



Final

FY 2013

**Office of Chemical Safety
and Pollution Prevention**

**National Program Manager
Guidance**

740K12001

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
A. INTRODUCTION	5
B. FY 2013 REGIONAL PRIORITIES	5
1. OPP’S CROSS-REGIONAL PRIORITIES.....	5
2. OPP’S REGION-SPECIFIC PRIORITIES.....	5
3. OPPT’S PROGRAM-SPECIFIC PRIORITIES.....	6
C. REGIONAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES	7
1. OPP’s CROSS-REGIONAL STRATEGIES	7
2. OPP’s REGION-SPECIFIC STRATEGIES	7
3. OPPT’s PROGRAM-SPECIFIC REGIONAL STRATEGIES.....	8
D. SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO PRIORITIES OR STRATEGIES FROM FY 2012	9
1. OPP	9
2. OPPT	10
E. OCSPP CONTACTS	11
II. CROSS AGENCY PROGRAMS, PRIORITIES, AND REQUIREMENTS	12
A. STRATEGIC PLAN	12
1. Goals and Objectives	12
2. Cross-Cutting Fundamental Strategies and Administrator Priorities	12
B. Expanding the Conversation on Environmentalism	13
C. STRENGTHENING STATE, TRIBAL AND INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS	13
D. WORKING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND CHILDREN’S HEALTH	15
1. OCSPP Program Contributions to Plan EJ 2014	15
2. Title VI	16
E. SUSTAINABILITY	17

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

F. BETTER SERVING COMMUNITIES	18
G. OPPORTUNITIES TO GAIN EFFICIENCY	19
H. STATE GRANT WORKPLANS AND PROGRESS REPORTS.....	20
1. Grants Policy Issuance (GPI) 11-03	20
2. State Grant Performance Measures.....	20
I. ENHANCED COLLABORATION WITH OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE.....	21
J. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND ALIGNMENT.....	21
III. OCSPP PROGRAM OVERVIEW.....	22
IV. OPP REGIONAL OFFICE PROGRAM PRIORITIES	23
A. OPP CROSS-REGIONAL PRIORITIES.....	24
1. School IPM.....	24
2. Strengthening State/Tribal Partnerships through Continued Effective Management Grants/Cooperative Agreements	25
B. OPP REGION-SPECIFIC PRIORITIES.....	28
1. Guidelines for Regional-Specific Priority Areas to Strengthen State and Tribal Partnerships and Programs	29
2. Pesticide Occupational Worker Safety (Including Soil Fumigation).....	30
3. Protection of Water Sources from Pesticide Exposure	32
4. Expansion and Enhancement of Pesticide Protections in Indian Country	34
5. Bed Bug Outreach/Assistance	35
6. Endangered Species.....	36
7. Support of the Agricultural Sector.....	36
V. OPPT PROGRAM-SPECIFIC REGIONAL OFFICES PRIORITIES	40
A. LEAD RISK REDUCTION PROGRAM.....	40
1. Program Description.....	40
2. Children’s Health and Environmental Justice (EJ).....	40
3. Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices	41

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

4.	Proposed Regional Offices ACS Measures	42
5.	Definitions and Clarification of Measures	42
B.	CHEMICAL RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	45
1.	Program Description	45
2.	Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices	45
3.	Proposed Regional Offices ACS Measures	46
4.	Definitions and Clarification of Measures	46
C.	CHEMICAL RISK REVIEW AND REDUCTION PROGRAM.....	47
1.	Program Description	47
2.	Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices	48
D.	POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM.....	48
1.	Program Description	48
2.	Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices	49
3.	Proposed Regional Offices ACS Measures	50
4.	Definitions and Clarification of Measures	50
E.	COMMUNITY ACTION FOR A RENEWED ENVIRONMENT (CARE).....	52
1.	Program Description	52
2.	Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices	52
3.	Proposed Regional Offices ACS Measures	53
4.	Definitions and Clarification of Measures	53

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

The annual National Program Manager (NPM) Guidance documents set forth program priorities and key actions for the upcoming year, and therefore serve as important internal controls for Agency programmatic operations. The Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP) NPM Guidance outlines our FY 2013 program priorities for EPA regional offices for each of the national programs managed by the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) and the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT), and defines our FY 2013 program priorities, implementation strategies and Regional office performance expectations and measures. This Guidance was developed in coordination with other EPA National Program Managers and Regional offices, and input received from states, territories, tribes and other concerned stakeholders. (Throughout this document, the term state may also include territories.) This Guidance identifies critical activities needed to be conducted by Regional offices to achieve the FY 2013 Annual Performance Plan as articulated in the FY 2013 President's Budget, guided by the *FY 2011-2015 EPA Strategic Plan*.

B. FY 2013 REGIONAL PRIORITIES

OCSPP's Regional office program priorities for FY 2013 are:

1. *OPP'S CROSS-REGIONAL PRIORITIES*

a) **Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in Schools**

Decrease exposure of children to pests and pesticides through increased adoption of verifiable and sustainable IPM programs in schools at the elementary through high school levels.

b) **Strengthening State/Tribal Partnerships Through Continued Effective Management Grants/Cooperative Agreements**

Provide oversight to guarantee resources are directed to areas where they are most needed, and that states are conducting meaningful work in priority areas; and ensure that 100% of State and Tribal Assistance Grant (STAG) funds are obligated within the first year of appropriation.

2. *OPP'S REGION-SPECIFIC PRIORITIES*

a) **Pesticide Occupational Worker Safety (including Soil Fumigation)**

Provide worker protection standard (WPS) compliance assistance, education and outreach for growers, applicators and workers, and augment state and tribal pesticide worker safety program efforts, including the new soil fumigation requirements.

b) **Protection of Water Resources from Pesticide Exposure (including support for implementation of the NPDES Pesticide Permits)**

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

Ensure that pesticides do not adversely affect the nation's water.

c) Expansion of Pesticide Protection in Indian Country

Expand pesticide program coverage in Indian country and Alaskan Native Villages with the goal of protecting human health and the environment by ensuring pesticides and alternatives are available in Indian country and can be used according to label directions without causing unreasonable risks.

d) Bed Bug Outreach/Assistance

EPA's efforts to address the national bed bug epidemic through education and outreach on pesticide and integrated pest management control approaches, and providing support to other federal state and local agencies to respond to infestations.

e) Endangered Species Protection

Limit potential effects from pesticide use to listed species, while at the same time not placing undue burden on agriculture or other pesticide users.

f) Support of the Agricultural Sector

Improve the ability of the Agricultural Sector to understand, adjust to and implement new pesticide requirements and specific national pesticide priorities designed to protect human health and the environment from pesticides used in agriculture.

3. OPPT'S PROGRAM-SPECIFIC PRIORITIES

a) Reduce Lead Risks

Continue progress in reducing risks from lead-based paint and disparities in blood lead levels between low income and non-low income children.

b) Reduce Risks from PCBs and Other Legacy Chemicals

Reduce exposure to and risks from chemicals known generally as legacy chemicals with a focus on PCBs,. OCSPP fibers program activities have been eliminated in FY 2013.

c) Prevent Pollution

Continue to eliminate or reduce waste at the point of generation, conserve natural resources and promote the development and use of safer, "greener" materials and products to achieve a healthier environment and a more sustainable economy, focusing attention on chemicals being identified as candidates for risk management action under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

C. REGIONAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

OCSPP's Regional office program priorities for FY 2013 are:

1. OPP's CROSS-REGIONAL STRATEGIES

a) Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in Schools

Conduct activities to encourage public school officials at the elementary through high school levels to adopt IPM practices as a means to decrease exposure of children to pests and pesticides—such as outreach, training, and technical assistance with school officials and organizations to help schools adopt and implement IPM practices consistent with the National School IPM program.

b) Management of State and Tribal Grants/Cooperative Agreement:

Provide oversight and support to our state and tribal partners to ensure that EPA resources are directed to areas where they are most needed and best support the goals of the National Pesticide Program; negotiate, implement, and manage state and tribal cooperative agreements and grants consistent with the joint OPP/OECA FIFRA Cooperative Agreement Guidance (FIFRA Grant Guidance); foster prompt and accurate communication of Pesticide Program regulations, policies, and guidance to grantees; and, provide effective technical assistance and policy support for the grantees.

2. OPP's REGION-SPECIFIC STRATEGIES

a) Pesticide Occupational Worker Safety (including Soil Fumigation)

Continue WPS (including soil fumigation) education, outreach and training for growers, applicators, and workers. If selected as a regional priority, conduct at least one region-specific project/initiative contributing to implementation/enhancement of the worker protection and/or pesticide applicator certification field programs, or mitigation of other occupational exposure risks. The goal of a WPS project should be enhanced protection of agricultural pesticide workers, the goal of a Certification and Training (C&T) project should be improved competency of certified pesticide applicators, and the goal of other occupational exposure risk projects should be enhanced protection of those workers, including outreach on the new soil fumigant requirements.

b) Protection of Water Resources from Pesticide Exposure (including support for implementation of the NPDES Pesticide Permits)

Conduct work to support states and tribes evaluating pesticides to see if they are a concern to water resources, managing pesticides of concern and demonstrating progress of pesticides in water management strategies. Also, where routine opportunities present themselves, provide outreach to pesticide users who may be covered by the new pesticide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits issued under the Clean Water Act. If selected as a regional priority, conduct at least one region-specific project/initiative contributing to protection of water sources from pesticide risk.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

c) Expansion of Pesticide Protection in Indian Country

If selected as a regional priority, conduct at least one region-specific project/initiative, which was designed to expand pesticide program coverage and reduce pesticide risk in Indian Country and Alaska Native Villages. Where appropriate, projects should seek to benefit multiple tribes. Projects can include: working with tribes to develop tribal Pesticide Use Assessments; exploring tribal interest in participating in circuit-rider programs, either by expanding existing single tribe programs or establishing new circuit-rider programs; or, by developing pesticide outreach materials useful to tribes.

d) Bed Bug Outreach/Assistance

Establish relationships with other federal, state, tribal and local agencies to assist them where needed in their combined bed bug infestation responses/activities. If selected as a regional priority, conduct at least one region-specific project/ initiative contributing to education about prevention of, or response to, bed bug infestation, or providing technical assistance to states, tribes, pest management professionals, local bed bug programs, environmental justice advocates, the general public, or other stakeholders. In order to assure efficient use of resources, Regional offices should take steps to avoid duplication of efforts in developing materials, trainings, and meetings by consulting with the Bed Bug Clearinghouse on EPA's website (a URL will be provided in the final NPM guidance) and by communicating with OPP and other Regional offices (such as through OPP/Regional Bedbug Communications Workgroup).

e) Endangered Species Protection

If selected as a regional priority, conduct at least one region-specific project/initiative contributing to implementation of the Pesticide Program Endangered Species Program and increased co-regulator and public knowledge about the ESPP.

f) Support of the Agricultural Sector

If selected as a regional priority, conduct at least one region-specific project/initiative which will help the Agricultural Sector understand, adjust to and implement pesticide requirements related to pollinator protection, soil fumigation, spray drift, resistance management, transition to safer pesticides and practices, or obtain input from the Agricultural Sector on how pesticides scheduled for Registration Review are actually used in the field and the impacts of potential risk mitigation approaches.

3. OPPT's PROGRAM-SPECIFIC REGIONAL STRATEGIES

a) Reduce Lead Risks

Implement lead-based paint risk reduction education, outreach and regulatory implementation programs; continue overseeing the Section 404(g) grant program; provide outreach for Pre-Renovation Education Rule (406) and Disclosure Rule (1018); support the Training and Certification Rule 402(a), in states and tribes; create opportunities for partnerships to address lead-based paint hazards and exposure reduction; implement the Lead-Based Paint Renovation,

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

Repair and Painting (RRP) Rule; and coordinate implementation of Lead Program activities with OECA's implementation of compliance assistance, monitoring and enforcement strategies.

b) Reduce Risks from PCBs and Other Legacy Chemicals

Focus on providing assistance to federal agencies, states and tribes, local governments and school systems and others with responsibility for ensuring proper use of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). If so, provide information about options for replacement and opportunities for technical and funding assistance through Environmental Services Companies (ESCOs).

c) Prevent Pollution

Encourage cleaner production processes and technologies; promote the development and use of safer, "greener" materials and products; and support the implementation of improved practices such as the use of conservation techniques and the reuse of materials in lieu of their placement into the waste stream, focusing attention on chemicals being identified as candidates for risk management action under the Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA). The program uses the Economy, Energy and Environment (E3) framework to promote sustainable manufacturing by helping companies lean and green their factories and implement cost-cutting measures. In implementing pollution prevention strategies, leverage and coordinate effectively with all related Agency efforts to achieve a healthier environment and a more sustainable economy. Include a focus on strengthening cross-agency collaboration to foster sustainability in sports by facilitating EPA's green projects in the sports industry and supporting the coordination of these efforts across EPA to minimize duplication of efforts, maximize potential synergies, leverage Agency resources, and maximize return on investment.

D. SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO PRIORITIES OR STRATEGIES FROM FY 2012

OCSPP's FY 2013 priorities for Regional offices have been updated to reflect priorities, plans and measures identified in the *FY 2011 – FY 2015 EPA Strategic Plan* and the FY 2013 President's Budget.

1. OPP

Because of the difficulty in obtaining data to support a baseline for the FY 2012 School IPM ACS measure (number of children in public school covered by verifiable and on-going IPM program), the ACS measure for School IPM will be updated in FY 2013 to a more activity-based measure. In FY 2013, the School IPM measure will count the number of activities conducted consistent with the National School IPM Plan to provide outreach, education, and/or assistance to public school officials at the elementary through high school levels to adopt verifiable and sustainable IPM practices. Progress on this measure should result in increased adoption of IPM practices in public schools, grades K-12. This new measure is a non-commitment measure for FY 2013.

