\$2.5)	\$3,380.0	\$3,329.0	\$3,412.0	\$83.0
<i>Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)</i>	\$3,396.8	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	\$3,394.3	\$3,381.0	\$3,329.0	\$3,412.0	\$83.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$6,219.1	\$6,345.0	\$6,248.0	\$6,415.0	\$167.0
<b>Subtotal, Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$27,287.9</b>	<b>\$24,419.0</b>	<b>\$24,064.0</b>	<b>\$23,526.0</b>	<b>(\$538.0)</b>

**Indoor Air**

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Indoor Air: Radon Program	\$5,201.2	\$5,429.0	\$5,363.0	\$5,488.0	\$125.0
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	\$21,425.6	\$21,440.0	\$21,632.0	\$19,180.0	(\$2,452.0)
<b>Subtotal, Indoor Air</b>	<b>\$26,626.8</b>	<b>\$26,869.0</b>	<b>\$26,995.0</b>	<b>\$24,668.0</b>	<b>(\$2,327.0)</b>
<b>Information Exchange / Outreach</b>					
Children and Other Sensitive Populations: Agency Coordination	\$4,968.5	\$6,203.0	\$6,144.0	\$6,309.0	\$165.0
Environmental Education	\$7,807.2	\$0.0	\$8,860.0	\$0.0	(\$8,860.0)
Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations	\$49,193.3	\$49,747.0	\$48,971.0	\$49,756.0	\$785.0
Exchange Network	\$17,541.7	\$15,364.0	\$15,137.0	\$18,058.0	\$2,921.0
Small Business Ombudsman	\$3,761.9	\$3,261.0	\$3,210.0	\$3,217.0	\$7.0
Small Minority Business Assistance	\$2,437.3	\$2,466.0	\$2,428.0	\$2,411.0	(\$17.0)
State and Local Prevention and Preparedness	\$12,867.6	\$12,960.0	\$12,784.0	\$13,298.0	\$514.0
TRI / Right to Know	\$14,605.5	\$15,728.0	\$15,504.0	\$15,109.0	(\$395.0)
Tribal - Capacity Building	\$10,861.3	\$11,477.0	\$11,328.0	\$11,710.0	\$382.0
<b>Subtotal, Information Exchange / Outreach</b>	<b>\$124,044.3</b>	<b>\$117,206.0</b>	<b>\$124,366.0</b>	<b>\$119,868.0</b>	<b>(\$4,498.0)</b>
<b>International Programs</b>					
US Mexico Border	\$5,790.7	\$4,646.0	\$5,439.0	\$0.0	(\$5,439.0)
Commission for Environmental Cooperation	\$4,208.8	\$4,022.0	\$3,962.0	\$0.0	(\$3,962.0)
Environment and Trade	\$1,817.4	\$1,945.0	\$1,920.0	\$0.0	(\$1,920.0)
International Capacity Building	\$7,210.8	\$5,311.0	\$5,228.0	\$0.0	(\$5,228.0)
POPs Implementation	\$1,682.4	\$1,831.0	\$1,808.0	\$0.0	(\$1,808.0)
International Sources of Pollution					
<i>Mexico Border</i>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$4,902.0	\$4,902.0
<i>International Sources of Pollution (other activities)</i>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7,506.0	\$7,506.0
Subtotal, International Sources of Pollution	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$12,408.0	\$12,408.0
Trade and Governance	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$6,216.0	\$6,216.0
<b>Subtotal, International Programs</b>	<b>\$20,710.1</b>	<b>\$17,755.0</b>	<b>\$18,357.0</b>	<b>\$18,624.0</b>	<b>\$267.0</b>
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>					
Information Security	\$4,291.9	\$5,583.0	\$5,504.0	\$5,790.0	\$286.0
IT / Data Management	\$99,196.3	\$91,019.0	\$90,753.0	\$94,360.0	\$3,607.0
<b>Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security</b>	<b>\$103,488.2</b>	<b>\$96,602.0</b>	<b>\$96,257.0</b>	<b>\$100,150.0</b>	<b>\$3,893.0</b>
<b>Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>					
Administrative Law	\$4,891.0	\$5,260.0	\$5,178.0	\$4,949.0	(\$229.0)
Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$970.5	\$1,175.0	\$1,160.0	\$1,264.0	\$104.0
Civil Rights / Title VI Compliance	\$10,796.0	\$11,240.0	\$11,065.0	\$11,097.0	\$32.0



	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	\$38,242.4	\$39,366.0	\$39,480.0	\$39,925.0	\$445.0
Legal Advice: Support Program	\$12,435.8	\$13,986.0	\$14,117.0	\$14,442.0	\$325.0
Regional Science and Technology	\$3,399.8	\$3,574.0	\$3,518.0	\$3,318.0	(\$200.0)
Regulatory Innovation	\$22,498.4	\$23,866.0	\$21,327.0	\$24,405.0	\$3,078.0
Regulatory/Economic-Management and Analysis	\$17,755.0	\$20,104.0	\$16,381.0	\$20,588.0	\$4,207.0
Science Advisory Board	\$4,983.3	\$4,790.0	\$4,727.0	\$5,083.0	\$356.0
<b>Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>	<b>\$115,972.2</b>	<b>\$123,361.0</b>	<b>\$116,953.0</b>	<b>\$125,071.0</b>	<b>\$8,118.0</b>
<b>Operations and Administration</b>					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations					
<i>Rent</i>	\$176,479.1	\$165,817.0	\$161,261.0	\$164,866.0	\$3,605.0
<i>Utilities</i>	\$14,682.7	\$8,210.0	\$8,082.0	\$11,333.0	\$3,251.0
<i>Security</i>	\$28,897.4	\$25,344.0	\$24,949.0	\$25,676.0	\$727.0
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)</i>	\$107,894.9	\$104,357.0	\$102,897.0	\$109,193.0	\$6,296.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$327,954.1	\$303,728.0	\$297,189.0	\$311,068.0	\$13,879.0
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$64,431.2	\$74,960.0	\$73,949.0	\$80,623.0	\$6,674.0
Acquisition Management	\$23,654.1	\$29,992.0	\$28,629.0	\$31,195.0	\$2,566.0
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	\$20,564.5	\$23,439.0	\$23,242.0	\$25,977.0	\$2,735.0
Human Resources Management	\$39,740.2	\$40,175.0	\$39,760.0	\$43,646.0	\$3,886.0
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$476,344.1</b>	<b>\$472,294.0</b>	<b>\$462,769.0</b>	<b>\$492,509.0</b>	<b>\$29,740.0</b>
<b>Pesticides Licensing</b>					
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	\$0.0	\$62,514.0	\$61,819.0	\$60,606.0	(\$1,213.0)
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	\$0.0	\$41,750.0	\$41,214.0	\$41,215.0	\$1.0
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	\$0.0	\$12,114.0	\$11,959.0	\$12,870.0	\$911.0
Pesticides: Field Programs	\$21,436.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Pesticides: Registration of New Pesticides	\$42,098.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Pesticides: Review / Reregistration of Existing Pesticides	\$54,442.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Science Policy and Biotechnology	\$1,202.9	\$1,780.0	\$1,752.0	\$1,675.0	(\$77.0)
<b>Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing</b>	<b>\$119,180.3</b>	<b>\$118,158.0</b>	<b>\$116,744.0</b>	<b>\$116,366.0</b>	<b>(\$378.0)</b>
<b>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)</b>					
RCRA: Waste Management					
<i>eManifest</i>	\$0.0	\$4,000.0	\$0.0	\$2,000.0	\$2,000.0

