Environmental Protection Agency
2009 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification

Table of Contents - Appendix

COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

Environmental Programs

Goal 1- Clean Air and Global Climate Change

Objective: Healthier Outdoor Air

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

For pollution assessments and transport, EPA is working with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) on technology transfer using satellite imagery. EPA will be working to further distribute NASA satellite products to and NOAA air quality forecast products to Regions, states, local agencies, and Tribes to provide better understanding of air quality on a day-to-day basis and to assist with PM forecasting. EPA will also work with NASA to develop a better understanding of PM formation using satellite data. EPA works with the Department of the Army, Department of Defense (DoD) on advancing emission measurement technology and with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce for meteorological support for our modeling and monitoring efforts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Objective: Healthier Indoor Air

EPA works closely through a variety of mechanisms with a broad range of Federal, state, Tribal,

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

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

As Co-chair of the interagency Committee on Indoor Air Quality (CIAQ), EPA works with the CPSC, DOE, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, and OSHA to review EPA draft publications, arrange the distribution of EPA publications, and coordinate the efforts of Federal agencies with those of state and local agencies concerned with indoor air issues.

Objective: Protect the Ozone Layer

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Objective: Radiation

The Radiation Program coordinates with Federal and state partners through the use of the Interagency Steering Committee on Radiation Standards (ISCORS); its members include NRC, DOE, DOD, HHS, DOL, DOT, and DHS and their goal is to improve consistency in Federal radiation protection programs. EPA continues to work with other Federal agencies including Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), DOE, and DHS to prevent metals and finished products suspected of having radioactive contamination from entering the country. EPA also works with the DOT on initiatives to promote use of non-nuclear density gauges for highway paving, and with the DOE and NRC to develop state-of-the-art tracking systems for radioactive sources in U.S. commerce. In addition, the program collaborates with state and local officials to maintain and operate the national network of radiation air monitors and continues to improve the sharing of information with DHS, DOE, other federal agencies, and the states to improve EPA's ability to contribute to interagency emergency response and environmental characterization during radiological emergencies.

Objective: Reduce Greenhouse Gas Intensity

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

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

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

EPA works primarily with the Department of State, USAID and DOE as well as with regional organizations in implementing climate-related programs and projects. In addition, EPA partners with others worldwide, including international organizations such as the United Nations Environment Programme, the United Nations Development Programme, the International Energy Agency, the OECD, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and our colleagues in Canada, Mexico, Europe and Japan.

Objective: Enhance Science and Research:

EPA coordinates its air quality research with other Federal agencies through the Subcommittee on Air Quality Research[1] of the NSTC Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR). The Agency and NIEHS co-chaired the subcommittee's Particulate Matter Research Coordination Working Group, which produced a strategic plan[2] for Federal research on the health and environmental effects, exposures, atmospheric processes, source characterization and control of fine airborne particulate matter. The Agency is also a charter member of NARSTO,[3] an international public-private partnership established in 1995 to improve management of air quality across North America. EPA coordinates specific research projects with other Federal agencies where appropriate and supports air-related research at universities and nonprofit organizations through its Science to Achieve Results (STAR) research grants program.

Goal 2- Clean and Safe Water

Objective: Protect Human Health

The 1996 SDWA amendments include a provision that mandates joint EPA/CDC study of waterborne diseases and occurrence studies in public water supplies. CDC is involved in assisting EPA in training health care providers (doctors, nurses, public health officials, etc.) on public health issues related to drinking water contamination and there is close CDC/EPA

[1] For more information, see <http://www.al.noaa.gov/AQRS/>.
[2] For more information, see <http://www.al.noaa.gov/AQRS/reports/srppm.html>.
[3] For more information, see <http://www.narsto.org/>.

coordination on research on microbial contaminants in drinking water. EPA has in place a MOU and an Interagency Agreement (IAG) with the CDC to implement this provision.

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

Public Water Systems (PWS)

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

Data Availability, Outreach and Technical Assistance

EPA coordinates with USGS, USDA (Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES), Rural Utilities Service); DOT, DoD, DOE, DOI (NPS and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Land Management, and Reclamation); HHS (Indian Health Service) and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).

Tribal Access Coordination

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

Collaboration with USGS

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

Collaboration with Public and Private Partners on Critical Water Infrastructure Protection

EPA coordinates with other Federal agencies, primarily DHS, CDC, FDA and DoD on biological, chemical, and radiological contaminants, and how to respond to their presence in drinking water and wastewater systems. A close linkage with the FBI, particularly with respect to

ensuring the effectiveness of the ISAC, will be continued. The Agency is strengthening its working relationships with the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, the Water Environment Research Federation and other research institutions to increase our knowledge on technologies to detect contaminants, monitoring protocols and techniques, and treatment effectiveness.

Collaboration with FDA

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

Beach Monitoring and Public Notification

The BEACH Act requires that all Federal agencies with jurisdiction over coastal and Great Lakes recreation waters adjacent to beaches used by the public implement beach monitoring and public notification programs. These programs must be consistent with guidance published by EPA. ibid. "National Beach Guidance and Required Performance Criteria for Grants." EPA will continue to work with the USGS and other Federal agencies to ensure that their beach water quality monitoring and notification programs are technically sound and consistent with program performance criteria published by EPA.

Objective: Protect Water Quality

Watersheds

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

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program (NPDES)

Since inception of the NPDES program under Section 402 of the CWA, EPA and the authorized states have developed expanded relationships with various Federal agencies to implement pollution controls for point sources. EPA works closely with USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service on consultation for protection of endangered species through a Memorandum of Agreement. EPA works with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on National Historic Preservation Act implementation. EPA and the states rely on monitoring data from USGS to help confirm pollution control decisions. The Agency also works closely with SBA and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to ensure that regulatory programs are fair and reasonable. The Agency coordinates with the NOAA on efforts to ensure that NPDES programs support coastal and national estuary efforts; and with the DOI on mining issues.

Joint Strategy for Animal Feeding Operations

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

Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF)

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

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

Nonpoint Sources

EPA will continue to work closely with its Federal partners to achieve our goals for reducing pollutant discharges from nonpoint sources, including reduction targets for sediments, nitrogen and phosphorous. Most significantly, EPA will continue to work with the USDA, which has a

key role in reducing sediment loadings through its continued implementation of the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, Conservation Reserve Program, and other conservation programs. USDA also plays a major role in reducing nutrient discharges through these same programs and through activities related to the AFO Strategy. EPA will also continue to work closely with the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management especially on the vast public lands that comprise 29 percent of all land in the United States. EPA will work with these agencies, USGS, and the states to document improvements in land management and water quality.