In addition, both the Pesticide Container/Containment Regulation Implementation priority and the Antimicrobial Hospital Disinfectants Efficacy and Misbranding priority have been deleted

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

from the FY 2013 OCSPP NPM Guidance, and will now be addressed under the FY 2013 OECA NPM Guidance. This is because the regional work needed to address these program areas in FY 2013 are related inspections and enforcement, which are more appropriately addressed on the OECA NPM Guidance. Regional offices will still be expected to continue program related activities for these areas (education, outreach, training and technical support); however, the level of program-related effort in the Regional offices associated with this work will be routine rather than rising to the level of “priority” work.

In the Protection of Water Resources from Pesticide Exposure priority, we have deleted the expectations that Regional pesticide staff will provide support to the Regional water program staff to review and develop NPDES pesticide permits. Those permits should already be in place, so that support will not be necessary in FY 2013.

We have also added a new pesticide priority for Support of the Agricultural Sector. The goal of this priority will be to help the agricultural sector understand, adjust to and implement new pesticide requirements and specific national priorities designed to protect human health and the environment from pesticides used in agriculture. The types and focus of regional projects to support this priority will support specific national pesticide program priorities (pollinator protection, soil fumigation, spray drift, resistance management, and transition to safer pesticides and practices). In addition, Regional offices may develop projects to support current or upcoming registration review activities by collecting information on real world pesticide use or impacts of risk mitigation approaches.

Finally, we have deleted ACS measure number 26, which was the State Grant Performance Measure (SGPM) for the pesticide program and addressed the number of applicators certified in each region. The data is already collected through the state and tribal agreement process and captured in the Certification Plan and Reporting Database (CPARD). Further, the Agency no longer requires a separate measure to capture state grant performance. Therefore, maintaining this measure in ACS is redundant.

2. OPPT

The FY2013 President’s Budget proposes a \$2.44 million and a 12.5 FTE reduction in the Chemical Risk Management program, including a reduction of \$1.407 million and 8.1 FTEs in Regional offices resources. This decrease reflects elimination of the fibers program activities and a reduction to EPA headquarters PCBs program activities. In the fibers program, updates to existing guidance, development of new guidance on emerging fibers hazards, and assistance to the public and regulated community – including schools and school systems – regarding asbestos regulations or health and safety concerns will not occur. There will be no capacity to implement the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) in the Regions. A clear message to enable Agency personnel to appropriately address inquiries from the public and regulated community either directly or through referral to other Agency programs will be developed. Requests for information should be directed to EPA’s asbestos website or the TSCA hotline. Congressional inquiries for Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests will continue to be addressed through existing Agency processes. The EPA headquarters PCBs program reduction will delay guidance on light ballasts and building caulk containing PCBs in schools, delaying the program’s ability to provide direction to school administrators and other building managers in

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

determining how to respond to the presence of PCBs in their facilities. Regional offices will continue to provide assistance and conduct education and outreach efforts on PCBs in schools and other buildings. As a result, the two FY 2012 asbestos ACS measures are replaced by a new measure (ACS measure TSCA1) tracking remaining Regional offices activities under the Chemical Risk Management program.

In FY 2013, the Pollution Prevention (P2) program will focus attention on chemicals identified as candidates for risk management action under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). The P2 program will also collaborate with other EPA environmental stewardship programs to provide an on-line, one stop shop of environmental information for sports teams, venue representatives, service providers and participants to pilot doing business differently to improve services, leverage resources and increase sustainability opportunities for stakeholders.

E. OCSPP CONTACTS

For general comments or questions, please contact Jennifer Vernon (202-564-6573). For program-specific questions, please contact:

Office of Pesticide Programs:

Daniel Helfgott, Field and External Affairs Division (703-308-8054)

Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics:

Mike Burns, Environmental Assistance Division (202-564-8273)

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

II. CROSS AGENCY PROGRAMS, PRIORITIES, AND REQUIREMENTS

This section of the Guidance describes EPA programs, priorities, and requirements that cut across EPA organizational lines and that involve OCSPP in some way. OCSPP either supports, implements, or is involved in the described activities below, but the overall efforts maybe led or managed by organizations other than OCSPP.

A. STRATEGIC PLAN

1. *Goals and Objectives*

OCSPP's FY 2013 NPM Guidance describes the key actions needed to accomplish the public health and environmental goals presented in the *FY 2011 – 2015 EPA Strategic Plan*. The *Strategic Plan* identifies the measurable environmental and human health outcomes the public can expect over the next five years and describes how we intend to achieve those results. The *Strategic Plan* represents a commitment to our core values of science, transparency and the rule of law in managing our programs.

With the help of states, tribes and other partners, OCSPP programs in headquarters and the Regional offices support the following:

- Goal 2, Objective 1 (Protecting America's Waters) – Protect Human Health;
- Goal 3, Objective 2 (Cleaning Up Communities and Advancing Sustainable Development) – Promote Sustainable and Livable Communities;
- Goal 3, Objective 4 (Cleaning Up Communities and Advancing Sustainable Development) – Strengthen Human Health and Environmental Protection in Indian Country;
- Goal 4, Objective 1 (Ensuring the Safety of Chemicals and Preventing Pollution) – Ensure Chemical Safety; and
- Goal 4, Objective 2 (Ensuring the Safety of Chemicals and Preventing Pollution) – Promote Preventing Pollution.

2. *Cross-Cutting Fundamental Strategies and Administrator Priorities*

The *FY 2011 – 2015 EPA Strategic Plan* also provides a blueprint for advancing *Administrator Lisa Jackson's seven priorities* for protecting human health and the environment. The *Strategic Plan* incorporates the Administrator's priorities into five cross-cutting fundamental strategies (XCFS). EPA has developed Action Plans to implement and advance each of the five XCFS. The Action Plans are designed to promote cross-program coordination and fundamentally change the way the Agency works to achieve our mission. Action Plans are and will be developed for each of the *Strategic Plan's* fiscal years. The most recent Action Plans are available is for the 2012 fiscal year, which articulates specific measureable actions that will be undertaken across

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

the Agency in FY 2012. FY 2012 XCFS Action Plans are available at <http://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/annualplan/fy2012.html>.

OCSPP is actively engaged in all five strategies. The XCFS detailed below are particularly relevant to the work of the OCSPP headquarters and Regional office programs: *Expanding the Conversation on Environmentalism*; *Working for Environmental Justice and Children's Health*; and, *Strengthening State, Tribal, and International Partnership*.

B. EXPANDING THE CONVERSATION ON ENVIRONMENTALISM

On March 24, 2011, EPA Deputy Administrator Bob Perciasepe issued a memorandum in which he affirmed his support for using the National Environmental Information Exchange Network (Exchange Network) as the preferred means of environmental data sharing between EPA, states, tribes, and others. Also, this memorandum affirmed the unanimous ECOS resolution calling for full implementation of the Exchange Network, and represented a renewed joint commitment to success of the Network.

The Environmental Information Exchange Network has provided the foundation for EPA and the states and tribes to now move aggressively to convert from old-fashioned paper reports to electronic reporting. To reduce burden, improve compliance, expand the information available to the public about pollution that affects them, and improve the ability of EPA and states to implement environmental programs, the Agency has commenced a comprehensive initiative to convert to electronic reporting. EPA is focusing this initiative in two main areas: (1) developing an Agency wide policy to ensure that new regulations include electronic reporting in the most efficient way; and (2) developing and then implementing an Agency plan to convert the most important existing paper reports to electronic, while also looking for opportunities to reduce or streamline outdated paper reporting. Since this work is cross-cutting, EPA has established an Agency Electronic Reporting Task Force to lead and manage this work.

The Agency invites the provision of examples to the Electronic Reporting Task Force of experiences in moving from paper to electronic reporting and is interested in learning from the states and tribes about their successes and challenges in converting from paper reporting to electronic. The Agency will keep states and tribes informed about its progress in this initiative.

If a state or tribe would like to share information with the Electronic Reporting Task Force, please contact David Hindin (OECA) and Andy Battin (OEI) for more information. More information can be found on-line at <http://www.epa.gov/exchangenetwork/>.

C. STRENGTHENING STATE, TRIBAL AND INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS

EPA, states and tribes fulfill critical roles in protecting and improving human health and the environment. By law and through shared experience, EPA, states and tribes must effectively collaborate in the planning and implementation of environmental programs and in ensuring compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements. The current economic challenges facing the states and tribes are requiring the Agency to seriously consider alternate approaches to the current levels of delivery of its environmental and public health programs. Further, the

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

Administrator has placed renewed emphasis on improving the Agency's relationships with the states through the *FY 2011-2015 Strategic Plan's* Cross-Cutting Fundamental Strategy, Strengthening State, Tribal and International Partnerships.

OCSPP is advancing this strategy in many ways. OPPT, OPP and the EPA regional offices regularly seek input and feedback from tribal representatives through engagement with individual tribes and tribal councils, OPP through the long established Tribal Pesticide Program Council (TPPC) and OPPT through the newly established National Toxics Tribal Council (NTTC). OCSPP has also commenced conducting formal Tribal Consultations under EPA's recently implemented Tribal Consultation Policy. OPPT and OPP also consult regularly with states - both individually and through consortia. OPPT hosts quarterly conference calls with members of state associations, include the Environmental Commissioners of the States (ECOS), the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials (ASTSWMO) and the Interstate Chemicals Council (IC2). OPP meets throughout the year with the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials (AAPCO) and the State FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group (SFIREG), which is comprised of state, federal, tribal and association representatives who meet to identify and discuss issues related to pesticides that affect the states.

OCSPP's international collaboration reduces the overall cost of environmental protection at home and abroad, adds to EPA's information and knowledge base for improved decision making, and contributes to global environmental and health outcomes. OPPT and OPP actively engage international partners (other countries, international organizations, etc.) as they work to further OCSPP's chemical safety and pollution prevention missions. Examples of international engagement include participating in the development and implementation of international agreements; collaborating with international partners in such fora as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), and the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC); and working on a bilateral basis with countries and regions to advance mutual chemicals management goals.

OCSPP programs understand that the priorities highlighted in this Guidance will require some flexibility in order to accommodate state, tribal and local concerns on a region-by-region basis. Accordingly, we will continue to foster innovation and re-engineer the way we work together to establish common directions for – and ensure the success of – our programs. OCSPP developed this Guidance in collaboration with states and tribes and other stakeholders. Themes consistently communicated to OCSPP throughout these discussions were: 1) state and tribal programs face critical resource constraints, forcing them to make difficult decisions on which activities they can support (a problem further exacerbated by increasing workloads); and 2) in recognition of these facts, states and tribes are calling for greater flexibility in the NPM Guidance to allow for differences in state, tribal and geographical priorities.

This Guidance attempts to provide the flexibility states and tribes are seeking. The document discusses the roles of EPA's headquarters and Regional offices, including the unique role Regional offices play in assisting state and tribal programs in building program capacity that support Agency and state and tribal goals and objectives.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

D. WORKING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH

As outlined in Administrator Jackson's priorities and detailed in EPA's Cross-Cutting Fundamental Strategies, "Working for Environmental Justice and Children's Health," children's health and environmental justice principles are an intrinsic part of decision-making at every level of the Agency. To this end, we have integrated children's health and environmental justice (EJ) considerations into our rulemaking and decision-making processes and program implementation efforts to improve children's health protection and more effectively address environmental justice concerns.

OCSPP will continue to support and build on existing activities and accomplishments to ensure that our policies, programs, activities and standards address disproportionate risks to children and other vulnerable populations. Specific children's health and EJ implications are detailed in this Guidance where appropriate. Examples of FY 2013 OCSPP Regional offices efforts in support of this strategy include:

- Continuing to target reducing disparities in blood lead levels between low-income and non-low-income children through the Lead Risk Reduction program;
- Continuing to protect children from risk posed by PCBs in caulks and light ballasts in their schools through the Chemical Risk Management program;
- Focusing the Pollution Prevention program's attention on chemicals being identified as candidates for assessment and risk management action under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), where potential for childhood exposure and health impacts weighs heavily in EPA's process for identifying such candidate chemicals; and
- The pesticide field programs listed in this guidance like the Pesticide Worker Safety Program, Bed Bugs, School IPM and Tribal Programs specifically address protection of environmental justice communities and children.

1. OCSPP Program Contributions to Plan EJ 2014

To implement Administrator Jackson's environmental justice priority in particular, EPA adopted Plan EJ 2014, its overarching environmental justice strategy.¹ This four-year plan is designed as a roadmap to help EPA integrate environmental justice into all of its programs. The plan

¹ For information concerning Plan EJ 2014, please see <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/ej/plan-ej/index.html>

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

includes five cross-Agency focus areas, tools development, and program initiatives. The five areas are:

- Incorporating Environmental Justice into Rulemaking,
- Considering Environmental Justice in Permitting,
- Advancing Environmental Justice through Compliance and Enforcement,
- Supporting Community-Based Action Programs, and
- Fostering Administration-Wide Action on Environmental Justice.

OCSPP is making significant contributions to Plan EJ 2014, including co-leading the Incorporating Environmental Justice into Rulemaking focus area, under which EPA is in FY 2013 finalizing and implementing guidance for Agency rule writers on considering environmental justice in EPA's Action Development Process (issued as Interim Final in July, 2010), developing draft technical guidance on conducting environmental justice analyses and establishing an on-going monitoring mechanism to advance continuous learning, promote consistency and ensure adherence to such guidance.

OCSPP will also rely on the use of new EJ tools and guidance as they continue to come online. EJ Screen and EJ Legal Tools are already available. These tools will help OCSPP identify communities of concern and assess ways in which, pursuant to our regulatory authority, we can help improve their health and environment.