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
<i>RCRA: Waste Management (other activities)</i>	\$65,599.8	\$65,158.0	\$66,297.0	\$65,111.0	(\$1,186.0)
Subtotal, RCRA: Waste Management	\$65,599.8	\$69,158.0	\$66,297.0	\$67,111.0	\$814.0
RCRA: Corrective Action	\$39,373.3	\$39,573.0	\$39,076.0	\$39,018.0	(\$58.0)
RCRA: Waste Minimization & Recycling	\$12,506.2	\$13,666.0	\$13,495.0	\$14,397.0	\$902.0
<b>Subtotal, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)</b>	<b>\$117,479.3</b>	<b>\$122,397.0</b>	<b>\$118,868.0</b>	<b>\$120,526.0</b>	<b>\$1,658.0</b>
<b>Toxics Risk Review and Prevention</b>					
Endocrine Disruptors	\$9,855.8	\$5,890.0	\$8,663.0	\$5,847.0	(\$2,816.0)
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction					
<i>HPV/VCCEP</i>	\$12,239.0	\$11,015.0	\$12,049.0	\$11,381.0	(\$668.0)
<i>Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction (other activities)</i>	\$32,462.7	\$34,031.0	\$33,623.0	\$35,096.0	\$1,473.0
Subtotal, Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction	\$44,701.7	\$45,046.0	\$45,672.0	\$46,477.0	\$805.0
Pollution Prevention Program	\$17,548.6	\$19,935.0	\$16,362.0	\$18,398.0	\$2,036.0
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Management	\$8,249.6	\$5,654.0	\$5,585.0	\$6,027.0	\$442.0
Toxic Substances: Lead Risk Reduction Program	\$12,589.8	\$13,546.0	\$13,335.0	\$13,652.0	\$317.0
<b>Subtotal, Toxics Risk Review and Prevention</b>	<b>\$92,945.5</b>	<b>\$90,071.0</b>	<b>\$89,617.0</b>	<b>\$90,401.0</b>	<b>\$784.0</b>
<b>UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS (LUST / UST)</b>					
LUST / UST	\$9,836.7	\$11,719.0	\$11,572.0	\$12,256.0	\$684.0
<b>Water: Ecosystems</b>					
Great Lakes Legacy Act	\$24,296.7	\$35,000.0	\$34,454.0	\$35,000.0	\$546.0
National Estuary Program / Coastal Waterways	\$21,474.8	\$17,203.0	\$26,779.0	\$17,239.0	(\$9,540.0)
Wetlands	\$19,641.9	\$21,518.0	\$21,248.0	\$22,223.0	\$975.0
<b>Subtotal, Water: Ecosystems</b>	<b>\$65,413.4</b>	<b>\$73,721.0</b>	<b>\$82,481.0</b>	<b>\$74,462.0</b>	<b>(\$8,019.0)</b>
<b>Water: Human Health Protection</b>					
Beach / Fish Programs	\$2,821.4	\$2,830.0	\$2,789.0	\$2,795.0	\$6.0
Drinking Water Programs	\$100,323.2	\$96,967.0	\$96,722.0	\$99,476.0	\$2,754.0
<b>Subtotal, Water: Human Health Protection</b>	<b>\$103,144.6</b>	<b>\$99,797.0</b>	<b>\$99,511.0</b>	<b>\$102,271.0</b>	<b>\$2,760.0</b>
<b>Water Quality Protection</b>					
Marine Pollution	\$12,890.5	\$12,851.0	\$12,674.0	\$13,185.0	\$511.0
Surface Water Protection	\$191,797.2	\$196,092.0	\$193,546.0	\$198,706.0	\$5,160.0
<b>Subtotal, Water Quality Protection</b>	<b>\$204,687.7</b>	<b>\$208,943.0</b>	<b>\$206,220.0</b>	<b>\$211,891.0</b>	<b>\$5,671.0</b>
<b>Total, Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>	<b>\$2,321,877.0</b>	<b>\$2,298,188.0</b>	<b>\$2,327,962.0</b>	<b>\$2,338,353.0</b>	<b>\$10,391.0</b>