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

Vessel Discharges

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

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

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

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

Objective: Enhance Science and Research

While EPA is the Federal agency mandated to ensure safe drinking water, other Federal and non-Federal entities are conducting research that complements EPA's research program on priority

contaminants in drinking water. For example, the CDC and NIEHS conduct health effects and exposure research. FDA also performs research on children's risks.

Many of these research activities are being conducted in collaboration with EPA scientists. The private sector, particularly the water treatment industry, is conducting research in such areas as analytical methods, treatment technologies, and the development and maintenance of water resources. Cooperative research efforts have been ongoing with the American Water Works Association Research Foundation and other stakeholders to coordinate drinking water research. EPA is also working with USGS to evaluate performance of newly developed methods for measuring microbes in potential drinking water sources.

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

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

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

Urban wet weather flow research is being coordinated with other organizations such as the Water Environment Research Foundation's Wet Weather Advisory Panel, the ASCE Urban Water Resources Research Council, the COE, and USGS. Research on the characterization and management of pollutants from agricultural operations (e.g., CAFOs) is being coordinated with USDA through workshops and other discussions.

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

The Drinking Water and Water Quality research programs plan to collaborate with the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, the Global Water Research Coalition, the National Research Council, Institute for Research in Construction, the American Society for Civil Engineers and several university Research organizations including Penn State University,

the University of Houston, Louisiana Tech University, and the Polytechnic University of New York to carryout the new Water Infrastructure Initiative.

Goal 3-Land Preservation and Restoration

Objective: Preserve Land

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

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

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

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

Objective: Restore Land

Superfund Remedial Program

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

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers also substantially contributes to the cleanup of Superfund sites by providing technical support for the design and construction of many fund-financed

remediation projects through site-specific interagency agreements. This Federal partner has the technical design and construction expertise and contracting capability needed to assist EPA regions in implementing most of Superfund's remedial action projects. This agency also provides technical on-site support to Regions in the enforcement oversight of numerous construction projects performed by private Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs).

Superfund Federal Facilities Program

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

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

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

The RCRA Permitting and Corrective Action Programs coordinate closely with other Federal agencies, primarily the DoD and DOE, which have many sites in the corrective action and permitting universe. Encouraging Federal facilities to meet the RCRA Corrective Action and permitting program's goals remains a top priority.

RCRA Programs also coordinate with the Department of Commerce and the Department of State to ensure the safe movement of domestic and international shipments of hazardous waste.

Leaking Underground Storage Tanks

EPA, with very few exceptions, does not perform the cleanup of leaking underground storage tanks (LUST). States and territories use the LUST Trust Fund to administer their corrective action programs, oversee cleanups by responsible parties, undertake necessary enforcement actions, and pay for cleanups in cases where a responsible party cannot be found or is unwilling or unable to pay for a cleanup.

States are key to achieving the objectives and long-term strategic goals. Except in Indian Country, EPA relies on state agencies to implement the LUST Program, including overseeing cleanups by responsible parties and responding to emergency LUST releases. LUST cooperative

agreements awarded by EPA are directly given to the states to assist them in implementing their oversight and programmatic role.

Emergency Preparedness and Response

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

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

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

Superfund Enforcement

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

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

Superfund Federal Facilities Enforcement Program

The Superfund Federal Facilities Enforcement program ensures that 1) all Federal facility sites on the National Priority List have interagency agreements (IAGs), which provide enforceable schedules for the progression of the entire cleanup; 2) these IAGs are monitored for compliance; and 3) Federal sites that are transferred to new owners are transferred in an environmentally

responsible manner. After years of service and operation, some Federal facilities contain environmental contamination, such as hazardous wastes, unexploded ordnance, radioactive wastes or other toxic substances. To enable the cleanup and reuse of such sites, the Federal Facilities Enforcement program coordinates creative solutions that protect both human health and the environment. These enforcement solutions help restore facilities so they can once again serve an important role in the economy and welfare of local communities and our country.

Oil Spills

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

Objective: Enhance Science and Research

EPA expends substantial effort coordinating its research with other Federal agencies, including work with DoD in its Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) and the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program, DOE and its Office of Health and Environmental Research. EPA also conducts collaborative laboratory research with DoD, DOE, DOI (particularly the USGS), and NASA to improve characterization and risk management options for dealing with subsurface contamination.

The Agency is also working with NIEHS, which manages a large basic research program focusing on Superfund issues, to advance fundamental Superfund research. The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) also provides critical health-based information to assist EPA in making effective cleanup decisions. EPA works with these agencies on collaborative projects, information exchange, and identification of research issues and has a MOU with each agency. EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, and Navy recently signed a MOU to increase collaboration and coordination in contaminated sediments research. Additionally, the Interstate Technology Regulatory Council (ITRC) has proved an effective forum for coordinating Federal and state activities and for defining continuing research needs through its teams on topics including permeable reactive barriers, radionuclides, and Brownfields EPA has developed an MOU[4] with several other agencies [DOE, DoD, NRC, USGS, NOAA, and USDA] for multimedia modeling research and development.

Other research efforts involving coordination include the unique controlled-spill field research facility designed in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation. Geophysical research experiments and development of software for subsurface characterization and detection of contaminants are being conducted with the USGS and DOE's Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

[4] For more information please go to: Interagency Steering Committee on Multimedia Environmental Models MOU, http://www.iscmem.org/Memorandum.htm

Goal 4-Healthy Communities and Ecosystems

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

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

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

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

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

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

Additionally, we participate actively in the Federal Interagency Committee on Invasive Animals and Pathogens (ITAP) which includes members from USDA, DOL, DoD, DHS and CDC to coordinate planning and technical advice among Federal entities involved in invasive species research, control and management.

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

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

One of the Agency's most valuable partners on pesticide issues is the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC), which brings together a broad cross-section of knowledgeable individuals from organizations representing divergent views to discuss pesticide regulatory, policy and implementation issues. The PPDC consists of members from industry/trade associations, pesticide user and commodity groups, consumer and environmental/public interest groups and others.

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

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

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

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

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

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

EPA relies on data from HHS to help assess the risk of pesticides to children. Other collaborative efforts that go beyond our reliance on the data they collect include developing and validating methods to analyze domestic and imported food samples for organophosphates, carcinogens, neurotoxins and other chemicals of concern. These joint efforts protect Americans from unhealthful pesticide residue levels.
EPA's chemical testing data provides information for the OSHA worker protection programs, NIOSH for research, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) for informing consumers about products through labeling. EPA frequently consults with these Agencies on project design, progress and the results of chemical testing projects.