In addition, OCSPP is undertaking the Worker Safety Initiative to achieve the goals of Plan EJ 2014. The Pesticide Worker Safety program is critical to ensuring agricultural farm workers are protected from occupational pesticide hazards, and a key component of EPA's and OPP's EJ activities. EPA's Worker Protection Standards (WPS) provides important regulatory protections for this population by requiring several safeguards such as training on recognition of pesticide hazards, protection from pesticide exposure, and emergency assistance in the event of a pesticide exposure or injury. Outreach to serve this community includes offering safety information and training, in a manner accessible to workers—such as through multilingual and low-literacy materials. This initiative also includes enhancement of the Worker Protection and Certification rules, implementation of the new soil fumigation requirements, and increased emphasis in risk assessments in the pesticide registration review program to understand and address pesticide risks to EJ populations.

2. Title VI

It is a priority of the Agency to ensure compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, <http://www.epa.gov/civilrights/t6lawrg.htm>. This statute prohibits discrimination based on race, color, and national origin, including limited English proficiency (LEP), by entities receiving Federal financial assistance.

- As required by implementing EPA regulations at 40 C.F.R. Part 7, EPA applicants must complete EPA Form 4700-4 to demonstrate compliance with Title VI and other non

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

discrimination statutes and regulations, http://www.epa.gov/ogd/forms/adobe/4700-4_sec.pdf. The regulations also impose specific obligations on grant recipients, including providing compliance information, establishing grievance procedures, designating a Title VI Coordinator, and providing notices of non-discrimination, <http://www.epa.gov/civilrights/docs/40p0007.pdf>.

- Title VI requires EPA financial assistance recipients to provide meaningful access to LEP individuals. To implement that requirement, and consistent with Executive Order 13166, <http://www.epa.gov/civilrights/docs/eo13166.pdf>, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) issued guidance to recipients entitled, "*Guidance to Environmental Protection Agency Financial Assistance Recipients Regarding Title VI Prohibition Against National Origin Discrimination Affecting Limited English Proficient Persons.*" http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=2004_register&docid=fr25jn04-79.pdf.
- OCR also published a Title VI Public Involvement Guidance for EPA Assistance Recipients Administering Environmental Permitting Programs, <http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2006/pdf/06-2691.pdf>.
- In coordination with the grants management community, OARM will work with OCR and the Office of General Counsel to develop and implement appropriate grant conditions, training programs and monitoring strategies to help achieve compliance with Title VI and implementing regulations and guidance.
- All recipients of EPA financial assistance have an affirmative obligation to implement effective Title VI compliance programs and ensure that their actions do not involve discriminatory treatment and do not have discriminatory effects even when facially neutral. Recipients should be prepared to demonstrate that such compliance programs exist and are being implemented or to otherwise demonstrate how they are meeting their Title VI obligations.

E. SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability combines sound environmental practices, economic viability, and social responsibility. Working for environmental justice and ensuring compliance with Title VI are important components of the sustainability equation. OCSPP collaborates with other programs and the Regional Offices to maximize the effectiveness on our ongoing sustainability efforts. This approach reflects the need to look at our environmental challenges as "One EPA" with a whole-systems approach, leveraging cross-program efforts and sharing tools and information among programs to provide stakeholders with a unified approach to protecting human health and the environment.

To that end, EPA's sustainability efforts will continue to systematically integrate and promote the prevention of pollution, and sustainability will serve as a guiding principle for collaboration between EPA programs in the alignment of priorities and measures of success. Specifically, OCSPP will continue to incorporate sustainable approaches in its work in collaboration with OSWER on:

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

- Pollution Prevention (P2), which encourages source reduction, advances the development of safer, “greener” materials and products, and promotes the implementation of improved practices such as the sustainable use of materials. Environmental and economic benefits obtained through pollution prevention include reduced use of hazardous and non-hazardous materials, water and energy, reduced emissions of greenhouse gasses and reduced costs of operations for businesses, governments and other institutions. P2 contributes to economic sustainability through increased profit, employment and community vitality. One key element of EPA’s pollution prevention strategy is advancing green chemistry which provides a framework for sustainability by designing chemicals and chemical processes that reduce or eliminate chemical hazards.
- Sustainable Materials Management (SMM), which is an approach to reduce negative environmental and societal impacts across the life cycle of materials from resource extraction, manufacturing, use, reuse, recycling and disposal. Efficiencies gained in SMM approaches can result in less energy used, more efficient use of materials, more efficient movement of goods and services, conservation of water and reduced volume and toxicity of waste.

OCSPP and OSWER will continue to pursue alignment in this work and other ongoing EPA sustainability approaches, and will adopt ACS commitments that will capture the progress achieved in those areas. In particular, opportunities presently exist to integrate these pollution prevention approaches into sector-based initiatives such as manufacturing, health care, hospitality, sporting and other venues, groceries, colleges and universities and other sectors considered to be a priority. These efforts include reducing exposure from recycling processes, OSWER’s and OCSPP’s collaboration on programs and standards across the lifecycle of electronics products, and the Agency-wide effort to promote sustainable practices in the design and operation of sports venues and enterprises.

F. BETTER SERVING COMMUNITIES

In FY 2013, EPA will institutionalize its commitment to support communities both through the resources EPA offers and the means by which we coordinate among programs. Since March 2010, when Deputy Administrator Bob Perciasepe convened a multi-region, multi-program effort, led by Office of Policy, to steer the Agency towards using communities as one of the Agency’s “organizing principles,” significant progress has been made. For example, a subset of 27 “community-based programs” have been identified that, while not exhaustive, illustrate the investment the agency has made across offices in direct assistance to communities. Additionally, geomapping capabilities were completed in March 2012 to help the Agency identify and track where EPA is working in communities through grants and technical assistance. The geomapping has the potential to better coordinate Headquarters and regional efforts and improve the ability to identify potential gaps in service to communities. Finally, new grants policy guidance went into effect in March 31, 2012, establishing a ‘OneEPA’ approach to coordinating and implementing community-based grant programs, including streamlining grants processes consistent with EPA’s fiduciary responsibilities and providing useful grants information to communities.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

In implementing EPA's long-term goals for an improved environment and better public health in communities, regions should look for additional opportunities in which their core program activities can help the Agency achieve the following intermediate outcomes: 1) Provide the right information about EPA programs to the right people at the right time; 2) Facilitate communities' access to EPA resources; 3) Increase the capacity of communities, including those that are underserved and overburdened, to protect their health and the environment; 4) Enhance effective internal coordination among all major EPA community-based programs; 5) Improve leveraging of EPA funding by EPA programs; 6) Improve leveraging of partnerships with public and private sector entities; and 7) Strengthen EPA staff capacity to do community-based work.

In particular in FY13, regions are asked to:

- Strengthen involvement and increase investment in one or more of the Agency's 27 programs that comprise the Community-Based Coordination Network. (*Contact: John Foster, Office of Sustainable Communities, 202-566-2870 or foster.john@epa.gov*)
- Support ongoing inter-agency partnerships that align resources or activities in communities (e.g. the Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice, the HUD-DOT-EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities, the Urban Waters partnership and others).
- Adhere to OGD's Community-Based Grants Policy, including implementing identified best practices for streamlining competitions, considering combining competitions, and implementing protocols to geo-code projects for inclusion in Agency-wide mapping. (http://intranet.epa.gov/ogd/policy/gpi_12_02_community_based_grants_03_02_12.pdf)
- Work with OGD and OEJ to post competition schedules and other grant information. (http://www.epa.gov/ogd/training/resources_for_communities/community_grants_table.htm)
- Utilize OSWER's Technical Assistance Services for Communities (TASC) contract to provide technical assistance for communities that find it difficult to apply for and manage grants. (*Contact: Howard Corcoran, OARM, 202-564-1903 or corcoran.howard@epa.gov*)

G. OPPORTUNITIES TO GAIN EFFICIENCY

As noted in OMB Circular No. A-123, "Management's Responsibility for Internal Control," the first objective of internal controls is to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of operations. In support of the Administrator's priority to improve EPA's internal operations, OCSPP and Regional offices are continually seeking more efficient and pragmatic ways to achieve our goals and objectives. EPA's annual NPM Guidance sets forth program priorities and key actions for the upcoming year, and therefore serve as an important internal control for Agency programmatic operations.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

The NPM Guidance reflects input from the Regional offices on program risks and vulnerabilities, and actions to reduce these risks. For example, for several years OCSPP has employed a GPRA Annual Performance Measure and two Annual Commitment System (ACS) measures to target improved and maintained efficiency in the Lead Risk Reduction program's processing of lead abatement worker certification applications in order to meet customer expectations in meeting the time frames specified in the application process. Achieving the ambitious targets for these measures, that are part of OCSPP's internal controls strategy, has required concerted and continuing attention from program managers at EPA headquarters and in the Regional offices and has resulted in genuine improvements in program performance that have directly benefited the program's customers.

H. STATE GRANT WORKPLANS AND PROGRESS REPORTS

EPA continues to work with states, tribes and other grant recipients to better align State Grant Workplan goals and measures outlined in EPA's national goals and performance measures. These improvements have enhanced the Agency's ability to demonstrate grant results to the Office of Management and Budget, Congress and the public. It is important that EPA and the states and tribes build on these efforts to ensure that grant Workplans meet the basic requirements necessary to ensure that our grants deliver their intended results and to facilitate the integration of those results into the Agency's strategic and annual planning, budgeting, and accountability processes. Additional information on grants improvements and the grants management process can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/ogd>.

In FY 2013, EPA remains committed to strengthening our oversight and reporting of results from state grants, by linking state grant work plan commitments to EPA's *Strategic Plan*, and enhancing transparency and accountability. EPA and the states will continue working in FY 2013 to achieve this through two related efforts:

1. Grants Policy Issuance (GPI) 11-03

State Grant Workplans and Progress Reports were developed by the State Grant Workplan Workgroup, composed of EPA and state grant practitioners. The GPI will go into effect for awards made on or after October 1, 2012. It was issued well in advance of the effective date to allow Regional offices and states sufficient time to adjust to the new requirements. Affected National Program Managers and Regional offices should ensure that the GPI is incorporated in upcoming FY 2013 Workplan negotiations, and provide appropriate outreach to state recipients. In addition, OGD will work with the Regional offices on a case-by-case basis to address any implementation challenges. Please contact Jennifer Bogus in OGD at 202-564-5294 should you have questions related to the GPI. Please contact the program office for specific program implementation questions. The OCSPP's program contacts are listed in the last section of the Executive Summary in this Guidance.

2. State Grant Performance Measures

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

OCSPP's State Grant Performance Measure (SGPM) in ACS for FY 2013 reporting is listed in Appendix A. Although the use of the template to capture results for these measures is not required, reporting on the results remains the responsibility of the Regional offices and states.

I. ENHANCED COLLABORATION WITH OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE

OCSPP and the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) have been working to enhance collaboration between the two Offices. Although each Office has a distinct mission, they are mutually reinforcing with each program bringing unique tools and expertise to bear on the common challenge of protecting the public and environment from chemical risks. Important aspects of this cooperative effort include better aligning programs' priorities for Regional offices, states, and tribes, pursuing joint work and exchanging timely and meaningful information on case development. This coordinated approach will enhance overall program efficiency and accelerate progress toward achievement of our common strategic objectives.

J. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND ALIGNMENT

OCSPP's suite of Annual Commitment System (ACS) performance measures, presented in Appendix A, has been refined to align with EPA's revised long-term goals and strategic measures presented in the *FY 2011 – 2015 EPA Strategic Plan* and the in EPA's *FY 2013 Annual Plan*. Attachment B identifies any significant changes in our FY 2013 priorities, strategies, and measures since the FY 2012 NPM Guidance. Attachment C provides a summary of our responses to all the comments received during the comment period.

The FY 2013 performance commitments in ACS will remain as draft until final performance agreements are reached in October 2012. Additional information on the EPA performance measures, planning and budgeting can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/index.htm>. More information on the Agency's NPM Guidance development process, public comment process and other NPM Guidances to the Regional offices can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/annualplan/fy2013.html>.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

III. OCSPP PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The OCSPP National Program Manager Guidance for FY 2013 represents participatory dialogue with EPA regional offices, and incorporated input from states, tribes and other concerned stakeholders. This Guidance was also developed with continued and improved coordination with the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) to align program and enforcement priorities, ensure that our work is mutually supportive and continue to strengthen and focus our joint strategic planning. The Guidance identifies our FY 2013 program priorities for Regional offices, summarizes the FY 2013 annual performance plans for each of the national programs managed by the Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) and the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT), details the specific contributions needed from the Regional offices in meeting the goals and objectives and identifies the Annual Commitment System performance measures that will be used to hold Regional office programs accountable for contributing to those goals and objectives.

OPP's core work involves registering pesticides, establishing pesticide tolerances and periodically reviewing existing pesticide registrations. OPP regulates pesticide use through activities such as promulgating rules, approving pesticide labels and labeling, providing guidance and technical assistance and working with state/local/federal officials on pesticide enforcement/compliance issues. OPP priorities include pesticide worker safety, protection of water sources from pesticide contamination, endangered species protection, ensuring the efficacy of antimicrobial pesticides and implementation of the new soil fumigation requirements. Some priorities are identified in this Guidance for Regional office action; while others are Headquarters focused but may require Regional office engagement with stakeholders.

OPPT ensures the safety of new chemicals entering and existing chemicals already in use in U.S. commerce, promotes the development and use of safer chemicals and technologies, promotes pollution prevention as the guiding principle for controlling pollution, reduces risks from lead-based paint and reduces other legacy chemical risks resulting from prior use and management practices. OPPT's long-term strategies and measures are found in Goal 4 of the *FY 2011 – 2015 EPA Strategic Plan*. As identified in the guidance that follows, EPA's regional offices make vital contributions to several of those strategies: reducing risks from lead-based paint nationally and in targeted vulnerable populations; reducing risks from PCBs and asbestos; and promoting pollution prevention as the strategy of first choice in reducing environmental risks and pursuing sustainability.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

IV. OPP REGIONAL OFFICE PROGRAM PRIORITIES

An effective National Pesticide Program—with contributions from OPP, Regional offices, EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA), states and tribes—ensures the protection of human health and the environment from potential risks associated with pesticide use. Ensuring that OPP's risk mitigation decisions result in the intended protections requires a strong field program and Regional offices play a key role in this effort. Pesticide Program field activities include educating end users on proper use, storage, and disposal of pesticides, ensuring proper implementation of pesticide rules and regulations, and helping states/tribes develop and execute pesticide programs.