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
<b>INSPECTOR GENERAL</b>					
<b>Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations</b>					
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	\$32,288.4	\$38,008.0	\$41,099.0	\$39,483.0	(\$1,616.0)
<b>Total, Inspector General</b>	<b>\$32,288.4</b>	<b>\$38,008.0</b>	<b>\$41,099.0</b>	<b>\$39,483.0</b>	<b>(\$1,616.0)</b>
<b>BUILDING AND FACILITIES</b>					
<b>Homeland Security</b>					
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$10,372.2	\$7,870.0	\$7,747.0	\$8,070.0	\$323.0
<b>Operations and Administration</b>					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$28,672.1	\$26,931.0	\$26,511.0	\$26,931.0	\$420.0
<b>Total, Building and Facilities</b>	<b>\$39,044.3</b>	<b>\$34,801.0</b>	<b>\$34,258.0</b>	<b>\$35,001.0</b>	<b>\$743.0</b>
<b>HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND</b>					
<b>Air Toxics and Quality</b>					
Radiation: Protection	\$1,960.9	\$2,373.0	\$2,342.0	\$2,414.0	\$72.0
<b>Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations</b>					
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	\$12,286.2	\$7,149.0	\$11,486.0	\$7,164.0	(\$4,322.0)
<b>Compliance</b>					
Compliance Assistance and Centers	\$11.1	\$22.0	\$22.0	\$22.0	\$0.0
Compliance Incentives	\$139.4	\$144.0	\$159.0	\$146.0	(\$13.0)
Compliance Monitoring	\$1,487.0	\$1,182.0	\$1,165.0	\$1,192.0	\$27.0
<b>Subtotal, Compliance</b>	<b>\$1,637.5</b>	<b>\$1,348.0</b>	<b>\$1,346.0</b>	<b>\$1,360.0</b>	<b>\$14.0</b>
<b>Enforcement</b>					
Environmental Justice	\$911.1	\$757.0	\$745.0	\$757.0	\$12.0
Superfund: Enforcement	\$164,108.2	\$161,610.0	\$164,845.0	\$163,678.0	(\$1,167.0)
Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement	\$8,846.2	\$9,843.0	\$9,726.0	\$10,225.0	\$499.0
Civil Enforcement	\$739.2	\$884.0	\$870.0	\$0.0	(\$870.0)
Criminal Enforcement	\$7,895.7	\$9,167.0	\$9,053.0	\$7,830.0	(\$1,223.0)
Enforcement Training	\$630.7	\$840.0	\$827.0	\$858.0	\$31.0
Forensics Support	\$2,805.2	\$2,310.0	\$3,750.0	\$2,441.0	(\$1,309.0)
<b>Subtotal, Enforcement</b>	<b>\$185,936.3</b>	<b>\$185,411.0</b>	<b>\$189,816.0</b>	<b>\$185,789.0</b>	<b>(\$4,027.0)</b>
<b>Homeland Security</b>					

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Homeland Security: Communication and Information	\$300.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection					
<i>Decontamination</i>	\$61.8	\$198.0	\$195.0	\$198.0	\$3.0
<i>Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)</i>	\$1,575.4	\$1,659.0	\$1,633.0	\$1,481.0	(\$152.0)
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	\$1,637.2	\$1,857.0	\$1,828.0	\$1,679.0	(\$149.0)
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery					
<i>Decontamination</i>	\$6,913.3	\$10,527.0	\$10,371.0	\$10,620.0	\$249.0
<i>Laboratory Preparedness and Response</i>	\$8,519.1	\$6,064.0	\$5,971.0	\$9,589.0	\$3,618.0
<i>Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)</i>	\$34,885.7	\$28,689.0	\$28,287.0	\$36,467.0	\$8,180.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	\$50,318.1	\$45,280.0	\$44,629.0	\$56,676.0	\$12,047.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$636.7	\$594.0	\$585.0	\$1,194.0	\$609.0
<b>Subtotal, Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$52,892.0</b>	<b>\$47,731.0</b>	<b>\$47,042.0</b>	<b>\$59,549.0</b>	<b>\$12,507.0</b>
<b>Information Exchange / Outreach</b>					
Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations	\$137.5	\$155.0	\$154.0	\$0.0	(\$154.0)
Exchange Network	\$1,374.2	\$1,433.0	\$1,411.0	\$1,433.0	\$22.0
<b>Subtotal, Information Exchange / Outreach</b>	<b>\$1,511.7</b>	<b>\$1,588.0</b>	<b>\$1,565.0</b>	<b>\$1,433.0</b>	<b>(\$132.0)</b>
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>					
Information Security	\$562.3	\$792.0	\$780.0	\$801.0	\$21.0
IT / Data Management	\$15,975.5	\$16,338.0	\$16,083.0	\$16,872.0	\$789.0
<b>Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security</b>	<b>\$16,537.8</b>	<b>\$17,130.0</b>	<b>\$16,863.0</b>	<b>\$17,673.0</b>	<b>\$810.0</b>
<b>Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>					
Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$1,020.6	\$837.0	\$825.0	\$846.0	\$21.0
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	\$826.8	\$606.0	\$740.0	\$631.0	(\$109.0)
<b>Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>	<b>\$1,847.4</b>	<b>\$1,443.0</b>	<b>\$1,565.0</b>	<b>\$1,477.0</b>	<b>(\$88.0)</b>
<b>Operations and Administration</b>					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations					
<i>Rent</i>	\$46,016.9	\$44,997.0	\$44,295.0	\$45,353.0	\$1,058.0
<i>Utilities</i>	\$1,619.3	\$2,466.0	\$2,428.0	\$3,042.0	\$614.0