The Agency works with a full range of stakeholders on homeland security issues: USDA, CDC, other Federal agencies, industry and the scientific community. Review of the agents that may be effective against anthrax has involved GSA, State Department, Research Institute for Infectious Disease, FDA, EOSA, USPS, and others, and this effort will build on this network.

The Acute Exposure Guidelines (AEGL) program is a collaborative effort that includes ten Federal agencies (EPA, DHS, DOE, DoD, DOT, NIOSH, OSHA, CDC, ATSDR, and FDA), numerous state agencies, private industry, academia, emergency medical associations, unions, and other organizations in the private sector. The program also has been supported internationally by the OECD and includes active participation by the Netherlands, Germany and France.

The success of EPA's lead program is due in part to effective coordination with other Federal agencies, states and Indian Tribes through the President's Task Force on Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children. EPA will continue to coordinate with HUD to clarify how new rules may affect existing EPA and HUD regulatory programs, and with the FHWA and OSHA on worker protection issues. EPA will continue to work closely with state and Federally recognized Tribes to ensure that authorized state and Tribal programs continue to comply with requirements established under TSCA, that the ongoing Federal accreditation certification and training program for lead professionals is administered effectively, and states and Tribes adopt the Renovation and Remodeling and the Buildings and Structures Rules when these rules become effective.

EPA has a MOU with HUD on coordination of efforts on lead-based paint issues. As a result of the MOU, EPA and HUD have co-chaired the President's Task Force since 1997. There are fourteen other Federal agencies including CDC and DoD on the Task Force. HUD and EPA also maintain the National Lead Information Center and share enforcement of the Disclosure Rule.

Mitigation of existing risk is a common interest for other Federal agencies addressing issues of asbestos and PCBs. EPA will continue to coordinate interagency strategies for assessing and managing potential risks from asbestos and other fibers. Coordination on safe PCB disposal is an area of ongoing emphasis with the DoD, and particularly with the U.S. Navy, which has special concerns regarding PCBs encountered during ship scrapping. Mercury storage and safe disposal are also important issues requiring coordination with the Department of Energy and DoD as they develop alternatives and explore better technologies for storing and disposing high risk chemicals.

To effectively participate in the international agreements on POPs, heavy metals and PIC substances, EPA must continue to coordinate with other Federal agencies and external stakeholders, such as Congressional staff, industry, and environmental groups. For example, EPA has an interest in ensuring that the listing of chemicals, including the application of criteria and processes for evaluating future chemicals for possible international controls, is based on sound science. Similarly, the Agency typically coordinates with FDA's National Toxicology Program, the CDC/ATSDR, NIEHS and/or the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) on matters relating to OECD test guideline harmonization.

EPA's objective is to promote improved health and environmental protection, both domestically and worldwide. The success of this objective is dependent on successful coordination not only with other countries, but also with various international organizations such as the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS), the North American Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC), OECD, the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the CODEX Alimentarius Commission. NAFTA and cooperation with Canada and Mexico play an integral part in the harmonization of data requirements.

EPA is a leader in global discussions on mercury and was instrumental in the launch of UNEP's Global Mercury Program, and we will continue to work with developing countries and with other developed countries in the context of that program. In addition, we have developed a strong network of domestic partners interested in working on this issue, including the DOE and the USGS.

EPA has developed cooperative efforts on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) with key international organizations and bodies, such as the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, the United Nations Environment Program, the Arctic Council, and the World Bank. EPA is partnering with domestic and international industry groups and foreign governments to develop successful programs.

Objective: Communities

The Governments of Mexico and the United States agreed, in November 1993, to assist communities on both sides of the border in coordinating and carrying out environmental infrastructure projects. The agreement between Mexico and the United States furthers the goals of the North American Free Trade Agreement and the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation. To this purpose, the governments established two international institutions, the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC) and the North American Development Bank (NADBank), which manages the Border Environment Infrastructure Fund (BEIF), to support the financing and construction of much needed environmental infrastructure.

The BECC, with headquarters in Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico, assists local communities and other sponsors in developing and implementing environmental infrastructure projects. The BECC also certifies projects as eligible for NADBank financing. The NADBank, with headquarters in San Antonio, Texas, is capitalized in equal shares by the United States and Mexico. NADBank provides new financing to supplement existing sources of funds and foster the expanded participation of private capital.

A significant number of residents along the U.S.-Mexico border area are without basic services such as potable water and wastewater treatment and the problem has become progressively worse in the last few decades. Over the last several years, EPA has continued to work with the U.S. and Mexican Sections of the International Boundary and Water Commission and Mexico's national water commission, Comisión Nacional del Agua (CONAGUA), to further efforts to improve drinking water and wastewater services to communities within 100 km on the U.S. and 300 km on the Mexico side of the U.S.-Mexico border.

Brownfields

EPA continues to lead the Brownfields Federal Partnership. The Partnership includes more than 20 federal agencies dedicated to the cleanup and redevelopment of brownfields properties. Partner agencies work together to prevent, assess, safely clean up, and redevelop brownfields. The Brownfields Federal Partnership's on-going efforts include promoting the Portfields and Mine-Scarred Lands projects and looking for additional opportunities to jointly promote community revitalization by participating in multi-agency collaborative projects, holding regular meetings with federal partners, and supporting regional efforts to coordinate federal revitalization support to state and local agencies.

Environmental Justice

Through the Federal Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice (IWG), EPA is working in partnership with ten other federal agencies to address the environmental and public health issues facing communities with environmental justice concerns. In 2009, the IWG will continue its efforts to work collaboratively and constructively with all levels of government, and throughout the public and private sectors. The issues range from lead exposure, asthma, safe drinking water and sanitation systems to hazardous waste clean-up, renewable energy/wind power development, and sustainable environmentally-sound economies. The IWG is utilizing

EPA's collaborative problem-solving model, based on the experiences of federal collaborative partnerships, to improve the federal government's effectiveness in addressing the environmental and public health concerns facing communities. As the lead agency, EPA shares its knowledge, experience and offers assistance to other federal agencies as they enhance their strategies to integrate environmental justice into their programs, policies and activities.

Objective: Ecosystems

National Estuary Program

Effectively implementing successful comprehensive management plans for the estuaries in the NEP depends on the cooperation, involvement, and commitment of Federal and state agency partners that have some role in protecting and/or managing those estuaries. Common Federal partners include NOAA, USFWS, COE, and USDA. Other partners include state and local government agencies, universities, industry, non-governmental organizations (NGO), and members of the public.