Regional offices are crucial to ensuring the flow of information between EPA, states and tribes necessary for effective risk mitigation. They provide information on pesticide regulatory actions, guidance, and policies to states and tribes for dissemination to end users, and relay information from states and tribes to OPP to verify the effectiveness of existing risk mitigation measures and inform future measures. Regional offices also support and strengthen state and tribal pesticide programs by negotiating and providing oversight of cooperative agreements and grants, and providing technical assistance to these important partners.

To add flexibility, the pesticides portion of the FY 2013 NPM Guidance is structured in two sections. The first section contains two "Cross-Regional Priorities" activities that require participation from all Regional offices. These priorities are 1) Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in Schools, and 2) Strengthening State and Tribal Partnerships through the Continued Effective Management of State and Tribal Grants/Cooperative Agreements. The second section in particular contains several activities which support one or more *Strategic Plan* objectives and/or XCFS and OPP goals. Additionally, these activities support XCFS "Strengthening State, Tribal and International Partnerships and Programs." Regional offices will select at least two priorities from the second section for special focus and will conduct at least one special project in each area selected. This approach enables Regional offices to select priority areas which best address the needs of their states, tribes and vulnerable populations, and will likely result in the greatest reduction of potential pesticide risk in their area of the country. For example, soil fumigation may pose greater potential risk in the West, worker protection may be the most pressing issue in the South, strengthening tribal programs may be a priority in the Southwest, and concerns with bed bug outreach and assistance may be the most pressing concern in the upper Mid-west and Northeast.

This approach recognizes that while an activity might be a priority for the National Program, the degree to which that activity would be a priority in a particular Region may vary. Through this approach, OPP believes all priority issues will be addressed, and are likely to receive greater attention in areas of the country where the issue poses the greatest potential risk. It is important to note that even in areas not identified as cross-regional priorities, or not selected as a specific regional priority, Regional offices are expected to maintain a basic level of technical assistance and support of state and tribal work and information requests from the public.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

A. OPP CROSS-REGIONAL PRIORITIES

Two priority activities have been identified as “Cross-Regional” priorities, where each Region must play a direct role in implementation. The first of these, “IPM in Schools,” supports EPA’s strategic plan strategy of “Working for Environmental Justice and Children’s Health,” and the strategic plan goal of “Ensuring Chemical Safety.” OPP continues to focus on protecting children and this initiative will reduce the levels of exposure of children to pests and pesticides.

The second cross-regional priority is “Strengthening State and Tribal Partnerships through the Continued Effective Management of State and Tribal Grants/Cooperative Agreements.” This priority supports EPA’s strategic plan strategy of “Strengthening State, Tribal, and International Partnerships” and is a core responsibility of Regional offices.

1. School IPM

a) Program Description

EPA recognizes that pest control and pesticide use in areas where children are present poses special challenges and concerns. Additionally, our Nation’s children spend a considerable amount of their time in schools, as do teachers and school support staff. The National Center for Education Statistics estimates that in the fall of 2010, nearly 49.4 million students attended public elementary and secondary schools, with enrollment rates steadily increasing every year. With this in mind, EPA is pursuing a program to encourage school officials to adopt integrated pest management (IPM) practices as a means to reduce exposure to, and risk from pests and pesticides in schools and on school grounds. The initial focus of this program will be public schools at the elementary through secondary levels. The goal of this activity is to decrease exposure of children in public schools (grades K-12) to pests and pesticides through increased adoption of verifiable and on-going IPM programs in public schools at the elementary through high school levels.

b) Consistent with the National School IPM Program, Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices May Include:

- Conducting outreach, training, and technical assistance with school officials and organizations to help schools adopt and implement IPM practices consistent with the National School IPM program.
- Conducting outreach, training and technical assistance to pest management professionals who contract with schools on School IPM techniques.
- Disseminating School IPM outreach materials and tools developed or provided by the National School IPM Center of Expertise.
- Coordinating with other regional programs that target schools.
- Partnering with other stakeholders implementing IPM in Schools initiatives.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

- Sponsoring and/or supporting school IPM events.
- Issuing regional grants to develop and implement sustainable school IPM programs.
- Supporting Headquarters with the administration of national school IPM grants.

c) Proposed Regional ACS Measure

ACS Codes	Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
IPM2	Number of activities conducted consistent with the National School IPM Plan to provide outreach, education, and/or assistance to public school officials at the elementary through high school levels to adopt verifiable and sustainable IPM practices.	Activities	<p>Non-Commitment Measure</p> <p>Note: Regional offices must provide a brief description and the number of each type of activity that will be conducted in their Region in the comment field.</p>

d) Definitions and Clarification of Measures

- This new measure is a non-commitment measure for FY 2013.
- This new School IPM measure will count the number of activities conducted consistent with the National School IPM Plan to provide outreach, education, and/or assistance to public school officials at the elementary through high school levels to adopt verifiable and sustainable IPM practices.
- Activities are defined as substantial increments of work with one or more internal or external stakeholder(s) or development of program capacity such as databases or educational resources to advance IPM in schools. In order to keep a wide range of activities somewhat comparable, each reported activity should generally include 1) preparation, 2) substantive participation, and 3) follow-up actions as needed.

2. Strengthening State/Tribal Partnerships through Continued Effective Management Grants/Cooperative Agreements

a) Program Description

Ensuring pesticide regulatory decisions achieve intended protections requires that regulatory authorities at the state and local level (a) understand those decisions, (b) possess tools to educate pesticide users about the impact of decisions, and (c) be able to investigate and take action when decisions are not properly implemented. Regional offices are responsible for negotiating,

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

implementing, and managing state and tribal cooperative agreements and grants consistent with the joint OPP/OECA Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act Cooperative Agreement Guidance (FIFRA grant guidance). Pesticide Program Cooperative Agreements ensure state and tribal activities support OPP's goals. EPA grants provide resources to carry out many of the activities required in the Cooperative Agreements. Regional offices provide oversight to guarantee resources are directed to areas where they are most needed, and that states are conducting meaningful work in priority areas. Regional offices are uniquely positioned to provide this oversight, given their proximity and working relationships with states and tribes.

b) Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices

- Negotiating state and tribal cooperative agreements and workplans consistent with the FIFRA grant guidance.
- Issuing grant funds to states and tribes in a timely manner once they become available and/or consistent with the start of the cooperative agreement funding period (unless another timeframe is negotiated with the grantee).
- Ensuring end-of-year reporting consistent with the mechanisms and timeframes listed in the FIFRA grant guidance.
- Fostering prompt, accurate communication of Pesticide Program regulations, policies, and guidance to grantees.
- Providing effective technical assistance and policy support for the grantees.

c) Examples of Effective Regional Grant Oversight for Pesticide Program Areas

Pesticide Occupational Worker Safety (including Soil Fumigation)

- Encourage states, tribes, and other program stakeholders to participate in the regulatory development process and contribute information/feedback to EPA as appropriate.
- Prompt states/tribes to evaluate and adopt Certification and Training Assessment Group (CTAG) recommendations and adopt them as appropriate – including recommendations for: improving recertification programs, adopting the national core manual and exam, and considering minimum age requirements for certification of applicators. After issuance of CTAG recommendations, Regional offices should work with states/tribes to evaluate their appropriateness and encourage implementation. Updated information on CTAG can be found at <http://pep.wsu.edu/ctag/>.
- Promote state/tribal use of national worker safety program materials such as the national core manual and exam, national aerial category materials, WPS train-the-trainer materials, and other products, to help reduce program costs and promote national program consistency. Regional offices should work with states/tribes to identify barriers to adopting national program materials and discuss ways to address any potential problems.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

- Work with states/tribes to support and inform worker safety measures.
- Provide education and outreach to states/tribes and agricultural and commercial pesticide handling establishments on new risk mitigation labeling requirements being implemented for the soil fumigants chloropicrin, dazomet, metam sodium, potassium, and methyl bromide.
- Use OPP-developed occupational safety materials to aid education and outreach efforts, such as fact sheets, standard presentations, inspector checklists, and Q&As when routine and appropriate opportunities present themselves, such as meetings with state or tribal co-regulators (e.g., workplan negotiations, mid or end-of-year evaluations, pre-State FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group (SFIREG) Meetings, regional tribal meetings), site visits, grower meetings, and applicator programs.

Protection of Water Resources from Pesticide Exposure

- Support state and tribal efforts to identify and evaluate pesticides of interest which have the potential to appear in ground or surface water to see whether a human health or environmental reference point is likely to be approached or exceeded in localized areas of a state or tribe .
- Assist state/tribal pesticide and water quality management agencies to develop programs to manage pesticides of concern (derived from pesticides of interest evaluations; i.e., those that have a high potential to threaten water quality standards).
- Support EPA’s pesticide registration review process by collecting and submitting state water quality monitoring data, including data on CWA §303(d) listed waters due to pesticide impairments, as described in Cooperative Agreement Guidance.

d) Proposed Regional ACS Measures

ACS Codes	Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
CORE	Percent of overall pesticide program "core" cooperative agreement activities that are included in grantee workplans and completed consistent with the pesticide program portion of the FIFRA Grant Guidance.	Percent completed	<p>Commitment target is 100%. *</p> <p>Note: <i>Percent of pesticide program core activities completed by grantee as compared to the total required by pesticide program portion of the FIFRA grant guidance.</i></p>

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

e) Definitions and Clarification of Measure

- Since end-of-year reports for these cooperative agreements are not due to OPP from the regions until February 28, data for this ACS measure will not be available at the end of the fiscal year for reporting into ACS. When regions report their ACS measures at the end of the fiscal year, they may indicate in the comment field for this measure that this data will not be available until February/March and will be reported at that time.
- Where core activities are not completed, they can be removed from the total required provided a reasonable rationale for not completing the core activity is documented (e.g., unexpected loss of staff or unplanned crises during the project period).
- This measure is intended to show that Regional offices include required core pesticide program activities in grantee workplans and conduct the oversight and support needed to help grantees successfully complete those activities. This measure focuses on core activities since they are required by the FIFRA Grant Guidance and are essential to maintaining a baseline operation of a program area, achieving environmental results, and helping support national performance measures (including providing data related to those measures). While core activities are required to appear in cooperative agreements, the level of effort and resources devoted may be negotiated depending on specific needs and priorities of states and tribes.
- This measure also recognizes there may be legitimate unanticipated reasons, such as unexpected loss of staff or technical expertise or unforeseen emergencies, which may prevent grantees from completing core workplan requirements. Under these circumstances, Regional offices may agree to temporarily modify core activities originally included in the workplan. Core activities modified or not completed due to legitimate unanticipated reasons can be removed from the total required if a reasonable rationale is documented (e.g., unexpected loss of staff or unplanned crises during the project period).

B. OPP REGION-SPECIFIC PRIORITIES

(Minimum of Two Areas Per Region)

Activities in this section support one or more of EPA's *FY 2011-2015 Strategic Plan* goals and Strategies. These areas were selected because there is a significant investment of EPA headquarters' resources and a clear potential for Regional office involvement. Unlike the previous section, not every Region will be required to conduct the activities described in each program area. Regional offices will have the flexibility to focus on areas that will have the greatest impact on reducing pesticide risk in their states and tribal lands. This approach recognizes the critical resource constraints faced by states and tribes, and that geographic and regional differences impact pesticide use and regulatory needs. Regional offices must use the flexibility in this guidance to work with states and tribes to focus on areas which best meet local

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

objectives, but which also contribute to Agency goals. It is the intention that even while an issue is not currently a priority in a Region, work conducted under this guidance might benefit other Regional offices should the issue become a higher local priority in the future. For example, the pesticide endangered species program is currently more visible in Region 10 due to legal activity involving pesticide use in the Northwest, but may become more important in other Regional offices in the near future.

It is important to note that while not every Regional office is required to conduct a “project” in each program area, regional activities will likely still be needed in program areas not selected as a priority in order to oversee and support cooperative agreements, FIFRA grant guidance, statutory and regulatory requirements, or respond to public inquiries. In addition, there will also be work to support other pesticide program areas and issues, such as the Antimicrobial Testing Program (ATP) and Container/Containment Rule implementation; however, the level of effort associated with program related work in these areas (e.g., technical assistance and outreach) will be more routine in nature rather than rising to the level of “priority” work, or regional support may be more related to enforcement activities covered in the OECA NPM Guidance. Additionally, in order to maintain Pesticide Program National performance measures, Regional offices will be **required** to report on all the Cross-Regional ACS measures listed at the end of this section regardless of which “Regional Specific Priority Areas to Strengthen State and Tribal Partnerships and Programs” are selected.

1. Guidelines for Regional-Specific Priority Areas to Strengthen State and Tribal Partnerships and Programs

Regional offices must conduct a project in at least **two** of the following priority areas listed below, and must ensure that they propose substantive projects for each priority area selected.

Specific priority areas to choose from are:

- (1) Pesticide Occupational Worker Safety (including Soil Fumigation);
- (2) Protection of Water Resources from Pesticide Exposure (including support for implementation of the NPDES Pesticide Permits);
- (3) Expansion of Pesticide Protection in Indian Country;
- (4) Bed Bug Outreach/Assistance;
- (5) Endangered Species Protection; and
- (6) Support of the Agricultural Sector.

Several guidelines will apply to the selection of the substantive projects:

- Each Region must conduct projects in at least two of the priority areas in this section. (Regional offices should report their selection of program areas in the comment field for the ACS measure RSP1, entitled “Number of Region-specific projects or initiatives

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

contributing to the implementation and enhancement of the region-specific priority areas.”)