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
<i>Security</i>	\$4,308.9	\$6,767.0	\$6,661.0	\$6,524.0	(\$137.0)
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)</i>	\$18,319.9	\$20,726.0	\$20,403.0	\$21,351.0	\$948.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$70,265.0	\$74,956.0	\$73,787.0	\$76,270.0	\$2,483.0
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	\$2,671.4	\$3,049.0	\$3,001.0	\$3,116.0	\$115.0
Acquisition Management	\$19,129.3	\$24,645.0	\$24,327.0	\$24,985.0	\$658.0
Human Resources Management	\$5,203.0	\$5,036.0	\$4,969.0	\$5,063.0	\$94.0
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$20,428.7	\$24,306.0	\$24,008.0	\$26,102.0	\$2,094.0
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$117,697.4</b>	<b>\$131,992.0</b>	<b>\$130,092.0</b>	<b>\$135,536.0</b>	<b>\$5,444.0</b>
<b>Research: Human Health and Ecosystems</b>					
Human Health Risk Assessment	\$3,926.4	\$3,972.0	\$3,910.0	\$3,325.0	(\$585.0)
<b>Research: Land Protection</b>					
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	\$23,859.1	\$20,081.0	\$19,768.0	\$21,021.0	\$1,253.0
Research: SITE Program	\$255.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Research: Land Protection</b>	<b>\$24,114.2</b>	<b>\$20,081.0</b>	<b>\$19,768.0</b>	<b>\$21,021.0</b>	<b>\$1,253.0</b>
<b>Research: Sustainability</b>					
Research: Sustainability	\$212.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Superfund Cleanup</b>					
Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal	\$222,093.7	\$191,880.0	\$190,011.0	\$193,853.0	\$3,842.0
Superfund: EPA Emergency Preparedness	\$9,101.6	\$9,318.0	\$9,195.0	\$9,504.0	\$309.0
Superfund: Federal Facilities	\$31,763.5	\$31,879.0	\$31,447.0	\$31,440.0	(\$7.0)
Superfund: Remedial	\$659,513.4	\$584,836.0	\$591,078.0	\$586,120.0	(\$4,958.0)
Superfund: Support to Other Federal Agencies	\$4,967.0	\$6,575.0	\$6,472.0	\$6,575.0	\$103.0
Brownfields Projects	\$4,420.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Superfund Cleanup</b>	<b>\$931,859.2</b>	<b>\$824,488.0</b>	<b>\$828,203.0</b>	<b>\$827,492.0</b>	<b>(\$711.0)</b>
<b>Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>	<b>\$1,352,419.3</b>	<b>\$1,244,706.0</b>	<b>\$1,253,998.0</b>	<b>\$1,264,233.0</b>	<b>\$10,235.0</b>
(Transfer to Office of Inspector General)	(\$12,286.2)	(\$7,149.0)	(\$11,486.0)	(\$7,164.0)	\$4,322.0
(Transfer to Science and Technology)	(\$29,312.3)	(\$26,126.0)	(\$25,718.0)	(\$26,417.0)	(\$699.0)
<b>Leaking Underground Storage Tanks</b>					
<b>Compliance</b>					
Compliance Assistance and Centers	\$644.1	\$688.0	\$709.0	\$753.0	\$44.0
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>					
IT / Data Management	\$136.5	\$177.0	\$174.0	\$162.0	(\$12.0)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
<b>Operations and Administration</b>					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations					
<i>Rent</i>	\$717.1	\$696.0	\$685.0	\$696.0	\$11.0
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations     (other activities)</i>	\$131.4	\$205.0	\$202.0	\$206.0	\$4.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$848.5	\$901.0	\$887.0	\$902.0	\$15.0
Acquisition Management	\$223.1	\$165.0	\$162.0	\$165.0	\$3.0
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$812.6	\$1,102.0	\$1,085.0	\$1,131.0	\$46.0
Human Resources Management	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$1,887.2</b>	<b>\$2,171.0</b>	<b>\$2,137.0</b>	<b>\$2,201.0</b>	<b>\$64.0</b>
<b>Research: Land Protection</b>					
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	\$657.0	\$660.0	\$650.0	\$413.0	(\$237.0)
<b>Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)</b>					
LUST / UST					
<i>EPA Act &amp; Related Authorities     Implementation</i>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1,575.0	\$0.0	(\$1,575.0)
<i>LUST / UST (other activities)</i>	\$14,996.1	\$10,558.0	\$10,393.0	\$10,548.0	\$155.0
Subtotal, LUST / UST	\$14,996.1	\$10,558.0	\$11,968.0	\$10,548.0	(\$1,420.0)
LUST Cooperative Agreements					
<i>EPA Act &amp; Related Authorities     Implementation</i>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$28,941.0	\$0.0	(\$28,941.0)
<i>LUST Cooperative Agreements (other     activities)</i>	\$65,353.0	\$58,207.0	\$61,237.0	\$58,207.0	(\$3,030.0)
Subtotal, LUST Cooperative Agreements	\$65,353.0	\$58,207.0	\$90,178.0	\$58,207.0	(\$31,971.0)
<b>Subtotal, Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)</b>	<b>\$80,349.1</b>	<b>\$68,765.0</b>	<b>\$102,146.0</b>	<b>\$68,755.0</b>	<b>(\$33,391.0)</b>
<b>Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks</b>	<b>\$83,673.9</b>	<b>\$72,461.0</b>	<b>\$105,816.0</b>	<b>\$72,284.0</b>	<b>(\$33,532.0)</b>
<b>OIL SPILL RESPONSE</b>					
<b>Compliance</b>					
Compliance Assistance and Centers	\$267.9	\$291.0	\$286.0	\$303.0	\$17.0
<b>Enforcement</b>					
Civil Enforcement	\$1,661.5	\$2,065.0	\$2,072.0	\$2,233.0	\$161.0
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>					
IT / Data Management	\$23.8	\$34.0	\$33.0	\$24.0	(\$9.0)
<b>Oil</b>					
Oil Spill: Prevention, Preparedness and Response	\$12,890.3	\$13,499.0	\$13,290.0	\$13,927.0	\$637.0