Wetlands

Federal agencies share the goal of increasing wetlands functions and values, and implementing a fair and flexible approach to wetlands regulations. In addition, EPA has committed to working with ACOE to ensure that the Clean Water Act Section 404 program is more open, consistent, predictable, and based on sound science.

Coastal America

In efforts to better leverage our collaborative authorities to address coastal communities' environmental issues (e.g., coastal habitat losses, nonpoint source pollution, endangered species, invasive species, etc.), EPA, by memorandum of agreement in 2002 entered into an agreement with Multi-agency signatories. November 2002. *Coastal America 2002 Memorandum of Understanding.* Available online at http://www.coastalamerica.gov/text/mou02.htm

Great Lakes

Pursuant to the mandate in Section 118 of the Clean Water Act to "coordinate action of the Agency with the actions of other Federal agencies and state and local authorities..." the Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) is engaged in extensive coordination efforts with state, Tribal, and other Federal agencies, as well as with our counterparts in Canada pursuant to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA). EPA leads a Federal Interagency Task Force, created by EO 13340, charged with increasing and improving collaboration and integration among Federal programs involved in Great Lakes environmental activities. The Great Lakes task force brings together ten Cabinet department and Federal agency heads to coordinate restoration of the Great Lakes, focusing on outcomes, such as cleaner water and sustainable fisheries, and targeting measurable results. In December 2005, the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration issued a Great Lakes Regional Collaboration Strategy. This Strategy is being used to guide the Great Lakes environmental efforts. Coordination by GLNPO supports the GLWQA

and other efforts to improve the Great Lakes: GLNPO monitoring involves extensive coordination among state, federal, and provincial partners, both in terms of implementing the monitoring program, and in utilizing results from the monitoring to manage environmental programs: GLNPO's sediments program works closely with the states and the Corps regarding dredging issues; implementation of the Binational Toxics Strategy involves extensive coordination with Great Lakes States; GLNPO works closely with states, Tribes, FWS, and NRCS in addressing habitat issues; and EPA also coordinates with these partners regarding development and implementation of Lakewide Management Plans for each of the Great Lakes and for Remedial Action Plans for the 30 remaining U.S./binational Areas of Concern.

Chesapeake Bay

The Chesapeake Bay Program has a Federal Agencies Committee, chaired by EPA, which was formed in 1984 and has met regularly ever since. There are currently over 20 different Federal agencies actively involved with the Bay Program through the Federal Agencies Committee. The Federal agencies have worked together over the past decade to implement the commitments laid out in the 1994 *Agreement of Federal Agencies on Ecosystem Management in the Chesapeake Bay* and the 1998 *Federal Agencies Chesapeake Ecosystem Unified Plan* (*FACEUP*). The Federal Agencies Committee has been focusing on how its members can help to achieve the 104 commitments contained in the *Chesapeake 2000* agreement adopted by the Chesapeake Bay Program in June 2000. Through this interagency partnership Federal agencies have contributed to some major successes, such as the U.S. Forest Service helping to meet the year 2010 goal to restore 2,010 miles of riparian forest buffers eight years early; the NPS the effort to establish over 500 miles of water trails three years early; and the USFWS in reaching the Program's fish passage goal of reopening 1,357 miles of formerly blocked river habitat in 2004. Also in 2004, through the Federal Agencies Committee, the members sought better coordination of agency budgets and other programs to try to leverage maximum benefit to the state, private, and Federal efforts protect and restore the Bay.

Gulf of Mexico

Key to the continued progress of the Gulf of Mexico Program is a broad multi-organizational Gulf states-led partnership comprised of regional; business and industry; agriculture; state and local government; citizens; environmental and fishery interests; and, numerous Federal departments and agencies. This Gulf partnership is comprised of members of the Gulf Program's Policy Review Board, subcommittees, and workgroups. Established in 1988, the Gulf of Mexico Program is designed to assist the Gulf States and stakeholders in developing a regional, ecosystem-based framework for restoring and protecting the Gulf of Mexico through coordinated Gulf-wide as well as priority area-specific efforts. The Gulf States strategically identify the key environmental issues and work at the regional, state, and local level to define, recommend, and voluntarily implement the supporting solutions. To achieve the Program's environmental objectives, the partnership must target specific Federal, state, local, and private programs, processes, and financial authorities in order to leverage the resources needed to support state and community actions.

Objective: Enhance Science and Research

Several Federal agencies sponsor research on variability and susceptibility in risks from exposure to environmental contaminants. EPA collaborates with a number of the Institutes within the NIH and CDC. For example, NIEHS conducts multi-disciplinary biomedical research programs, prevention and intervention efforts, and communication strategies. The NIEHS program includes an effort to study the effects of chemicals, including pesticides and other toxics, on children. EPA collaborates with NIEHS in supporting the Centers for Children's Environmental Health and Disease Prevention, which study whether and how environmental factors play a role in children's health. EPA coordinates with ATSDR through a memo of understanding on the development of toxicological reviews and toxicology profiles, respectively. EPA also is coordinating improvements to the IRIS process through an ad hoc working group of federal partners (e.g., DOD, DOE, and NASA). The Agency collaborates with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) on very difficult and complex human health risk assessments through consultation or review.

Research in ecosystems protection is coordinated government-wide through the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR). EPA actively participates in the CENR and all work is fully consistent with, and complementary to, other Committee member activities. The Ecological Research Program (ERP) scientists staff two CENR Subcommittees: the Subcommittee on Ecological Systems (SES) and the Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality (SWAQ). The ERP has initiated discussions within the SES on the subject of ecosystem services and potential ERP collaborations are being explored with the U.S. Geological Service (USGS) and with USDA Forest Service. Within SWAQ, the ERP has contributed to an initiative for a comprehensive census of water availability and quality, including the use of Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program methods and ongoing surveys as data sources. In addition, the ERP has taken a lead role with USGS in preparing a SWAQ document outlining new challenges for integrated management of water resources, including strategic needs for monitoring and modeling methods, and identifying water requirements needed to support the ecological integrity of aquatic ecosystems.

Consistent with the broad scope of the ecological research program, ERP has had complementary and joint programs with FS, USGS, USDA, NOAA, BLM, USFS, NGOs, and many others specifically to minimize duplication, maximize scope, and maintain a real time information flow that have been ongoing since the inception of the program. For example, all of these organizations work together to produce the National Land Cover Data used by all landscape ecologists nationally. Each contributes funding, services and research to this uniquely successful effort.