- Projects must be designed to enhance the stated goals of the program area selected by the Region and show meaningful results.
- Projects may entail outreach, education, training, stakeholder coordination, program evaluation, state or tribal program capacity building and support, or other similar project/initiatives that may lead to program improvement.
- Proposals for projects should include a clear statement of what work will be done, what the project hopes to accomplish, and how the project will support the goals of the program areas.
- Regional offices are encouraged to set ambitious goals that result in true protections.
- To help ensure robust projects, OPP and the Regional offices will review and discuss proposed projects prior to initiating work.
- Projects may be designed to be completed in one to three years. Multi-year projects should have measurable milestones for each year of the project.
- Projects (or one phase of a multi-year project) must be completed by the end of the fiscal year. Regional offices must submit project reports to OPP within 30 days of the end of the federal fiscal year.
- The results of each project will be reviewed by OPP and Regional offices at the end of the fiscal year and discussed on a conference call or meeting so that innovations and lessons learned may be shared across the Regional offices and pesticide program.
- Project results will be compiled for National Pesticide Program Accomplishment reports.

2. Pesticide Occupational Worker Safety (Including Soil Fumigation)

a) Program Description

Effective implementation of EPA’s occupational safety programs is one of OPP’s highest priorities, and a key component of OPP’s strategy to ensure the safety of pesticide chemicals, prevent pollution and advance environmental justice and children’s health. The Pesticide Worker Safety program consists of two important field programs and several key initiatives that are critical to the protection of human health and the environment through mitigation of occupational pesticide risks and risks occurring from pesticide applications. These programs include OPP’s agricultural worker protection program, the applicator certification program, the outreach to health care providers initiative, and several additional initiatives and partner projects that help promote pesticide safety and prevent or reduce occupational pesticide exposure and incidents.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

Addressing occupation risk relies on Regional offices collaborating with states/tribes, other federal agencies, industry groups, trade organizations, advocacy groups, community-based organizations, the regulated community and other program stakeholders in order to reduce the occurrence of pesticide related incidents in pesticide workers. Reducing risk is accomplished through a number of mechanisms including proposing modifications, improvements and enhancements to the worker protection standard and certification and training requirements.

Regional offices provide assistance by coordinating with states/tribes to ensure the regulated community is fully informed about requirements in worker safety and certification and training regulations and that appropriate mechanisms exist and are used to ensure compliance with requirements. Regional offices also play a key role in supporting outreach and education programs, supporting pesticide safety training programs, establishing community-based grant programs, providing outreach to health care providers that treat pesticide-related illnesses, and employing other innovative approaches to promote pesticide worker safety.

An issue that may be considered under this program area is implementation of the soil fumigation risk mitigation as found in the Amended Reregistration Eligibility Decisions (REDs) for soil fumigant pesticides, and the registration actions for iodomethane and dimethyl disulfide. In FY 2013, it will be a priority to provide education and outreach to states/tribes and affected agricultural and commercial pesticide handling establishments about new risk mitigation labeling requirements being implemented for the soil fumigants chloropicrin, dazomet, metam sodium, potassium, methyl bromide, iodomethane and dimethyl disulfide. The RED decisions and registration actions for these pesticides call for new risk mitigation measures for fumigant handlers and post-application workers, as well as protections for bystanders. EPA expects fumigant labels implementing risk mitigation measures will begin to appear in the field in 2012 and 2013. Ensuring state/tribal officials and fumigant users understand the new label requirements is an important component of the risk mitigation.

In addition to worker safety program and soil fumigation activities, Regional offices may include activities that contribute to the protection of others who may be exposed to pesticides through their occupations. This may include persons who apply pesticides to lawns and gardens or to structures including schools and office buildings or private residences.

b) Environmental Justice (EJ)

This Worker Safety NPM priority area is part of the Pesticide Program's overall work to support the Agency's EJ Plan 2014, which also includes: enhancement of the Worker Protection and Certification rules, implementation of the new soil fumigation requirements, and increased emphasis in risk assessments in the pesticide registration review program to understand and address pesticide risks to EJ populations.

The Pesticide Worker Safety program is critical to assuring that agricultural farmworkers are protected from occupational pesticide hazards, and it is also a key component of EPA's and OPP's EJ activities within the pesticide program. According to the most recent findings of the National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS), it is estimated that there are nearly 2 million migrant and seasonal farmworkers in the United States, which represent some of the most economically disadvantaged people in the U.S. According to the NAWS report, thirty percent of

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

all farm workers had total family incomes that were below the poverty guidelines. Farmworker families have potentially higher levels of pesticide exposure than non-farmworker families through the transfer of pesticide residues from a worker returning from the fields, and the proximity of their housing to treated areas.

Farmworkers provide an important labor service to agriculture, and the abundant and affordable U.S. food supply benefits greatly from the labor they provide. It is important to protect this population from occupational pesticide hazards to ensure their safety in the workplace and viability as a community. EPA's Worker Protection Standards (WPS) provides important regulatory protections for this population by requiring several safeguards such as training on recognition of pesticide hazards, protection from pesticide exposure, and emergency assistance in the event of a pesticide exposure or injury. Outreach to serve this community includes offering safety information and training in a manner accessible to workers, such as through multilingual and low-literacy materials.

c) Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices Selecting this Priority Area

Regional offices emphasizing this area must conduct at least one Region-specific project/initiative contributing to implementation/enhancement of the worker protection and/or pesticide applicator certification field programs, or mitigation of other occupational exposure risks. The goal of a WPS project should be enhanced protection of agricultural pesticide workers, the goal of a C&T project should be improved competency of certified pesticide applicators, and the goal of other occupational exposure risk projects should be enhanced protection of those workers, including outreach on the new soil fumigant requirements. Consistent with the Agency's initiatives on Environmental Justice, region-specific projects/initiatives on in this area should have particular emphasis on addressing EJ concerns and incorporate community engagement where feasible.

EPA is nearing completion of revisions to the worker protection standard and pesticide applicator certification regulations (40 CFR Parts 170 and 171), and expects publishing proposed rule revisions in the spring of 2012. Headquarters will conduct a variety of efforts and activities related to these revisions, with regional participation, e.g. webinars and other outreach activities. Regional offices should stay aware of regulatory development activities and communicate with states, tribes, and other stakeholders about the status of the process, providing information about the process as needed when it is updated and made available.

3. *Protection of Water Sources from Pesticide Exposure*

a) Program Description

To ensure pesticides do not adversely affect the nation's water resources, EPA will support states and tribes in conducting a program to: 1) evaluate pesticide risks to local water resources, 2) take actions to reduce or prevent pesticide contamination of water resources over time, where potential pesticide risks are identified, and 3) establish mechanisms to demonstrate the progress of management strategies designed to address water quality concerns caused by pesticide use.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

EPA, states, and tribes will investigate and respond to pesticide water contamination incidents, especially where water quality standards or other reference points are threatened or exceeded. OPP, EPA's Office of Water, Regional offices, states and tribes will share information and collaborate to identify and manage the risk of pesticide use to water resources. OPP will also use state and tribal water monitoring data in the pesticide registration and registration review process.

For FY 2013, Pesticide regional offices may be called upon to support implementation of Pesticide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits issued under the Clean Water Act. As of October 2011 people who apply pesticide products to: a) control mosquitoes and other aquatic insect species, b) control aquatic weeds or algae, c) wide-area pest control and control of vegetation along ditchbanks, and d) control aquatic animal pests, are required to operate under an NPDES permit. Within each Region, Water Program staff will have the lead on this issue but may benefit from guidance, coordination, or direct assistance from Pesticide Program Regional staff.

Regional Pesticide Programs should offer support in the following areas:

- Where routine opportunities present themselves, provide outreach to potential permittees in states, tribal areas, and federal facilities that will be covered under the federal Pesticide General Permit (PGP).
- Where routine opportunities present themselves, provide outreach to potential permittees in states with delegated NPDES authority.

To assist in outreach efforts, Regional Pesticide Program staff will be provided outreach materials from EPA's Office of Water and/or Regional water programs. In addition, to ensure effective education of the regulated community, steps should be taken to coordinate outreach opportunities with Regional Water Program staff, Regional Pesticide Program staff, state lead water agency staff, and state lead pesticide agency staff.

Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), conditions for pesticide use can include requirements to protect water resources. EPA also provides funding to states and tribes to protect water resources from pesticides. Under cooperative agreements managed by EPA regional offices, states and tribes are asked to evaluate pesticides, which may threaten water quality standards or other appropriate reference points, and to place pesticides identified as a concern under active management to reduce concentrations in the environment that would otherwise result in undue exposure and risk. This evaluation process allows states and tribes to focus resources at the local level to manage the greatest risk to their water quality.

Regional work in this area should support state and tribal efforts to ensure the identification and mitigation over time of water quality concerns due to pesticide use. Regional offices should also provide technical assistance implementation of pesticide NPDES permits issued under the Clean Water Act and, where routine opportunities present themselves, provide outreach on NPDES permits to pesticide users potentially covered by the new requirements.

b) Proposed Principal Activities for Regional Offices Selecting this Priority Area

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

- Regional offices emphasizing this area must conduct at least one Region-specific project/initiative contributing to protection of water sources from pesticide risk.
- Regional offices should support the Regional Water Programs in the implementation of Pesticide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits issued under the Clean Water Act in the following areas:
 - Where routine opportunities present themselves, provide outreach to potential permittees in states, territories, tribal areas, and federal facilities that will be covered under the federal Pesticide General Permit (PGP);
 - Where routine opportunities present themselves, provide outreach to potential permittees in states with delegated NPDES authority; and
 - To ensure effective education of the regulated community, steps should be taken to coordinate outreach opportunities with Regional Water Program Staff, Regional Pesticide Program staff, and state lead water and lead pesticide agency staffs.

4. Expansion and Enhancement of Pesticide Protections in Indian Country

a) Program Description

The primary goal of the National Pesticide Tribal Program is to help protect human health and the environment by ensuring pesticides and alternatives are available in Indian country and can be used according to label directions without causing unreasonable risks. This priority area seeks to expand protections from pesticide risk by providing pesticide program coverage in Indian Country and Alaska Native Villages, and to maximize our tribal resources by pursuing policies and approaches that address the greatest human health and environmental risk concerns from pesticide use in Indian Country. In addition, this priority area should benefit a number of tribes rather than just a single tribe. Examples of this kind of “multi-tribal approach” are circuit riders, multi-tribal training development of outreach that can benefit many tribes, and support of tribal organizations dealing with pesticide issues in Indian Country and Alaskan Native Villages.

b) Proposed Principal Activities for Regional Offices Selecting this Priority Area

Regional offices emphasizing this area must conduct at least one Region-specific project/initiative, which reduces pesticide risk in Indian Country and Alaska Native Villages. Where appropriate, projects should seek to benefit multiple tribes. Projects can include working with tribes to develop tribal Pesticide Use Assessments, if this would be valuable in identifying the areas in Indian Country with the greatest need for tribal pesticide program grants and cooperative agreements; or, exploring tribal interest in participating in circuit-rider programs either by expanding existing single tribe programs or establishing new circuit-rider programs or developing pesticide outreach materials useful to tribes. If there is interest in participating or hosting a circuit-rider program, and if a circuit-rider program is appropriate for the situations considered, Regional offices should take steps to establish these expanded or new circuit-rider programs given available resources.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

5. *Bed Bug Outreach/Assistance*

a) **Program Description**

Over the last several years, bed bug complaints and infestations have increased markedly in some areas of the country, and the spread of bed bugs infestations are predicted to increase. People seeking effective, cheap, and rapid solutions have in some cases resorted to the use of unregistered pesticide products or misuse of registered products. Economically-challenged segments of the population may be more susceptible due to the relatively high cost of effective treatment, the presence of multi-family housing, and limited access to information.

EPA's efforts to address bed bugs have focused on: 1) encouraging use of pesticides effective against bed bugs that do not pose unreasonable risks to people or the environment; 2) promoting the use of integrated pest management for bed bug control; 3) discouraging the use of unregistered pesticides or the overuse of registered pesticides as measures to control bed bugs, 4) providing information to the public on bed bug infestations and 5) collaborating with other agencies and stakeholders to share information on bed bug control.

b) **Principal Activities for Regional Offices Selecting this Priority Area**

- Regional offices emphasizing this area must conduct at least one Region-specific project/initiative contributing to education about prevention of, or response to, bed bug infestation, or providing technical assistance to states, tribes, pest management professionals, local bed bug programs, environmental justice advocates, the general public, or other stakeholders.
- Assist OPP in the development and dissemination of information related to bed bugs and their control.
- In order to assure efficient use of resources, Regional offices should take steps to avoid duplication of efforts in developing materials, trainings, and meetings by consulting with the Bed Bug Clearinghouse on EPA's website (a URL will be provided in the final NPM guidance) and by communicating with OPP and other Regional offices (such as through OPP/Regional Bedbug Communications Workgroup). Where appropriate, Regional offices should contribute relevant information to the Bed Bug Clearinghouse and should encourage states and local agencies to consult and contribute to the clearinghouse as well.

Where feasible, Regional offices should also consider:

- Establishing relationships with other federal, state, tribal and local agencies within the Region to assist them where needed in their combined bed bug infestation responses/activities.
- Assisting states in detecting and stopping distribution of unregistered pesticides intended for use against bed bugs.
- Providing financial assistance to states for bed bug research, outreach, and education.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

6. *Endangered Species*

a) Program Description

Under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), EPA strives to protect endangered/threatened plants and animals (listed species) and the habitats upon which they depend. The ESA requires federal agencies to ensure that any action they authorize, fund, or carry out, will not “likely jeopardize” the continued existence of any listed species, or “destroy or adversely modify” critical habitat of a listed species. Through risk assessment and mitigation, OPP’s goal under the Endangered Species Protection Program (ESPP) is to limit potential effects from pesticide use to listed species, while at the same time not placing undue burden on agriculture or other pesticide users.

Through risk assessment and, where necessary, consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service, EPA may identify measures necessary to ensure no likely jeopardy to listed species. When such measures are geographically specific, the ESPP is designed to relay such information through Endangered Species Protection Bulletins.