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
<b>Operations and Administration</b>					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations					
<i>Rent</i>	\$447.0	\$438.0	\$431.0	\$438.0	\$7.0
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations     (other activities)</i>	\$53.4	\$52.0	\$57.0	\$58.0	\$1.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$500.4	\$490.0	\$488.0	\$496.0	\$8.0
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$500.4</b>	<b>\$490.0</b>	<b>\$488.0</b>	<b>\$496.0</b>	<b>\$8.0</b>
<b>Research: Land Protection</b>					
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	\$841.3	\$901.0	\$887.0	\$704.0	(\$183.0)
<b>Total, Oil Spill Response</b>	<b>\$16,185.2</b>	<b>\$17,280.0</b>	<b>\$17,056.0</b>	<b>\$17,687.0</b>	<b>\$631.0</b>
<b>STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS</b>					
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)</b>					
Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water SRF	\$1,039,998.4	\$687,554.0	\$689,080.0	\$555,000.0	(\$134,080.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Drinking Water SRF	\$800,695.0	\$842,167.0	\$829,029.0	\$842,167.0	\$13,138.0
Congressionally Mandated Projects	\$150,200.2	\$0.0	\$143,723.0	\$0.0	(\$143,723.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Alaska Native Villages	\$34,907.5	\$15,500.0	\$24,610.0	\$15,500.0	(\$9,110.0)
Brownfields Projects	\$85,865.8	\$89,258.0	\$93,518.0	\$93,558.0	\$40.0
Clean School Bus Initiative	\$4,523.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program					
<i>EPAct &amp; Related Authorities     Implementation</i>	\$0.0	\$35,000.0	\$49,220.0	\$49,220.0	\$0.0
<i>CA Emission Reduction Project Grants</i>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$9,844.0	\$0.0	(\$9,844.0)
Subtotal, Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program	\$0.0	\$35,000.0	\$59,064.0	\$49,220.0	(\$9,844.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Mexico Border	\$96,452.7	\$10,000.0	\$19,688.0	\$10,000.0	(\$9,688.0)
<b>Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)</b>	<b>\$2,212,643.2</b>	<b>\$1,679,479.0</b>	<b>\$1,858,712.0</b>	<b>\$1,565,445.0</b>	<b>(\$293,267.0)</b>
<b>Categorical Grants</b>					
Categorical Grant: Beaches Protection	\$10,573.4	\$9,900.0	\$9,746.0	\$9,900.0	\$154.0
Categorical Grant: Brownfields	\$50,556.9	\$49,495.0	\$48,723.0	\$49,495.0	\$772.0
Categorical Grant: Environmental Information	\$15,830.8	\$12,850.0	\$9,844.0	\$11,000.0	\$1,156.0
Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	\$104,650.9	\$103,346.0	\$101,734.0	\$103,346.0	\$1,612.0
Categorical Grant: Homeland Security	\$3,730.2	\$4,950.0	\$4,873.0	\$4,950.0	\$77.0
Categorical Grant: Lead	\$22,935.5	\$13,564.0	\$13,352.0	\$13,564.0	\$212.0
Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)	\$209,889.6	\$194,040.0	\$200,857.0	\$184,540.0	(\$16,317.0)
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Enforcement	\$19,063.6	\$18,711.0	\$18,419.0	\$18,711.0	\$292.0

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Program Implementation	\$13,319.3	\$12,970.0	\$12,768.0	\$12,970.0	\$202.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)					
<i>Monitoring Grants</i>	\$13,246.5	\$18,500.0	\$18,211.0	\$18,500.0	\$289.0
<i>Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106) (other activities)</i>	\$197,964.3	\$203,164.0	\$199,995.0	\$203,164.0	\$3,169.0
Subtotal, Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)	\$211,210.8	\$221,664.0	\$218,206.0	\$221,664.0	\$3,458.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention	\$6,121.9	\$5,940.0	\$4,863.0	\$4,940.0	\$77.0
Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	\$97,461.9	\$99,100.0	\$97,554.0	\$99,100.0	\$1,546.0
Categorical Grant: Radon	\$7,915.0	\$8,074.0	\$7,948.0	\$8,074.0	\$126.0
Categorical Grant: Sector Program	\$1,360.9	\$2,228.0	\$1,209.0	\$1,828.0	\$619.0
Categorical Grant: State and Local Air Quality Management	\$208,567.3	\$185,180.0	\$216,825.0	\$185,580.0	(\$31,245.0)
Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds	\$4,582.0	\$0.0	\$9,844.0	\$0.0	(\$9,844.0)
Categorical Grant: Toxics Substances Compliance	\$5,710.3	\$5,099.0	\$5,019.0	\$5,099.0	\$80.0
Categorical Grant: Tribal Air Quality Management	\$11,840.5	\$10,940.0	\$10,769.0	\$13,300.0	\$2,531.0
Categorical Grant: Tribal General Assistance Program	\$61,569.8	\$56,925.0	\$56,037.0	\$57,925.0	\$1,888.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Injection Control (UIC)	\$10,150.8	\$10,891.0	\$10,721.0	\$10,891.0	\$170.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks	\$29,459.4	\$22,274.0	\$2,461.0	\$22,800.0	\$20,339.0
Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training	\$828.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Water Quality Cooperative Agreements	\$1,258.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Wetlands Program Development	\$16,313.7	\$16,830.0	\$16,567.0	\$16,830.0	\$263.0
<b>Subtotal, Categorical Grants</b>	<b>\$1,124,900.7</b>	<b>\$1,064,971.0</b>	<b>\$1,078,339.0</b>	<b>\$1,056,507.0</b>	<b>(\$21,832.0)</b>
<b>Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>	<b>\$3,337,543.9</b>	<b>\$2,744,450.0</b>	<b>\$2,937,051.0</b>	<b>\$2,621,952.0</b>	<b>(\$315,099.0)</b>
<b>Total, Rescission of Prior Year Funds</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$5,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$5,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$10,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$5,000.0)</b>
<b>TOTAL, EPA</b>	<b>\$7,911,371.9</b>	<b>\$7,199,400.0</b>	<b>\$7,472,324.0</b>	<b>\$7,142,520.0</b>	<b>(\$329,804.0)</b>



## **DISCONTINUED PROGRAMS**

**Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds**

Program Area: Categorical Grants

Goal: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems

Objective(s): Ecosystems

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted
<b><i>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</i></b>	<b>\$4,582.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$9,844.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$9,844.0)</b>
Total Budget Authority / Obligations	\$4,582.0	\$0.0	\$9,844.0	\$0.0	(\$9,844.0)
Total Workyears	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**Program Project Description:**

The Targeted Watersheds Grant Program encourages successful community-based approaches and management techniques to protect and restore the nation's waters.

The Targeted Watersheds Grant Program enhances community watershed groups' efforts through two different types of competitive grants. Implementation grants provide monetary assistance directly to watershed organizations to implement restoration/protection activities within their watershed. Resources are used to stabilize stream banks, demonstrate nutrient management schemes, establish pollutant credits and trading projects, and work with local governments and private citizens to promote sustainable practices and strategies. Capacity building grants support established watershed service providers in their effort to increase the viability, sustainability and effectiveness of local watershed groups by providing tools, training, and education.

**FY 2009 Activities and Performance Plan:**

There is no request for this program in FY 2009.

**FY 2009 Change from FY 2008 Enacted Budget (Dollars in Thousands):**

- (-\$9,844.0) This reduction reflects elimination of congressionally directed funding provided in the FY 2008 Omnibus.

**Statutory Authority:**

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006, Public Law 109-54.

**Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training**

Program Area: Categorical Grants

Goal: Clean and Safe Water

Objective(s): Protect Water Quality

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted
<b><i>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</i></b>	<b><i>\$828.1</i></b>	<b><i>\$0.0</i></b>	<b><i>\$0.0</i></b>	<b><i>\$0.0</i></b>	<b><i>\$0.0</i></b>
Total Budget Authority / Obligations	\$828.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Total Workyears	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**Program Project Description:**

Section 104(g)(1) of the Clean Water Act authorizes funding for the Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator On-site Assistance Training program. This program targets small publicly-owned wastewater treatment plants, with a discharge of less than 5,000,000 gallons per day. Federal funding for this program is administered through grants to states, often in cooperation with educational institutions or non-profit agencies. In most cases, assistance is administered through an environmental training center.

The goal of the program is to provide direct on-site assistance to operators at these small wastewater treatment facilities. The assistance focuses on issues such as wastewater treatment plant capacity, operation training, maintenance, administrative management, financial management, trouble-shooting, and laboratory operations.

**FY 2009 Activities and Performance Highlights:**

There is no request for this program in FY 2009.

**FY 2009 Change from FY 2008 Enacted Budget (Dollars in Thousands):**

- No change in program funding.

**Statutory Authority:**

CWA.

**Categorical Grant: Water Quality Cooperative Agreements**

Program Area: Categorical Grants

Goal: Clean and Safe Water

Objective(s): Protect Water Quality

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted
<b><i>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</i></b>	<b><i>\$1,258.1</i></b>	<b><i>\$0.0</i></b>	<b><i>\$0.0</i></b>	<b><i>\$0.0</i></b>	<b><i>\$0.0</i></b>
Total Budget Authority / Obligations	\$1,258.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Total Workyears	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**Program Project Description:**

Under authority of Section 104(b)(3) of the Clean Water Act, EPA makes grants to a wide variety of recipients, including states, Tribes, state water pollution control agencies, interstate agencies, and other nonprofit institutions, organizations, and individuals to promote the coordination of environmentally beneficial activities. This competitive funding vehicle is used by EPA's partners to further the Agency's goals of providing clean and safe water. The program is designed to fund a broad range of projects, including: innovative water efficiency programs, research, training and education, demonstration, best management practices, stormwater management planning, and innovative permitting programs and studies related to the causes, effects, extent, and prevention of pollution.

**FY 2009 Activities and Performance Highlights:**

There is no request for this program in FY 2009.

**FY 2009 Change from FY 2008 Enacted Budget (Dollars in Thousands):**

- No change in program funding.

**Statutory Authority:**

CWA.

## EXPECTED BENEFITS OF THE PRESIDENT'S E-GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

### **Grants.gov**

The Grants.gov Initiative benefits EPA and its grant programs by providing a single location to publish grant opportunities and application packages, and by providing a single site for the grants community to apply for grants using common forms, processes and systems. EPA believes that the central site raises the visibility of our grants opportunities to a wider diversity of applicants. Grants.gov has also allowed EPA to discontinue support for its own electronic grant application system, saving operational, training, and account management costs.

The grants community benefits from savings in postal costs, paper and envelopes.

Applicants save time in searching for Agency grant opportunities and in learning the application systems of various agencies. At the request of the state environmental agencies, EPA has begun to offer Grants.gov application packages for mandatory grants (i.e. Continuing Environmental Program Grants). States requested that we extend usage to mandatory programs to streamline their application process.

During FY07 EPA posted 173 grant opportunities on Grants.gov Find and linked 100% of those competitive opportunities to electronic application packages on Apply. EPA received 2,942 applications through Grants.gov in 2007, a 28% increase over the number of applications received in 2007.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-04-00-04-1316-24-402-16	\$536.2
2009	020-00-04-00-04-1316-24	\$517.7

### **Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE)**

The Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) is comprised of nine government-wide automated applications and/or databases that have contributed to streamlining the acquisition business process across the government. EPA leverages the usefulness of some of these systems via electronic linkages between EPA's acquisition systems and the IAE shared systems. Other IAE systems are not linked directly to EPA's acquisition systems, but

benefit the Agency's contracting staff and vendor community as stand-alone resources.

EPA's acquisition systems use data provided by the Central Contractor Registry (CCR) to replace internally maintained vendor data. Contracting officers can download vendor-provided representation and certification information electronically, via the Online Representations and Certifications (ORCA) database, which allows vendors to submit this information once, rather than separately for every contract proposal. Contracting officers are able to access the Excluded

Parties List System (EPLS) via links in EPA's acquisition systems to identify vendors that are debarred from receiving contract awards.

Contracting officers can also link to the Wage Determination Online (WDOL) to obtain information required under the Service Contract Act and the Davis-Bacon Act. EPA's acquisition systems link to the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG) for submission of contract actions at the time of award.

FPDS-NG provides public access to government-wide contract information. The Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS) supports vendor submission of subcontracting data for contracts identified as requiring this information. EPA submits synopses of procurement opportunities over \$25,000 to the Federal Business Opportunities (FBO) website, where the information is accessible to the public. Vendors use this website to identify business opportunities in federal contracting.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	\$127.278
2009	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	\$151.282

### **Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) Grants and Loans**

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) requires the agencies to unambiguously identify contract, grant, and loan recipients and determine parent/child relationship, address information, etc. The FFATA taskforce

determined that using both the Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) DUNS Number (standard identifier for all business lines) and Central Contractor Registration (CCR), the single point of entry for data collection and dissemination, is the most appropriate way to accomplish this. This fee will pay for EPA's use of this service in the course of reporting grants and/or loans.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-16-02-0231-24	\$89.9
2009	020-00-01-16-02-0231-24	\$89.9

Note: FY 2008 amount is for Agency contribution and FY 2009 amount is for service fee.

### **Enterprise Human Resource Integration Initiative**

The Enterprise Human Resource Integration's (EHRI) Electronic Official Personnel Folder (eOPF) is designed to provide a consolidated repository that digitally documents the employment actions and history of individuals employed by the

Federal government. EPA plans to migrate from a manual Official Personnel File (OPF) process to the federal eOPF system by April 2008. This initiative will benefit the Agency by reducing contract support costs for file room maintenance and improve customer service for employees and productivity for HR specialists.