Homeland Security research is conducted in collaboration with numerous agencies, leveraging funding across multiple programs and producing synergistic results. EPA's National Homeland Security Research Center (NHSRC) works closely with the DHS to assure that EPA's efforts are directly supportive of DHS priorities. EPA is also working with DHS to provide support and guidance to DHS in the startup of their University Centers of Excellence program.

Recognizing that the DoD has significant expertise and facilities related to biological and chemical warfare agents, the NHSRC works closely with the Edgewood Chemical and Biological Center (ECBC), the Technical Support Working Group, the Army Corps of Engineers, and other Department of Defense organizations to address areas of mutual interest and concern. In conducting biological agent research, the NHSRC is also collaborating with CDC. The NHSRC works with DOE to access and support research conducted by DOE's National Laboratories, as well as to obtain data related to radioactive materials.

In the computational toxicology program, through its ToxCast™ program, a multi-component effort launched in FY 2007, the Agency is obtaining high-throughput screening data on 320 chemicals of known toxicological profiles. More than 400 endpoints are being generated on each chemical through multiple research contracts and an Interagency Agreement with the National Institutes of Health Molecular Libraries Initiative at the National Chemical Genomics Center.

In addition to these major collaborations, the NHSRC has relationships with numerous other Federal agencies, including the U.S. Air Force, U.S. Navy, FDA, USGS and NIST. Also, the NHSRC is working with state and local emergency response personnel to understand better their needs and build relationships, which will enable the quick deployment of NHSRC products. In the water infrastructure arena, the NHSRC is providing information to the Water Information Sharing and Analysis Center (WaterISAC) operated by the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA). The NAS has also been engaged to provide advice on the long-term direction of the water research and technical support program.

EPA coordinates its nanotechnology research with other Federal agencies through the National Nanotechnology Initiative (NNI),[5] which is managed under the Subcommittee on Nanoscale Science, Engineering and Technology (NSET) of the NSTC Committee on Technology (CoT). The Agency's Science to Achieve Results (STAR) program, which awards research grants to universities and non-profit organizations, has issued its recent nanotechnology grants[6] jointly with NIOSH, NIEHS, and NSF.

The Agency coordinates its global change research with other Federal agencies through the Climate Change Science Program (CCSP),[7] which is managed under the Subcommittee on Global Change Research of the NSTC Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR).

EPA collaborates with DOE, USGS, and the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)[8] to conduct research on mercury. EPA also works with other Federal agencies to coordinate U.S. participation in the Arctic Mercury Project, a partnership established in 2001 by the eight member states of the Arctic Council—Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, and the U.S.

[5] For more information, see <http://www.nano.gov>.
[6] For an example, see <http://es.epa.gov/ncer/rfa/2005/2005_star_nano.html>.
[7] For more information, see <http://www.climatescience.gov/>.
[8] For more information, see <http://www.epri.com/>.

The Agency coordinates its research fellowship programs with other Federal agencies and the nonprofit sector through the National Academies' Fellowships Roundtable, which meets biannually.[9]

EPA coordinates its research on endocrine disruptors with other Federal agencies through the interagency working group on endocrine disruptors under the auspices of the Toxics and Risk Subcommittee of the CENR. EPA coordinates its biotechnology research through the interagency biotechnology research working group and the agricultural biotechnology risk analysis working group of the Biotechnology Subcommittee of NSTC's Committee on Science.

Goal 5-Compliance and Environmental Stewardship

Objective: Improve Compliance

The Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Program coordinates closely with DOJ on all enforcement matters. In addition, the program coordinates with other agencies on specific environmental issues as described herein.

The Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) coordinates with the Chemical Safety and Accident Investigation Board, OSHA, and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry in preventing and responding to accidental releases and endangerment situations, with the BIA on Tribal issues relative to compliance with environmental laws on Tribal Lands, and with the SBA on the implementation of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA). OECA also shares information with the IRS on cases which require defendants to pay civil penalties, thereby assisting the IRS in assuring compliance with tax laws. In addition, it coordinates with the SBA and a number of other Federal agencies in implementing the Business Gateway initiative, an "E-Government" project in support of the President's Regulatory Management Agenda. OECA also works with a variety of Federal agencies including the DOL and the IRS to organize a Federal Compliance Assistance Roundtable to address cross cutting compliance assistance issues. Coordination also occurs with the COE on wetlands.

Due to changes in the Food Security Act, the USDA/NRCS has a major role in determining whether areas on agricultural lands meet the definition of wetlands and are therefore regulated under the CWA. Civil Enforcement coordinates with USDA/NRCS on these issues also. The program coordinates closely with the USDA on the implementation of the Unified National Strategy for Animal Feedlot Operations. EPA's Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Program also coordinates with USDA on food safety issues arising from the misuse of pesticides, and shares joint jurisdiction with Federal Trade Commission (FTC) on pesticide labeling and advertising. Coordination also occurs with Customs and Border Protection on implementing the secure International Trade Data System across all Federal agencies, and on pesticide imports. EPA and the FDA share jurisdiction over general-purpose disinfectants used on non-critical surfaces and some dental and medical equipment surfaces (e.g., wheelchairs). The Agency has entered into a MOU with HUD concerning lead poisoning.

[9] For more information, see <http://www7.nationalacademies.org/fellowships/roundtable.html>.

The Criminal Enforcement Program coordinates with other Federal law enforcement agencies (i.e., FBI, Customs, DOL, U.S. Treasury, USCG, DOI and DOJ) and with state and local law enforcement organizations in the investigation and prosecution of environmental crimes. EPA also actively works with DOJ to establish task forces that bring together Federal, state and local law enforcement organizations to address environmental crimes. In addition, the program has an Interagency Agreement with the DHS to provide specialized criminal environmental training to Federal, state, local, and Tribal law enforcement personnel at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Glynco, GA. The Homeland Security and Forensics Support Programs also coordinate with other Federal law enforcement agencies and with state and local law enforcement organizations to support counter-terrorism efforts.

Under Executive Order 12088, EPA is directed to provide technical assistance to other Federal agencies to help ensure their compliance with all environmental laws. The Federal Facility Enforcement Program coordinates with other Federal agencies, states, local, and Tribal governments to ensure compliance by Federal agencies with all environmental laws. In FY 2009, EPA will also continue working with other Federal agencies to support the Federal Facilities Stewardship and Compliance Assistance Center (www.fedcenter.gov).

OECA collaborates with the states and Tribes. States perform the vast majority of inspections, direct compliance assistance, and enforcement actions. Most EPA statutes envision a partnership between EPA and the states under which EPA develops national standards and policies and the states implement the program under authority delegated by EPA. If a state does not seek approval of a program, EPA must implement that program in the state. Historically, the level of state approvals has increased as programs mature and state capacity expands, with many of the key environmental programs approaching approval in nearly all states. EPA will increase its effort to coordinate with states on training, compliance assistance, capacity building and enforcement. EPA will continue to enhance the network of state and Tribal compliance assistance providers.

The Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance chairs the Interagency Environmental Leadership Workgroup established by Executive Order 13148. The Workgroup consists of over 100 representatives from most Federal departments and agencies. Its mission is to assist all Federal agencies with meeting the mandates of the Executive Order, including implementation of environmental management systems and environmental compliance auditing programs, reducing both releases and uses of toxic chemicals, and compliance with pollution prevention and pollution reporting requirements. In FY 2009, the OECA will work directly with a number of other Federal agencies to improve CWA compliance at Federal facilities. OECA and other agencies will jointly investigate the underlying causes of persistent CWA violations and design and implement fixes to the problems to keep facilities in compliance over the long term. OECA anticipates that FY 2009 will see the completion of a multiple-year partnership with the Veterans Health Administration (VHA), a part of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). OECA and the VHA formed the partnership in 2002 to improve compliance at VHA medical centers across the nation. Since then, EPA and VHA have jointly designed and begun implementing environmental management systems at all VHA medical centers, completed multi-day onsite reviews at more than 20 medical centers to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their

environmental programs and to guide the VHA in making program improvements at all its medical centers, and delivered multiple environmental compliance courses for VHA staff and managers.

EPA works directly with Canada and Mexico bilaterally and in the trilateral Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC). EPA's border activities require close coordination with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Justice, and the States of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. EPA is the lead agency and coordinates U.S. participation in the CEC. EPA works with NOAA, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Geological Survey on CEC projects to promote biodiversity cooperation, and with the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative to reduce potential trade and environmental impacts such as invasive species.

The Agency is required to review environmental impact statements and other major actions impacting the environment and public health proposed by all Federal agencies, and make recommendations to the proposing Federal agency on how to remedy/mitigate those impacts. Although EPA is required under § 309 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) to review and comment on proposed Federal actions, neither the National Environmental Policy Act nor § 309 CAA require a Federal agency to modify its proposal to accommodate EPA's concerns. EPA does have authority under these statutes to refer major disagreements with other Federal agencies to the Council on Environmental Quality. Accordingly, many of the beneficial environmental changes or mitigation that EPA recommends must be negotiated with the other Federal agency. The majority of the actions EPA reviews are proposed by the Forest Service, Department of Transportation (including the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Aviation Administration), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Interior (including Bureau of Land Management, Minerals Management Service and National Parks Service), Department of Energy (including Federal Regulatory Commission), and Department of Defense.

EPA works directly with Canada and Mexico bilaterally and in the trilateral Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC). EPA's border activities require close coordination with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Justice, and the States of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. EPA is the lead agency and coordinates U.S. participation in the CEC. EPA works with NOAA, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Geological Survey on CEC projects to promote biodiversity cooperation, and with the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative to reduce potential trade and environmental impacts such as invasive species.

Objective: Improve Environmental Performance through Pollution Prevention and Innovation

EPA is involved in a broad range of pollution prevention (P2) activities which can yield reductions in waste generation and energy consumption in both the public and private sectors. For example, the EPP initiative, which implements Executive Orders 12873 and 13101, promotes the use of cleaner products by Federal agencies. This is aimed at stimulating demand for the development of such products by industry.

This effort includes a number of demonstration projects with other federal Departments and agencies, such as the NPS (to use Green Purchasing as a tool to achieve the sustainability goals of the parks), DoD (use of environmentally preferable construction materials), and Defense Logistics Agency (identification of environmental attributes for products in its purchasing system). The program is also working within EPA to "green" its own operations. The program also works with NIST to develop a life-cycle based decision support tool for purchasers.
Under the Suppliers' Partnership for the Environment program and its umbrella program, the GSN, EPA's P2 Program is working closely with NIST and its Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program to provide technical assistance to the process of "greening" industry supply chains. The EPA is also working with the DOE's Industrial Technologies Program to provide energy audits and technical assistance to these supply chains.

EPA is working with DOE and USDA to develop a "Biofuels Posture Plan," the first step in implementing a Biofuels Initiative to support the goals of the President's Advanced Energy Initiative. The Biofuels Posture Plan will be designed to promote the development of a biofuels industry in the U.S. to help shift the country towards clean, domestic energy production and away from dependence on foreign sources of energy (mostly petroleum). EPA is investigating the use of municipal and industrial solid and hazardous wastes as sources of biomass that can be used to produce clean biofuels. EPA is promoting specific waste-to-energy technologies through policy development, research, and, where feasible, regulatory change.

The Agency is required to review environmental impact statements and other major actions impacting the environment and public health proposed by all Federal agencies, and make recommendations to the proposing Federal agency on how to remedy/mitigate those impacts. Although EPA is required under § 309 of the Clean Air Act (CAA) to review and comment on proposed Federal actions, neither the National Environmental Policy Act nor § 309 CAA require a Federal agency to modify its proposal to accommodate EPA's concerns. EPA does have authority under these statutes to refer major disagreements with other Federal agencies to the Council on Environmental Quality. Accordingly, many of the beneficial environmental changes or mitigation that EPA recommends must be negotiated with the other Federal agency. The majority of the actions EPA reviews are proposed by the Forest Service, Department of Transportation (including FHWA and FAA), COE, DOI (including Bureau of Land Management, Minerals Management Service and NPS), DOE (including Federal Regulatory Commission), and DoD.

EPA and DOI are coordinating an Interagency Tribal Information Steering Committee that includes the Bureau of Reclamation, DOE, HUD, USGS, Federal Geographic Data Committee, BIA, Indian Health Service, Department of the Treasury, and DOJ. This Interagency effort is aimed to coordinate the exchange of selected sets of environmental, resource, and programmatic information pertaining to Indian Country among Federal agencies in a "dynamic" information management system that is continuously and automatically updated and refreshed, to be shared equally among partners and other constituents.

Under a two-party interagency agreement, EPA works extensively with the Indian Health Service to cooperatively address the drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of Indian Tribes. EPA is developing protocols with the Indian Health Service Sanitation Facilities

Construction Program for integration of databases of the two agencies, within the framework of the Tribal Enterprise Architecture.

EPA has organized a Tribal Data Working Group under the Federal Geographic Data Committee, and, along with BIA, is the co-chair of this group. EPA will play a lead role in establishing common geographic data and metadata standards for Tribal data, and in establishing protocols for exchange of information among Federal, non-Federal and Tribal cooperating partners.