While it is EPA’s goal to accomplish its work relative to listed species through ongoing risk assessments to support the registration review process, the Agency also finds itself conducting assessments and consultations outside that scope as a result of legal challenges brought against the Agency. Much attention has been given to the Agency’s effects determinations for endangered species, and the consultation process required of EPA and the Services (National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).

Regional offices should focus on acting as liaison between OPP headquarters office and states/tribes and pesticide users on potential impacts of pesticide use on threatened and endangered species. Regional offices should also continue outreach and education on the ESPP with the goal of increasing state, tribal, territory, and public knowledge of the program. Where Bulletins are being developed, Regional offices play a critical role in facilitating input on proposed limitations and placing additional emphasis on educating pesticide inspectors.

b) Proposed Principal Activities for Regional Offices Selecting this Priority Area

- Regional offices emphasizing this area must conduct at least one Region-specific project/initiative contributing to implementation of the Pesticide Program Endangered Species Program and increased co-regulator and public knowledge about the ESPP.
- Regional offices should also assist OPP in disseminating and obtaining review and comment on ESPP-related information such as draft pesticide risk assessments, measures recommended by the Services through Biological Opinions, and draft Bulletins, including crop data, pesticide use data, and the feasibility of proposed mitigation measures.

7. *Support of the Agricultural Sector*

a) Program Description

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

The goal of this priority is to help the agricultural sector understand, adjust to and implement new pesticide requirements and national priorities designed to protect human health and the environment from pesticides used in agriculture. According to the most recent EPA Pesticide Market Estimates (2006-2007)², over 684 million pounds of pesticides were used in the Agricultural sector, representing 80% of total pesticide use in the United States. In addition, many of EPA's risk mitigation actions related to pesticide use directly affect the Ag Sector, and may require changes to established agricultural and pesticide use practices. Therefore, EPA support of the Ag sector to help them recognize efforts they can take, either voluntarily or through improved understanding of pesticide use requirements, can have a significant impact on addressing harm to human health and the environment from pesticide use.

b) Proposed Principal Activities for Regional Offices Selecting this Priority Area

Regional offices emphasizing this area must conduct at least one region-specific project/initiative which will help the agricultural sector understand, adjust to and implement new pesticide requirements or to address the following national priorities designed to protect human health and the environment from pesticides used in agriculture: pollinator protection, soil fumigation, spray drift, resistance management, integrated pest management, or transition to safer pesticides and practices. In addition, Regional offices may develop projects to support current or upcoming registration review activities by collecting information on real world pesticide use or impacts of risk mitigation approaches.

c) Proposed Regional ACS Measures

In order to help maintain national performance measures, each Regional office must report on each of the ACS measures listed below, **including the tribal ACS measures**, regardless of which region-specific priority area is selected.

² http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/pestsales/07pestsales/usage2007_2.htm#3_5

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

ACS Codes	Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
RSP2	Number of region-specific projects or initiatives contributing to the implementation and enhancement of the region-specific priority areas.	Projects or initiatives	<p>Commitment target is 2 (one from each Region-Specific Priority Area selected).</p> <p>Note: Regional offices should specify the Region-Specific Priority Areas the projects support in the comment field in ACS.</p>
TR-2	Number of tribes covered under tribal pesticide program and/or enforcement grants and cooperative agreements for continuing environmental programs established since FY 2005 in Indian Country.	Tribes	Non-Commitment Measure
TR-3	Number of people covered under tribal pesticide program and/or enforcement grants and cooperative agreements for continuing environmental programs established since FY 2005 in Indian Country	People	Non-Commitment Measure
TR-4	Number of acres covered under tribal pesticide program and/or enforcement grants and cooperative agreements for continuing environmental programs established since FY 2005 in Indian Country	Acres	Non-Commitment Measure

d) Definitions and Clarification of Measures

- The tribal measures listed above (TR-2, TR-3 and TR-4) are intended to measure our progress in expanding our ability to protect human health and the environment in Indian

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

Country using the multi-tribal approach described in the region-specific priority area, “Expansion and Enhancement Of Pesticide Protections In Indian Country.” These measures track the national net increase in pesticide-program coverage based on the number of tribes, number of people, and number of acres that are covered under tribal pesticide program and/or enforcement grants and cooperative agreements for continuing environmental programs established since FY 2005 in Indian Country (the year before the Program began emphasizing the multi-tribal approach). We expect that increased pesticide program presence in Indian Country will result in improvements to human health and the environment in Indian Country.

- OPP and the Regional offices will use data provided by the American Indian Environmental Office (AIEO) to determine the number of people and acres within the tribal areas covered by grants. The measures reported by each Regional office will be rolled up nationally by OPP to determine the percentage increase for the measure since FY 2005 (number of tribes, people and acres covered by continuing pesticide program and/or enforcement grants established in Indian Country since 2005, divided by number of tribes, people and acres covered under continuing pesticide program and/or enforcement grants in Indian Country in FY 2005, multiplied by 100). Regional offices will not be required to make specific commitments for these measures because levels of attainment cannot be predicted in advance. This is because of overall funding uncertainty, any new grants to fund circuit-riders will go to tribes with the greatest need as determined from compared Pesticide Use Assessments and Regional offices will not be able to know in advance if tribes within their region will be able to receive funding for new multi-tribal programs.

Final FY 2013 OCSP NPM GUIDANCE

V. OPPT PROGRAM-SPECIFIC REGIONAL OFFICES PRIORITIES

OPPT ensures the safety of new chemicals entering and existing chemicals already being used in U. S. commerce, reduces risks associated with legacy chemicals (e.g., lead, PCBs, asbestos) remaining from prior practices, promotes the development and use of safer chemicals and technologies, and promotes pollution prevention as the guiding principle for reducing pollution. OPPT's long-term strategies and measures are found in Goal 4.1 and 4.2 of the *FY 2011 – FY 2015 EPA Strategic Plan*. As identified in the guidance that follows, EPA's regional offices make vital contributions to several of those strategies: reducing risks from lead-based paint nationally and in targeted vulnerable populations; reducing risks from other high-concern chemicals; and, promoting pollution prevention as the strategy of first choice in reducing environmental risks and pursuing sustainability. For more information about OPPT's programs, go to <http://www.epa.gov/opptintr/>.

A. LEAD RISK REDUCTION PROGRAM

1. Program Description

Recent data show significant progress in the continuing effort to eliminate childhood lead poisoning as a public health concern. EPA has historically measured progress by tracking reductions in the number of children with elevated blood lead levels of 10 micrograms per deciliter or higher. Data released in 2010 by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) indicate that the incidence of childhood blood lead levels at or exceeding 10 micrograms per deciliter has declined from approximately 1.6 percent of children in 2002 to 0.9 percent of children through 2006, the most recent time frame for which the CDC data are capable of supporting a statistically reliable estimate due to the extremely low number of children with blood lead levels of 10 micrograms per deciliter or higher in subsequent sampling periods. These results, together with other recent data, suggest that the federal government's goal of eliminating the incidence childhood blood lead concentrations at that level by 2010 has essentially been achieved.

2. Children's Health and Environmental Justice (EJ)

Results of recent studies, however, indicate adverse health effects to children at extremely low blood levels, below 10 micrograms per deciliter. In response to this new information and the fact that approximately 38 million homes in the U.S. have lead-based paint, EPA is now targeting reductions in the number of children with blood lead levels of 5 micrograms per deciliter or higher. The lead program also tracks the disparities in blood lead levels between low-income children and non-low-income children. The program uses these performance measures to track progress toward eliminating childhood lead poisoning in vulnerable populations.

EPA's Lead Risk Reduction program contributes to the goal of eliminating childhood lead poisoning by:

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

- Establishing standards governing lead hazard identification and abatement practices and maintaining a national pool of professionals trained and certified to implement those standards;
- Providing information to housing occupants so they can make informed decisions and take actions about lead hazards in their homes; and,
- Establishing and maintaining a national pool of certified firms and individuals who are trained to carry out renovation and repair and painting projects while adhering to the lead-safe work practice standards and to minimize lead dust hazards created in the course of such projects.
- For more information, see <http://www.epa.gov/lead>.

3. Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices

The Lead Risk Reduction program FY 2013 Activities and Performance Plan proposed in EPA's FY 2013 President's Budget can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/>. Regional office activities proposed to be conducted in FY 2013 implementing that plan include:

- Implement lead-based paint risk reduction education, outreach and regulatory implementation programs in target areas with high concentrations of children with elevated blood levels.
- Continue overseeing the Section 404(g) grant program to maintain a trained workforce of certified lead-based paint professionals and certified renovation firms in authorized states and continue operating these programs in non-authorized states, ensuring that 100% of grant funds are obligated within the first fiscal year of appropriation.
- Provide outreach for Pre-Renovation Education Rule (406) and Disclosure Rule (1018).
- Support the Training and Certification Rule 402(a), in EPA states and tribes; and coordinate with state and tribal programs, as needed, for 402(a) rule compliance assistance in authorized states.
- Create opportunities for partnerships to address lead-based paint hazards and exposure reduction. For example, utilize the Indian Health Service Environmental Health Office to accommodate tribes in this area by performing lead-based testing in sensitive areas where children are prone to 8-hour activity.
- Implement the Lead-Based Paint Renovation, Repair and Painting (RRP) Rule including: providing Section 404(g) grants to states, tribes, and territories to develop and carry out authorized programs; working with states, tribes, and territories to encourage successful delegation of the rule; accrediting qualified training providers; providing information and compliance assistance to firms and other regulated parties; providing effective public outreach so that demand for qualified RRP contractors is strong; and, ensuring that 100% of grant funds are obligated within the first fiscal year of appropriation.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

- Coordinate implementation of Lead Program activities with OECA’s implementation of compliance assistance, monitoring and enforcement strategies encompassing the full suite of lead regulations, as articulated in OECA’s TSCA Compliance Monitoring Strategy.

4. Proposed Regional Offices ACS Measures

ACS Code	Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
13A	Annual percentage of viable lead-based paint abatement certification applications that require less than 20 days of EPA Regional office effort to process (Direct Implementation)	Percentage	<i>Note: Directly supports GPRA annual performance measure</i>
13B	Annual percentage of viable lead-based paint abatement certification applications that require less than grantee state-established timeframes to process	Percentage	State Grant Performance Measure
14	Number of abatement activities performed by certified abatement workers occurring in the region.	Abatements	Non-Commitment Measure
RRP2	Number of active accredited lead-based paint renovation, repair and painting certification training providers in the region.	Training Providers	Non-Commitment Measure
TR-1	Number of tribal partnerships or projects addressing lead-based paint hazards and exposure reduction.	Partnerships or Projects	Non-Commitment Measure

5. Definitions and Clarification of Measures

- ACS measure 13A examines the efficiency of the Regional offices as they process viable individual abatement certification applications. For ACS Measure 13A, one or two Regional offices may be performing all individual lead certifications in FY2013 on behalf of the other Regional offices.
- If the federal Lead-based Paint Program (FLPP) database is amended to accommodate the change and the delegation of authority is revised prior to the start of FY2013 then,

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

Regional offices that are not processing abatement certifications should notify EAD to attempt to make changes in ACS.

- If ACS changes are not made, then Regional office(s) should report 100% and ensure that the comment field has the following statement: In FY2013, Region N is processing the certifications for the region.
- If in FY2013 the changes in FLPP are not ready, then we will continue to use the following procedures:
 - EPA regional offices are measured on the number and percentage of individual certification applications processed in less than 20 calendar days. This measure is calculated by using two timeframes. Timeframe 1 is the number of days elapsed from the "Sent to Regional office" date (when the contractor sends the application to the Regional office) to the "Regional Office Review" date (when the Regional office enters its recommendation to approve/disapprove.) Timeframe 2 is the number of days from the "Approval or Disapproval Letter Generated" date entered by the Regional office to the "Final Package Sent" date entered by the Regional office.
 - Timeframes 1 and 2 are added together to give the total processing time. These two timeframes do not include time from any other FLPP process and specifically exclude any time associated with fee confirmation. All of the dates discussed are only valid if recorded in FLPP, and the date recorded in FLPP is the date that these activities are checked off in the database. For example, if a final package is mailed to an applicant on September 1, and then two weeks later (on September 15) the Regional office staff enters FLPP to update the database, and clicks the "Final Package Sent" button for that application, the September 15 date is entered into FLPP as the date the final package is was sent (rather than the actual September 1 date). This cannot be overridden, so be sure to enter your progress on the day that you accomplish each action.
 - ACS measure 13B is a State Grant Performance Measure, which examines the efficiency of authorized Grantee-States as they process viable abatement certification applications within the Grantee-State established timeframes. Regional offices should ensure that their respective states achieve the minimum planning target, stated as the Regional office bid. The Regional offices will use the comment field to report their authorized Grantee-State timeframes (number of days taken by Grantee-State to process a viable application) for each shareholder (state or tribe) and the percentage of applications processed under the Grantee-State established timeframe. The timeframe may vary by state, taking variables such as regulations and contractor processing time into account. The number agreed upon should be a reasonable determination that reflects the length of time that it takes the Grantee-State to process an application, as identified by the Grantee-State and represented to the public.
 - Below is an example of the information that should be reported by the Regional offices in the comment field.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

Shareholder	Timeframe (calendar days)	% Processed within timeframe
AL	25	72.5
GA	20	75
KY	20	72
MS	10	75
NC	20	72
TN	60	100

- ACS measure 14 is a non-commitment measure, which looks to measure the number of abatements that occur within each state. The measure will provide valuable information on the true impact of the abatement contractors certified by EPA and the authorized programs. For ACS Measure 14, the phrase “abatement activities” is a broad universe and may include lead hazard screens and risk assessments. However, for ACS measure 14, the Regional offices should only count the number project notifications received in the fiscal year in order to accurately assess the number of abatement projects being done in the Regional offices.
- ACS measure RRP2 is a non-commitment measure, which captures the number of training providers for lead-based paint Renovation, Repair and Painting (RRP) with active accreditations processed by each Regional office. Regional offices should count the number of current accredited trainers whose accreditations were processed by that Regional office as of the last working day in August 2013. This measure does not count the number of accredited training courses. The measure will provide valuable information on the program’s ability to ensure an adequate workforce of trained and certified RRP professionals to meet the demands of homeowners and others seeking such workers to perform RRP activities.
- ACS measure TR-1 is a non-commitment measure, which tracks the number of tribal partnerships or other projects addressing lead-based paint hazards and exposure reduction on tribal lands. Tribal partnerships are a more focused subset of overall lead partnerships. Examples of tribal partnerships or projects include: Direct Implementation Tribal Cooperative Agreements (DITCAs), on-going projects, outreach, DITCA related activities, cooperative agreements, formal agreements, tribal grants, Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), etc.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

B. CHEMICAL RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

1. Program Description

The Chemical Risk Management (CRM) program supports national efforts aimed at mitigating chemical risk and exposure through reductions in use and safe removal, disposal, and containment of certain prevalent, high-risk chemicals – known generally as legacy chemicals. Some of these chemicals were used widely in commerce and introduced into the environment before their risks were known. In FY 2013, the CRM Program will focus on ensuring proper use of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), limiting exposures to PCBs in schools and other buildings, and encouraging the use of non-mercury products both domestically and through international mercury use reduction partnerships.

2. Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices

The Chemical Risk Management program FY 2013 Activities and Performance Plan proposed in EPA's FY 2013 President's Budget can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/>.

Regional office activities proposed to be conducted in FY 2013 implementing that plan include:

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

- Provide assistance in assessing presence of PCBs in caulk, fluorescent light ballasts, and other sources in schools and other buildings. Provide information about proper replacement and disposal of PCB-containing materials and opportunities for technical and funding assistance through Environmental Services Companies (ESCOs) and other mechanisms.
- Promote education and outreach efforts on PCBs in schools and other buildings, drawing on materials recently developed. Target populations may include: Local Educational Authorities (LEAs), School Districts/Boards, individual schools (including charter schools), principals, PTAs (including individual parents and teachers), maintenance workers, and individual students. Distribution mechanisms may include: web products, written publications (fact sheets, booklets, reports), public meetings, conferences, exhibits, community outreach, training sessions, award programs, mass mailings (electronic or postal), and phone calls.

Asbestos

- The FY2013 President's Budget proposes elimination of the OCSPP fibers program activities, including updates to existing guidance, development of new guidance on emerging fibers hazards, and assistance to the public and regulated community – including schools and school systems – regarding asbestos regulations or health and safety concerns. There will be no capacity to implement AHERA in the Regions. A clear message to enable Agency personnel to appropriately address inquiries from the public and regulated community either directly or through referral to other Agency programs will be developed. Requests for information should be directed to EPA's

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

Asbestos website (<http://www.epa.gov/asbestos/>) or the TSCA Hotline (telephone: 202-554-1414; and email address: tsc hotline@epa.gov). Congressional inquiries or Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests will continue to be addressed through existing Agency processes.

- Preparations in FY 2012 to implement this FY 2013 reduction include:
 - Identifying key questions/inquiries the Agency receives from the public and regulated community;
 - Identifying key information which needs to be updated and/or made more user friendly to address likely questions and inquiries from the public and regulated community;
 - Developing new information as appropriate, e.g., FAQs, to answer questions not currently addressed;
 - Developing a protocol for handling incoming inquiries to EPA;
 - Completing development of Asbestos Resource Directory;
 - Developing a protocol for TSCA Hotline responses to inquiries;
 - Uploading all appropriate information to Asbestos Resource Directory; and,
 - Briefing TSCA Hotline staff on protocol for responding to inquiries.
- Other continuing Agency programs, such as OSWER’s emergency response, will enable the Agency to respond to major contamination events.
- OECA will have a limited national presence for asbestos enforcement and focus on the most egregious violations of Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) in FY 2013.

3. Proposed Regional Offices ACS Measures

ACS Code	Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
TSCA1	Number of activities conducted to reduce or prevent exposure to chemicals of concern, with a focus on PCBs .	Activities	Non-Commitment Measure

4. Definitions and Clarification of Measures

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

ACS measure TSCA1 replaces the two FY 2012 asbestos measures, reflecting EPA's proposal to eliminate fibers program activities in the FY 2013 President's Budget. ACS measure TSCA1 is a non-commitment measure in its first year that will establish a baseline to support development of future commitments. The measure seeks to capture the number of activities undertaken by the Regional offices to reduce or prevent exposure to chemicals with well-established risks that EPA is working actively to reduce, with a focus on PCBs. Activities may include, but are not limited to, workshops, presentations, community outreach and development of tools. Regional offices will be asked to describe, in the ACS Comment Field, the activities anticipated to contribute to this measure.

C. CHEMICAL RISK REVIEW AND REDUCTION PROGRAM

1. Program Description

Chemicals are employed by U.S. industries to produce widely used items, including consumer products such as cleansers, paints, plastics and fuels as well as industrial solvents and additives, in some cases leading to significant public and environmental exposure. While these chemicals play an important role in people's everyday lives, some may adversely affect human health and the environment, requiring EPA to take risk management actions to address unreasonable human health and environmental risks. There are more than 83,000 chemicals identified in EPA's Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) inventory, of which approximately 3,700 are High Production Volume (HPV) chemicals that are produced at over 1,000,000 lbs per year, and of which an additional 3,300 chemicals produced at over 25,000 lbs per year.

Under TSCA, the EPA has significant responsibilities for ensuring that commercial chemicals do not present unreasonable risk to human health or the environment. The Chemical Risk Review and Reduction (CRRR) program focuses on assessing and managing the potential risks of tens of thousands of existing chemicals that entered commerce before TSCA took effect and on managing the potential risks of new chemicals before their entry into commerce. Key program efforts include ensuring the safety of:

- Existing chemicals, by obtaining needed data, assessing those data and taking regulatory and non-regulatory actions to eliminate or significantly reduce any unreasonable risk they may pose; and,
- New chemicals, by reviewing and acting on new chemical notices submitted by industry, including Pre-Manufacture Notices (PMNs), to ensure that no unreasonable risk is posed when those chemicals are introduced into U.S. commerce.

In September 2009, Administrator Jackson announced a fundamental transformation of EPA's approach for ensuring chemical safety to make significant and long overdue progress in protecting human health and the environment, particularly from existing chemicals that have not been tested for adverse health or environmental effects. This new approach, which is reflected in the *FY 2011 – 2015 EPA Strategic Plan* and was developed and implemented throughout FY 2010 and FY 2011, has as its focal points:

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

- *Obtaining, Managing, and Making Public Chemical Information:* Continue developing a sustainable chemical safety information pipeline to support future assessments and risk management actions.
- *Screening and Assessing Chemical Risks:* Continue assessing the risks of existing chemicals to inform and support development and implementation of risk management actions, as appropriate.
- *Reducing Chemical Risks:* Advance consideration and implementation of risk management actions initiated in FY 2011 and continued through FY 2012 and consider initiating new risk management actions in FY 2013.

In March 2012, EPA completed a Work Plan identifying 83 chemicals for further assessment under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). For more information, see <http://www.epa.gov/oppt/existingchemicals/pubs/workplan.html>. EPA selected seven of those chemicals for risk assessment during FY 2012. In FY 2013, EPA will complete the assessments commenced in FY 2012 and initiate additional assessments for chemicals identified as candidates through the work planning process described in the CRRR program section of the FY 2013 President's Budget.

2. Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices

No Regional offices activities are proposed for FY 2013 under the CRRR Program due to the absence of direct resources allocated to Regional offices under this Program/Project. The Chemical Risk Review and Reduction program FY 2013 Activities and Performance Plan proposed in EPA's FY 2013 President's Budget can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/>.

D. POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM

1. Program Description

The Pollution Prevention (P2) program is one of EPA's primary tools for encouraging environmental stewardship by federal and state and tribal governments, industry, communities, and individuals. The P2 program is designed to eliminate or reduce waste at the point of generation by: encouraging cleaner production processes and technologies; promoting the development and use of safer, "greener" materials and products; and, supporting the implementation of improved practices, such as the use of conservation techniques and the reuse of materials in lieu of their placement into the waste stream. The P2 program has already begun to consider and address the implications of climate change in its goals, objectives, and strategies, including adding a green house gas reduction measure to its GPRA performance measures portfolio, and uses the Economy, Energy and Environment (E3) framework to promote sustainable manufacturing by helping companies lean and green their factories and implement cost-cutting measures. As a result of the P2 program, EPA and its partners have achieved significant: reductions in the use of hazardous materials, energy and water; reductions in the generation of greenhouse gases; savings in production, operation and waste management costs;

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

and, increases in the use of safer chemicals and products. In contributing to the Agency's mission to reduce chemical risks, the program is focusing its attention on chemicals being identified as candidates for risk management action under TSCA. Additionally, the program is working to enhance pollution prevention education and outreach resources and disseminate information to the public. The P2 program is augmented by a counterpart P2 grant program in the State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) account.

For more information about EPA's Pollution Prevention Program, see <http://www.epa.gov/p2/>.

2. Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices

- Administer the P2 State and Tribal Assistance Grant (STAG) program to fund state and tribal P2 technical assistance programs and regional P2Rx Centers that contribute significantly to achieving EPA's P2 performance targets, ensuring that 100% of STAG funds are obligated within the first year of appropriation. Identify, and work with the states and tribes to replicate, successful pilots for maximum national impact.
- Administer the Source Reduction Assistance (SRA) grant program to fund states, tribes, local governments and other institutions that contribute significantly to achieving EPA's P2 performance targets. Identify, and work with the states and tribes and others to replicate, successful pilots for maximum national impact.
- Promote multi-media coordination with (air, water, waste, and toxics programs) within each Regional Office to promote P2/sustainability outcomes.
- Provide direct P2 technical assistance to businesses, governments and organizations to advance P2 program goals and strategies. Connect small and medium enterprises engaged in manufacturing with technical assistance through the Economy, Energy and Environment (E3) framework to promote sustainable manufacturing by helping companies lean and green their factories and implement cost-cutting measures.
- Continue to engage in development and use of a tool to improve the collection, tracking and reporting of P2 and SRA grant results.

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

3. Proposed Regional Offices ACS Measures

ACS Code	Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
262	Gallons of water reduced through pollution prevention.	Gallons	<i>Note: Directly supports GPRA annual performance measure</i>
263	Business, institutional and government costs reduced through pollution prevention.	Dollars	<i>Note: Directly supports GPRA annual performance measure</i>
264	Pounds of hazardous material reduced through pollution prevention.	Pounds	<i>Note: Directly supports GPRA annual performance measure</i>
297	Metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO _{2e}) reduced or offset through pollution prevention.	MTCO _{2e}	<i>Note: Directly supports GPRA annual performance measure</i>

4. Definitions and Clarification of Measures

- For all Pollution Prevention measures, “reduced” is defined to mean reduction through P2 improvements and includes pollution avoided. An example of “avoiding” pollution would be substituting a less hazardous chemical instead of a more hazardous chemical.
- The pollution “reduced” and “avoided” must be related to source reduction, and not out-of-process recycling. The P2 Program considers the reuse of materials as source reduction, not out-of-process recycling, because reuse occurs before material is discarded. Out-of-process recycling involves waste haulers picking up material after it has been discarded.
- When considering material reuse from a grant or program measurement perspective, it is helpful to remember that the P2 Program places a priority on preventing hazardous pollution over non-hazardous pollution. The reuse of hazardous materials would allow counting any associated life-cycle benefits towards annual targets for reductions in (virgin) hazardous materials, energy use/GHG emissions, water use, and costs. The reuse

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

of nonhazardous materials, on the other hand, could not serve as a primary purpose of a P2 grant, nor would it allow reporting benefits towards annual targets for reductions in hazardous materials or dollar costs. If the reuse of nonhazardous materials is ancillary to primary P2 activities under a grant, however, Regional offices should report the greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions associated with reusing those nonhazardous materials. These GHG reductions would otherwise go unreported and the GHG reduction measure is defined broadly and without hazardous material limitations. For that matter, GHG reductions from ancillary out-of-process recycling activities undertaken in conjunction with P2 implementation activities should also be counted, for the same reason.

- For the greenhouse gas measure, “reduced” and “offset” collectively cover activities that result in less combustion of fossil fuels. This can occur by using fossil fuel energy more efficiently, simply using less fossil fuel energy, or switching to an energy source with a lower fossil fuel impact. For further details and examples, consult the 2012 P2 Measurement Guidance.
- ACS measure 262 is a commitment measure that counts the gallons of water reduced as a result of water conservation. What is counted is the reduced use of water in the first place. This can be accomplished through conservation and re-use of water. For further details and examples, consult the 2012 P2 Measurement Guidance.
- ACS measure 263 is a commitment measure that counts the amount of money saved as a result of the incorporation of pollution prevention practices into the daily operations of government agencies, businesses, and institutions. Institution is defined as an established organization, especially of a public character (e.g., hospitals, universities, group purchasing organization, etc). The P2 Program, in consultation with the Pollution Prevention Resource Center (PPRC), has updated the financial cost calculator which provides specific cost savings for specific types, of pollutants as well as water and energy conservation. Further details and examples can be found in the 2012 P2 Measurement Guidance.
- ACS measure 264 is a commitment measure that counts the reduction of hazardous material released to air, water, land, or incorporated into products, or used in an industrial process. Hazardous is used in a broad sense to include federally or state regulated pollutants, including Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and Clean Water Act water quality criteria pollutants and conventional pollutants, but excludes items generally considered of low hazard and frequency recyclable or divertible, such as paper products, cans, iron and steel scrap, and construction waste.
- ACS measure 297 is a commitment measure that counts the metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) reduced or offset.
- The P2 Program has developed a Greenhouse Gas Reductions Calculator to calculate greenhouse gas reductions from P2 activities, a Cost Calculator to calculate financial benefits from P2 activities, and a webinar for help in using the calculators. These tools are being made available for Regional office use to compute the conversion of electricity,

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

fuels, BTUs, and chemicals to MTCO_{2e} for reporting purposes. The calculators and webinar can be found at:

- <http://www.epa.gov/p2/pubs/resources/measurement.html>
- <http://www.p2.org/category/general-resources/p2-data-calculators/>
- <http://pprc.org/webinars/2011webinars.cfm>

E. COMMUNITY ACTION FOR A RENEWED ENVIRONMENT (CARE)

1. Program Description

Through the CARE program, EPA provides funding tools and technical support that enable underserved communities to create collaborative partnerships to take effective actions to address local environmental problems. The National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) issued a positive evaluation of the CARE program in May 2009 observing "...the CARE program complements EPA regulatory strategies with place-based strategies—strategies that consider the local context in which environmental decisions are made and effects are felt. The Panel believes that the CARE approach represents a "next step" in environmental improvement and protection."