The Agency plans to reduce the Headquarters OPF contract once the eOPF is implemented. The contract will be evaluated one year from the actual eOPF deployment to determine if additional cost reductions are feasible or if the contract could be eliminated. In addition, customer service will improve for employees since they will have 24/7 access to view and print their

official personnel documents and HR specialists will no longer be required to manually file, retrieve or mail personnel actions to employees thus improving productivity.

EPA benefits from EHRI in FY09 are anticipated to be the same as those described for FY08.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-16-01-1219-21	\$406.0
2009	020-00-01-16-01-1219-21	\$474.2

### **Recruitment One-Stop (ROS)**

Recruitment One-Stop (ROS) simplifies the process of locating and applying for Federal jobs. USAJOBS is a standard job announcement and resume builder. It is the one-stop for Federal job seekers to search for and apply to positions on-line. This integrated process benefits citizens by providing a more efficient process to locate and apply for jobs, and assists Federal agencies in hiring top talent in a competitive marketplace. The Recruitment One-Stop initiative has increased job seeker satisfaction with the Federal job application process and is helping the Agency to locate highly-qualified candidates and improve response times to applicants.

By integrating with ROS, the Agency has eliminated the need for applicants to

maintain multiple user IDs to apply for Federal jobs through various systems. The vacancy announcement format has been improved for easier readability. The system can maintain up to 5 resumes per applicant, which allows them to create and store resumes tailored to specific skills -- this is an improvement from our previous system that only allowed one resume per applicant. In addition, ROS has a notification feature that keeps applicants updated on the current status of the application, and provides a link to the agency website for detailed information. This self-help ROS feature allows applicants to obtain up-to-date information on the status of their application upon request.

EPA benefits from Recruitment One-Stop in FY09 are anticipated to be the same as those described for FY08.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-16-04-0010-24	\$102.2
2009	020-00-01-16-04-0010-24	\$106.3

### **eTraining**

The President's Management Agenda encourages e-learning to improve training,

efficiency and financial performance. EPA recently exercised its option to renew the current Interagency Agreement with OPM-GoLearn that provides licenses to online

training for employees. EPA purchased 5,000 licenses to prevent any interruption in service to current users.

EPA benefits from eTraining in FY09 are anticipated to be the same as those described for FY08.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24-403-250	\$80.0
2009	020-00-01-16-1217-24	\$80.0

### **Human Resources LoB**

The Human Resources Line of Business (HR LoB) provides federal government the infrastructure to support pay-for-performance systems, modernized HR systems, and the core functionality necessary for the strategic management of human capital.

The HR LoB offers common solutions that will enable Federal departments and agencies to work more effectively, and it provides managers and executives across the Federal Government improved means to meet strategic objectives. EPA benefits by supporting an effective program management activity which will deliver more tangible results in 2009 and beyond.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24-403-250	\$65.217
2009	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$65.217

### **Grants Management LoB**

EPA manages 6,288 grant awards equaling approximately \$4.1 billion. EPA anticipates the key benefit will be having a centralized location to download all applications, make awards, and track awards to closeout. Automated business processes available through consortium service providers will decrease agency reliance on manual and paper-based processing. Consortium lead agencies will spread operations and maintenance (O&M) costs, and development, modernization, and enhancement (DME) costs across agencies, decreasing the burden that any one agency must bear.

GM LoB will lead to a reduction in the number of systems of record for grants data across EPA and the government and the

development of common reporting standards, improving EPA's ability to provide agency- and government-wide reports on grant activities and results. Migrating to a consortium lead agency will help EPA comply with the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 and the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006.

Service to constituents will be improved through the standardization and streamlining of government-wide grants business processes. The public will save time a result of quicker notification and faster payments due to an automated system for grants processing. Furthermore, GM LoB will minimize complex and varying agency-specific requirements and increase grantee ease of use on Federal grants management



systems. Constituents will benefit as they will have fewer unique agency systems and processes to learn; grantees' ability to learn how to use the system will be improved and reliance on call center technical support will

be reduced. Consortium lead agencies will also provide grantees with online access to standard post-award reports, decreasing the number of unique agency-specific reporting requirements.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-04-00-04-1300-24-108-025	\$59.3
2009	020-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$59.3

### **Geospatial LoB**

The Geospatial Line of Business (GeoLoB) will reduce EPA costs and improve our operations in several areas. The investment in FY08 and FY09 will provide the necessary planning and coordination to begin providing significant benefits to EPA in FY10 and beyond in the following ways:

EPA's mission requires the use of a broad range of data on places (e.g. facilities, roads, waste sites, etc.) and geographic features (wetlands, soils, hydrography, etc) to support our decision making processes. OMB circular A-16 identified over 30 critical datasets, many of which are needed to support environmental decisions. The GeoLoB Program Management Office, established in late FY07, will help EPA by providing much needed planning and coordination across the A-16 data stewards to complete these critical data sets.

EPA is moving towards deployment of a service-oriented architecture that will facilitate flexible access to data to support a variety of business applications. Implementing a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) requires the establishment of common standards and

policies. The GeoLoB will advance the establishment of a geospatial segment architecture as part of the Federal Enterprise Architecture that can expose geospatial data and capabilities across vertical lines of business. In the process of establishing the geospatial segment architecture, the GeoLoB will promote the implementation of standards and policies to support an SOA.

EPA's geospatial program has saved approximately \$2 million per year by consolidating procurements for data and tools into multi-year enterprise licenses. The GeoLoB will reduce costs by providing an opportunity for EPA and other agencies to share approaches on procurement consolidation that other agencies can follow. In FY08, EPA is leading a GeoLoB initiative to explore opportunities for Federal-wide acquisition of key geospatial software and data.

EPA benefits from Geospatial LoB in FY09 are anticipated to be the same as those described for FY08.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-16-04-3100-24	\$43.2
2009	020-00-01-16-04-3100-24	\$42.0

### **eRulemaking**

The eRulemaking program is designed to enhance public access and participation in the regulatory process through electronic systems; reduce burden for citizens and businesses in finding relevant regulations and commenting on proposed rulemaking actions; consolidate redundant docket systems; and improve agency regulatory processes and the timeliness of regulatory decisions.