EPA is developing protocols with the Bureau of Reclamation, Native American Program, for integration of databases of the two agencies, within the framework of the Tribal Enterprise Architecture. EPA is also developing agreements to share information with the Alaska District, COE.

To promote mutual goals as leadership programs with industry, the Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation (OPEI) through its National Environmental Performance Track, works with the Voluntary Protection Programs (VPP) in the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). EPA and OSHA collaborate in developing incentives for members, identifying potential members, providing joint recognition, and sharing best practices from their experience in managing leadership programs.

Under a MOU, EPA and NPS established a partnership to share resources for promoting environmental management system approaches that are good for both the environment and business. The MOU promotes the implementation of cost-effective environmental management practices for businesses in the tourism industry, including the approximately 600 NPS concessionaires that provide various visitor services in more than 130 national parks.

Information on regulations and other issues that may have an adverse impact on small businesses is shared regularly with the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy. An ongoing activity includes the coordination of interactions among the Office of Air and Radiation, the State Small Business Assistance Program's National Steering Committee, and the Office of Advocacy in the development of the proposed 55 area source Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) rules that will impact small businesses and state programs.

The Sector Strategies program addresses issues that directly affect the environmental performance of selected industries and other sectors of the economy. At times, actions taken to enhance sector-wide performance involve other Federal agencies. This work tends to be informal and issue-specific, as opposed to formal inter-agency partnerships. For example, previous work on Agribusiness sector issues involved the Natural Resource Conservation Service of the USDA. Energy conservation work with the Metal Foundry sector involved the DOE's innovative technologies program. In 2005, Port sector stakeholders include the U.S. Maritime Administration (DOT), COE and NOAA. Data work with the Cement sector involves USGS contacts. And future "green highway" work of the Construction Sector may involve the FHWA.

Activities associated with the Environmental Education Program are coordinated with other Federal agencies in a variety of ways:

EPA currently funds approximately $1.5M for eight interagency agreements with four Federal agencies. Current projects are focused on helping these agencies to better coordinate their environmental education efforts (see www.handsontheland.org) and improving capacity to measure environmental education program outcomes. All of the activities are funded jointly by the cooperating Federal agency and a third non-profit partner. Detailed information about the interagency agreements is available at http://www.epa.gov/enviroed/iag.html.

EPA chairs the Task Force on Environmental Education which meets periodically to share information. The current focus involves sharing information on linking environmental education programs to the strategic planning initiatives of Federal agencies and developing program impact measures.

EPA, in partnership with Department of Education, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, the Department of Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and the Centers for Disease Control, is implementing a national Schools Chemical Cleanout Campaign (SC3). SC3 is building a national public/private network that will facilitate the removal of dangerous and inappropriate chemicals from K - 12 schools; encourage responsible chemical management practices to prevent future chemical accidents and accumulations; and raise issue awareness.

As a participant on the following interagency workgroups, EPA remains informed of related efforts across the government and provides coordination assistance as necessary: The Interagency Committee on Education (Chair: Department of Education); Partners in Resource Education (Chair: National Environmental Education and Training Foundation); the Federal Interagency Committee on Interpretation (Chair: National Park Service); Ocean Education Task Force (workgroup of the U.S. Ocean Commission); and the Afterschool.gov (Chair: General Services Administration).

EPA coordinates U.S. participation in the activities of the North American Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC) on green purchasing, supply chains, and buildings.

EPA's web portal of all Federal environmental education program web sites is: http://www.epa.gov/enviroed/FTFmemws.html.

Objective: Improve Human Health and the Environment in Indian Country

In 2007, EPA completed two important tribal infrastructure Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) by five federal agencies. EPA, the Department of the Interior, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development committed to work as partners to improve infrastructure on tribal lands and focus efforts on providing access to safe drinking water and basic wastewater facilities to tribes.

The first MOU promotes coordination between federal tribal infrastructure programs and financial services while allowing department programs to retain their unique advantages. It is fully expected that the efficiencies and partnerships resulting from this collaboration will directly assist tribes with their infrastructure needs. For the first time five federal departments have joined together and agreed to work across traditional program boundaries on tribal infrastructure issues. The second MOU signed by the parties was created under this authority and addresses the issue of access to safe drinking water and wastewater facilities on tribal lands. For more information, please see the web link: http://www.epa.gov/tribalportal/mous.htm.

Objective: Enhance Science and Research

EPA is coordinating with DoD's Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) in an ongoing partnership, especially in the areas of sustainability research and of incorporating materials lifecycle analysis into the manufacturing process for weapons and military equipment. EPA's People, Prosperity, and Planet (P3) student design competition for sustainability will partner with NASA, NSF, OFEE, USAID, USDA, CEQ, and OSTP. EPA is continuing its partnerships with NSF, NIEHS, AND NIOSH on jointly issued grant solicitations for nanotechnology, and its coordination through the NSET with all agencies that are part of the NNI.

EPA will continue work under the MOA with the USCG and the State of Massachusetts on ballast water treatment technologies and mercury continuous emission monitors. The agency also coordinates technology verifications with NOAA (multiparameter water quality probes); DOE (mercury continuous emission monitors); DoD (explosives monitors, PCB detectors, dust suppressants); USDA (ambient ammonia monitors); Alaska and Pennsylvania (arsenic removal); Georgia, Kentucky, and Michigan (storm water treatment); and Colorado and New York (waste-to-energy technologies).

Coordination with Other Federal Agencies

Enabling Support Programs

Office of the Administrator (OA)

EPA collaborates with other Federal agencies in the collection of economic data used in the conduct of economic benefit-cost analyses of environmental regulations and policies. The Agency collaborates with the Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census on the Pollution Abatement Costs and Expenditure (PACE) survey in order to obtain information on pollution abatement expenditures by industry. In our effort to measure the beneficial outcomes of Agency programs, we co-sponsor with several other agencies the U.S. Forest Service's National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE), which measures national recreation participation and recreation trends. EPA also collaborates with other natural resource agencies (e.g., United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Department of Interior, Forest Service, National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)) to foster improved interdisciplinary research and reporting of economic information by collaboratively supporting workshops and symposiums on environmental economics topics (ecosystem valuation resource evaluation); economics of invasive species; and measuring health benefits.

The Agency also continues to work with other Federal agencies in the development of children's environmental health indicators used to monitor the outcomes of children's health efforts. The Agency collaborates with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Center for Health Statistics to obtain approval of the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics (www.childstats.gov) on the reporting of appropriate children's health indicators and data. Furthermore, the Agency is an active member of the Interagency Forum on Aging-Related Statistics (www.agingstats.gov). The Forum was created to foster collaboration among Federal agencies that produce or use statistical data on the older population. The biannual chartbook contains an indicator on air quality and the counties where older adults reside that have experienced poor air quality.