Since 2005, CARE grants have reached 87 communities, allowing for the CARE process to occur in 40 states and territories with over 1,700 partners engaged for a total of \$16 million in grants. Through 2009, combined, CARE communities have: leveraged dollar for dollar the CARE funding, although it is not required; visited over 4,000 homes providing information and/or environmental testing; worked to reduce risks in almost 300 schools and provided environmental information to over 2,800 businesses and 50,00 individuals.

CARE delivers funding through cooperative agreements. In the smaller Level I agreements, the community, working with EPA, creates a collaborative problem-solving group of community stakeholders. That group assesses the community's toxic exposure, environmental problems and priorities, and begins to identify potential solutions. In the larger Level II agreements, the community, working with EPA, selects and funds projects that reduce risk and improve the environment in the community.

CARE is a cross-Agency program that depends on strong collaboration between all the National Program Managers and between Headquarters and Regional Offices. The CARE Executive Team (comprised of senior management from Headquarters and Regional Offices) guides the program. Eleven cross-Agency Headquarters/Regional Offices teams manage the program. The Regional Offices coordinate across their offices to meet the needs of specific communities. This collaboration is essential in ensuring that communities have access to all of EPA voluntary programs and other resources and tools from across the Agency. CARE also coordinates with federal agencies such as the Center for Disease Control (CDC)/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and other Agencies to better meet communities' needs.

2. Proposed Principal Activities for the Regional Offices

Final FY 2013 OCSPP NPM GUIDANCE

- Provide multi-media regional support needed to ensure the success of the region’s CARE cooperative agreements.
- Identify experienced project officers/leaders for each of the CARE projects and provide training and support as needed.
- Strengthen cross program regional team organized to support CARE project leaders and CARE community needs with dedicated technical and programmatic support.
- During CARE Level I projects, project officers help provide the technical support needed for communities to identify and rank their risks and build long-term, viable partnerships..
- During CARE Level II projects, project officers help communities’ access EPA programs and expertise to create and implement local solutions and measure and track their results.
- Encourage staff participation in training new project leaders and at sessions during the national CARE workshop.
- Ensure required reporting of progress and results through the Quarterly and End of Year Reports and assist in other efforts to aggregate program results on a national level.
- Support work to capture best practices and lessons learned to help other communities replicate these approaches.
- Support CARE national teams that have been organized to manage the CARE program and provide support to Regional Office teams and projects.

3. Proposed Regional Offices ACS Measures

ACS Code	Regional Offices Measure	Unit of Measure	Comments
CARE1	Number of Community Action for Renewed Environment (CARE) cooperative agreement projects managed in order to obtain toxic reductions at the local level.	Cooperative Agreement	Non-Commitment Measure

4. Definitions and Clarification of Measures

ACS measure CARE1 seeks to track the number of CARE projects managed by the Regional Office. The CARE measure was developed as an inherently duplicative measure and other NPMs will have similar CARE measures. The Regional Offices will use the ACS comment field to report the CARE cooperative agreement projects and will report the same information if another NPM has a similar CARE measure. In FY 2013, OCSPP does not have the lead for CARE program; and such the ACS CARE1 measure is a non-commitment measure.

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
Final FY 2013 NPM Guidance Attachment A
NPM Guidance Measures**

G/O/S*	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commitment Indicator (Y/N)	State Performance Measure (Y/N)	Planning Target	National Target (FY 2013 Pres. Bud)
4/1	IPM2	Number of activities conducted consistent with the National School IPM Plan to provide outreach, education, and/or assistance to public school officials at the elementary through high school levels to adopt verifiable and sustainable IPM practices. ¹	Y	N		
4/1	CORE ²	Percent of overall pesticide program “core” cooperative agreement activities that are included in grantee workplans and completed consistent with the pesticide program portion of the FIFRA Grant Guidance.	N	N	100% ³	
4/1	RSP2	Number of Region-specific projects or initiatives contributing to the implementation and enhancement of the Regional specific priority areas.	N	N	2 per Region	

¹ Activities are defined as substantial increments of work with one or more internal or external stakeholder(s) or development of program capacity such as databases or educational resources to advance IPM in schools. In order to keep a wide range of activities somewhat comparable, each reported activity should generally include 1) preparation, 2) substantive participation, and 3) follow-up actions as needed.

² Since end-of-year reports for these cooperative agreements are not due to OPP from the regions until February 28, data for this ACS measure will not be available at the end of the fiscal year for reporting into ACS. When regions report their ACS measures at the end of the fiscal year, they may indicate in the comment field for this measure that this data will not be available until February/March and will be reported at that time.

³ Percent of pesticide program core activities completed by grantee as compared to the total required by pesticide program portion of the FIFRA grant guidance. Where core activities are not completed, they can be removed from the total required provided a reasonable rationale for not completing the core activity is documented (e.g., unexpected loss of staff or unplanned crises during the project period).

G/O/S*	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commitment Indicator (Y/N)	State Performance Measure (Y/N)	Planning Target	National Target (FY 2013 Pres. Bud)
4/1	TR-2	Number of tribes covered under tribal pesticide program and/or enforcement grants and cooperative agreements for continuing environmental programs established since FY 2005 in Indian Country.	Y	N		
4/1	TR-3	Number of people covered under tribal pesticide program and/or enforcement grants and cooperative agreements for continuing environmental programs established since FY 2005 in Indian Country.	Y	N		
4/1	TR-4	Number of acres covered under tribal pesticide program and/or enforcement grants and cooperative agreements for continuing environmental programs established since FY 2005 in Indian Country.	Y	N		
4/1	13A	Annual percentage of viable lead-based paint abatement certification applications that require less than 20 days of EPA Regional Office effort to process (Direct Implementation).	N	N		95
4/1	13B	Annual percentage of viable lead-based paint abatement certification applications that require less than grantee State-established timeframes to process.	N	Y		
4/1	14	Number of abatement activities performed by certified abatement workers occurring in the Region.	Y	N		

G/O/S*	ACS Code	Measure Text	Non-Commitment Indicator (Y/N)	State Performance Measure (Y/N)	Planning Target	National Target (FY 2013 Pres. Bud)
4/1	RRP2	Number of active accreditations for lead-based paint renovation, repair and painting certification training providers in the Regional Office.	Y	N		
4/1	TR-1	Number of tribal partnerships or projects addressing lead-based paint hazards and exposure reduction.	Y	N		
4/1	TSCA1	Number of activities conducted to reduce or prevent exposure to chemicals of concern, with a focus on PCBs.	Y	N		
4/2	262	Gallons of water reduced through pollution prevention.	N	N		24.8 B
4/2	263	Business, institutional and government costs reduced through pollution prevention.	N	N		738 M
4/2	264	Pounds of hazardous material reduced through pollution prevention.	N	N		1030 M
4/2	297	Metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO2e) reduced or offset through pollution prevention.	N	N		4.2 M
3/4	CARE1	Number of Community Action for Renewed Environment (CARE) cooperative agreement projects managed in order to obtain toxic reductions at the local level.	Y	N		

**Strategic Plan Goal/Objective*

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
Final FY 2013 NPM Guidance Attachment B
Explanation of Changes between FY 2012 and FY 2013 Template**

Change from FY 2012 Guidance Document		Reason for Change	Affected Pages and Sections
Priorities	<p><u>Deletion:</u> The <i>Container/Containment</i> and the <i>Antimicrobial Testing Program (ATP)</i> priorities have both been deleted as priorities from the FY 2013 OCSPP NPM Guidance.</p>	<p>The expectation is that these programs will be addressed under the FY 2013 OECA NPM Guidance. This is because most of the regional work needed to address these program areas in FY2013 are related to inspections and enforcement. While we are deleting these programs from the OCSPP NPM Guidance, regions will still be expected to continue basic program related activities for these areas (education, outreach, training and technical support); however, the level of program-related effort in the regions associated with these programs will be more routine rather than rising to the level of “priority” work.</p>	
	<p><u>Deletion:</u> In the <i>Protection of Water Resources from Pesticide Exposure</i> priority, we have deleted the expectations that regional pesticide staff will provide support to the regional Water Program staff to review and develop NPDES pesticide permits.</p>	<p>Those permits should already be in place, so that support will not be necessary in FY 2013.</p>	<p>The <i>Protection of Water Resources from Pesticide Exposure</i> priority begins on page 32.</p>
	<p><u>Addition:</u> A new pesticide priority for <i>Support of the Agricultural Sector</i> to the OPP Region-Specific Priorities section from which Regions must choose two priorities to support.</p>	<p>The goal of this priority will be to help the agricultural sector understand, adjust to, and implement new pesticide requirements and specific national priorities designed to protect human health and the environment from pesticides used in agriculture. The types and focus of regional projects to</p>	<p>The pesticide priority for <i>Support of the Agricultural Sector</i> begins on page 36.</p>

Change from FY 2012 Guidance Document		Reason for Change	Affected Pages and Sections
		support this priority will support specific national pesticide program priorities (pollinator protection, soil fumigation, spray drift, resistance management, and transition to safer pesticides and practices). In addition, regions may develop projects to support current or upcoming registration review activities by collecting information on real world pesticide use or impacts of risk mitigation approaches.	
	<u>Modification:</u> Elimination of the fibers program activities and a reduction to PCBs program activities in the Chemical Risk Management program—Including a reduction of dollars and FTEs in Regional Offices resources.	FY2013 President’s Budget proposes a \$2,442.0/12.5 FTE reduction in the Chemical Risk Management program, including a reduction of \$1,407 and 8.1 FTEs in Regional Offices resources. This decrease reflects elimination of the fibers program activities and a reduction to PCBs program activities.	The <i>Chemical Risk Management Program</i> begins on page 45.
	<u>Modification:</u> Collaboration on environmental stewardship and chemicals identified for assessment and risk management action in the Pollution Prevention program.	In FY 2013, the Pollution Prevention (P2) Program will focus attention on chemicals being identified as candidates for assessment and risk management action under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). The P2 program will collaborate with other EPA environmental stewardship programs.	The <i>Pollution Prevention Program</i> begins on page 47.
Strategies	None.		

Change from FY 2012 Guidance Document		Reason for Change	Affected Pages and Sections
Annual Commitment Measures	<u>Deletion:</u> “IPM1” measure. Replaced by new “IPM2” measure.	We were not able to obtain the data to support the previous ACS measure for School IPM, IPM1 (number of children in public school covered by verifiable and on-going IPM program). Therefore, we have moved to an activity based measure (“IPM2”). Progress on this measure should result in increased adoption of IPM practices in public schools, grades K-12.	The <i>School IPM</i> section begins on page 24.
	<u>Addition:</u> “IPM2” measure. This new measure is a non-commitment measure for FY 2013. Measures the number of activities conducted consistent with the National School IPM Plan to provide outreach, education, and/or assistance to public school officials at the elementary through high school levels to adopt verifiable and sustainable IPM practices.	We were not able to obtain the data to support the previous ACS measure for School IPM, IPM1 (number of children in public school covered by verifiable and on-going IPM program). Therefore, we have moved to an activity based measure (“IPM2”). Progress on this measure should result in increased adoption of IPM practices in public schools, grades K-12.	The <i>School IPM</i> section begins on page 24.
	<u>Deletion:</u> state grant performance measure “26”.	State Grant Performance Measures are no longer required. Furthermore, this data is already collected through the state and tribal agreement process and captured in the Certification Plan and Reporting Database (CPARD), making this measure redundant.	
	<u>Deletion:</u> Asbestos measures “15A” and “15B”. Replaced by new “TSCA1” measure.	Asbestos measures were deleted in favor of the new “TSCA1” measure. New measure captures chemicals of concern more accurately and reflects the work done by the Chemical Risk Management program,	The <i>Chemical Risk Management Program</i> begins on page 45.

Change from FY 2012 Guidance Document		Reason for Change	Affected Pages and Sections
		which includes asbestos.	
	Addition: “TSCA1” measure. This new measure is a non-commitment measure for FY 2013.	New measure captures chemicals of concern more accurately and reflects the work done by the Chemical Risk Management program, which includes asbestos.	The <i>Chemical Risk Management Program</i> begins on page 45.
	Modification: Measure text for “297”	Deleted the word “annual” from the beginning of the measure so now it contains identical language as President's budget.	The <i>Pollution Prevention Program</i> begins on page 47.
	Modification: Measure CARE1. This measure is a non-commitment measure for FY 2013.	OCSPP does not have the lead for the Agency for the CARE program.	The <i>Community Action For a Renewed Environment (CARE)</i> section begins on page 51.
Tracking Process	Modification: If the federal Lead-based Paint Program (FLPP) database is amended to accommodate the change and the delegation of authority is revised prior to the start of FY2013.	If the FLPP database revisions and updates are completed by the start of FY2013, then only one or two regions will be processing abatement certifications.	The <i>Lead Risk Reduction Program</i> begins on page 40.
Contacts	None		