The Federal Docket Management System, which was launched under eRulemaking, has simplified the public's participation in the rulemaking process and made EPA's

rulemaking business processes more accessible as well as transparent. FDMS provides EPA's 1,430 registered users with a secure, centralized electronic repository for managing the Agency's rulemaking development via distributed management of data and robust role-based user access. EPA posts regulatory and non-regulatory documents in *Regulations.gov* for public viewing, downloading, and commenting. From January through October 2007, *Regulations.gov* posted 1,374 Federal Register notices, 1,171 rules and proposed rules, and 24,461 public submissions. During the same time-frame, EPA posted 13,429 supporting and related materials.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-16-04-0060-24-306-113	\$ 535.0
2009	020-00-01016-04-0060-24	\$1,531.1

### **E-Authentication**

Public trust in the security of information exchanged over the Internet plays a vital role in the success of E-Gov initiatives. E-Authentication is setting the standards for the identity proofing of individuals and businesses, based on risk of online services used. The initiative focuses on meeting the authentication business needs of the E-Gov initiatives and building the necessary infrastructure to support common, unified processes and systems for government-wide

use. This will help build the trust that must be an inherent part of every online exchange between citizens and government.

The only web-based E-Authentication that EPA is currently implementing is for Central Data Exchange Web Portal (CDX-Web) at Level 3. CDX-Web provides E-Authentication and other services for back-end EPA systems, and our current plan is to offer production Level 3 E-Authentication for the end-users of the one system that currently is on track to implement PKI-

based digital signatures. This implementation will achieve production Level 3 E-Authentication by upgrading PKI certificate management practices and validation technologies already available within the CDX-Web environment so that they meet the requirements for E-Authentication participation. As currently planned, the implementation will provide E-Authentication services for 1,000 to 2,000 end-users.

The initiative benefits EPA by providing expertise, guidance, and documentation,

including project planning and reporting templates, to enable EPA to achieve production implementation of E-Authentication for its CDX-Web by the end of Q2 FY08. EPA is taking advantage of the availability of PKI certificates provided through the EPA Authentication Federation to offer production level 3 E-Authentication service.

EPA benefits from E-Authentication in FY09 are anticipated to be similar to those described for FY08.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-16-03-0250-24	\$104.1
2009	020-00-01-16-03-0250-24	\$201.9

### **Business Gateway**

By creating a single portal for business information, such as the e-Forms catalog, Business Gateway directly benefits EPA's regulated communities, many of whom are subject to complex regulatory requirements across multiple agencies. The Business Gateway initiative benefits EPA by supporting the Agency's emphasis on the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002. EPA has over 100 initiatives, activities, and services directed at small business needs. Business.gov continues to provide a one-stop compliance tool enabling small and emerging businesses access to compliance information, forms and tools across the Federal Government. Business

Gateway supports EPA's small business activities function by providing the following benefits:

- Providing a single point of access for electronic regulatory forms;
- Providing "plain English" compliance guidance, fact sheets and links to checklists for small businesses; and
- Maintaining an extensive Web site with numerous links to other internal and external assistance sources.

EPA anticipates similar benefits from Business Gateway in 2009 as stated for 2008.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-16-04-0100-24	\$120.0
2009	020-00-01-16-04-0100-24	\$209.3

**E-Travel**

E-Travel is designed to provide EPA more efficient and effective travel management services, with cost savings from cross-government purchasing agreements and improved functionality through streamlined travel policies and processes, strict security and privacy controls, and enhanced agency oversight and audit capabilities.

EPA employees also will benefit from the integrated travel planning provided through E-Travel. EPA and GSA have agreed to a September 2008 GovTrip implementation date.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-01-03-0221-24	\$1,088.7
2009	020-00-01-01-03-0221-24	\$1,327.9

**IT LoB**

The initiative benefits EPA through improved IT performance, greater efficiencies in IT infrastructure investments, and consistency and standardization of infrastructure platforms. The IT LoB will provide EPA with best practice data and industry-wide performance metrics to validate existing performance.

EPA stands to benefit from all three IT Infrastructure areas of concentration (End User Systems and Support, Mainframes and Servers Systems and Support, and Telecommunications Systems and Support). In addition, EPA should benefit from information and, potentially, pricing previously available to only larger agencies.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-02-00-04-3300-24	\$20.0
2009	020-00-02-00-04-3300-24	\$0.0

**Financial Management Line of Business**

EPA will complete the planning and acquisition phase of its Financial System Modernization Project (FSMP) and will begin migration to a shared service provider. This work will benefit from the migration guidance developed in FY06, including the use of performance metrics developed for service level agreements and the use of

standard business processes developed for four core financial management sub-functions: Payments, Receipts, Funds and Reporting. The Agency expects to achieve operational savings in future years because of the use of the shared service provider for operations and maintenance of the new system.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2008	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	\$45.0
2009	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	\$44.4

### **Budget Formulation and Execution (BFE) LoB**

The Budget Formulation and Execution Lines of Business (BFE LoB) allows EPA and other agencies to access budget-related benefits and services and optionally implement LoB sponsored tools and

services.

EPA has benefited from the BFE LoB in the following ways:

- Through on-going agency presentations, the LoB shares valuable information on what has/hasn't worked (best/worst practices) on the use of different budget systems and software.
- Through the use of a collaboration effort, a government-wide/government only capability for electronic collaboration (*Wiki*) has been established where a Budget Community website allows EPA to share budget information with OMB (and other federal agencies) in a more efficient and effective manner.
- The LoB is working on giving EPA and other agencies the capability to have secure, virtual on-line meetings where participants can not only hear what's been said by conference calling into the meeting, but also view budget-related presentations directly from their workspace.

- The LoB has provided EPA and other agencies with Budget Execution and Financial Management Integration tools, such as fundamental budget documents, that provide agencies a better understanding of the relationship and tie-in between the budget process and the financial management process.
- The LoB has provided budget-related training to EPA budget employees on OMB's MAX budget system, and on Treasury's FACTS II statements and how it ties to the budget process.
- EPA will also benefit from the LoB's on-going effort to develop a government-wide "core competencies" budget training and certification program where employees entering the field of budget will be required to complete essential basic federal budgeting training; thus providing EPA with a better qualified budget analysts.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2008	-----	\$110.0 of in-kind services
2009	-----	\$95.0 of in-kind services