EPA's Office of Homeland Security (OHS) continues to focus on broad, Agency and government-wide homeland security policy issues that cannot be adequately addressed by a single program office, as well as ensuring implementation of EPA's Homeland Security Strategy. A significant amount of the responsibilities require close coordination with Federal partners, through Policy Coordinating Committees (PCCs), briefings and discussions with individual senior Federal officials. The Associate Administrator for Homeland Security and OHS represent the Administrator, Deputy Administrator, and other senior Agency officials at meetings with personnel from the White House and Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and other high-level stakeholders. OHS coordinates the development of responses to inquiries from the White House, DHS, the Congress, and others with oversight responsibilities for homeland security efforts. EPA's ability to effectively implement its broad range of homeland security responsibilities is significantly enhanced though these efforts. OHS ensures consistent development and implementation of the Agency's homeland security policies and procedures,

while building an external network of partners so that EPA's efforts can be integrated into, and build upon, the efforts of other Federal agencies.

The Science Advisory Board (SAB) primarily provides the Administrator with independent peer reviews and advice on the scientific and technical aspects of environmental issues to inform the Agency's environmental decision-making. Often, the Agency program office seeking the SAB's review and advice has identified the Federal agencies interested in the scientific topic at issue. The SAB coordinates with those Federal agencies by providing notice of its activities through the Federal Register, and as appropriate, inviting Federal agency experts to participate in the peer review or advisory activity. The SAB, from time to time, also convenes science workshops on emerging issues, and invites Federal agency participation through the greater Federal scientific and research community.

EPA's Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (OSDBU) works with the Small Business Administration (SBA) and other Federal agencies to increase the participation of small and disadvantaged businesses in EPA's procurement of goods, services, equipment, and construction. OSDBU works with the SBA to develop EPA's goals for contracting with small and disadvantaged businesses; address bonding issues that pose a roadblock for small businesses in specific industries, such as environmental clean-up and construction; and address data-collection issues that are of concern to OSDBUs throughout the Federal government. EPA's OSDBU works closely with the Center for Veterans Enterprise and EPA's Regional and program offices to increase the amount of EPA procurement dollars awarded to Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSB). It also works with the Department of Education and the White House Historically Black College and University (HBCU) Workgroup to increase opportunities for HBCUs to partner with small businesses and Federal agencies, especially in the area of scientific research and development. Work is also coordinated with the Minority Business Development Agency to fund opportunities for small disadvantaged businesses, and to collaborate to provide outreach to small disadvantage businesses and Minority-Serving Institutions throughout the United States and the trust territories. EPA's OSDBU Director is an active participant in the Federal OSDBU Council (www.osdbu.gov), and served as the Council's Chairperson in FYs 2004 and 2006. The OSDBU Directors collaborate to the extent possible to support major outreach efforts to small and disadvantaged businesses, SDVOSB, and minority-serving educational institutions via conferences, business fairs, and speaking engagements.

Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)

EPA makes active contributions to standing interagency management committees, including the Chief Financial Officers Council and the Federal Financial Managers' Council. These groups are focused on improving resources management and accountability throughout the Federal government. EPA also coordinates appropriately with Congress and other Federal agencies, such as Department of Treasury, Office of Management of Budget (OMB), and the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

Office of Administration and Resources Management (OARM)

EPA is committed to working with Federal partners that focus on improving management and accountability throughout the Federal government. The Agency provides leadership and expertise to government–wide activities in various areas of human resources, grants administration, contracts management and Homeland Security. These activities include specific collaboration efforts with Federal agencies and departments through:

- Chief Human Capital Officers, a group of senior leaders that discuss human capital initiatives across the Federal government; and

- Legislative and Policy Committee, a committee comprised of other Federal agency representatives who assist Office of Personnel and Management in developing plans and policies for training and development across the government.

- The Chief Acquisition Officers Council, the principal interagency forum for monitoring and improving the Federal acquisition system. The Council also is focused on promoting the President's Management Agenda in all aspects of the acquisition system, as well as the President's specific acquisition-related initiatives and policies.

The Agency is participating in government-wide efforts to improve the effectiveness and performance of Federal financial assistance programs, simplify application and reporting requirements, and improve the delivery of services to the public. This includes membership on the Grants Policy Committee, the Grants Executive Board, and the Grants.gov Users Group. EPA also participates in the Federal Demonstration Partnership to reduce the administrative burdens associated with research grants.

EPA is working with the OMB, General Services Administrations, and Department of Commerce's National Institute of Standards and Technology to implement Homeland Security Presidential Directive No. 12 - Policy for a Common Identification Standard for Federal Employees and Contractors.

Office of Environmental Information (OEI)

To support EPA's overall mission, OEI collaborates with a number of other Federal agencies and state and Tribal governments on a variety of initiatives, including initiatives to make government more efficient and transparent, protect human health and the environment, and assist in homeland security. OEI is more specifically involved in the information technology (IT), information management (IM), and information security aspects of the projects it collaborates on.

EPA is the managing partner agency of the eRulemaking Program, one of the President's 25 government-wide Electronic Government (E-Gov) initiatives. The eRulemaking Program is operated within OEI. The Program's mission is to improve public access to, understanding of, and participation in regulation development and to streamline government's management of and

efficiency in promulgating regulations. In January 2003, eRulemaking launched the award-winning *Regulations.gov* web site. For the first time ever, citizens could access and comment on all proposed Federal regulations *from a single web site*. Tens of millions of public users have come to this site to find, view, and comment on proposed regulations. In September 2005, the eRulemaking Program launched the award-winning Federal Docket Management System (publicly accessible at www.regulations.gov). The Federal Docket Management System is an electronic document repository enabling agencies to post all rulemaking and non-rulemaking documents for public access and comment. Now the public also can access Federal Register documents, supporting technical/legal/economic analyses, and public comments previously only available by physically visiting a docket center. EPA and its partner agencies enhance the system each quarter by incorporating new capabilities for public and agency users, including: the ability to bookmark documents, email notification, Real Simple Syndication Feed (RSS), eAuthenticated login, electronic records, full-text search, and the ability for major search engines to locate documents within Regulations.gov. The eRulemaking Program has migrated more than 29 Departments and Independent Agencies, comprised of 161 bureaus, boards, agencies and administrations, representing more than 90% of the Federal rules promulgated annually. Collectively, this collaborative multi-agency effort is projected to result in significant savings to the Federal government through the elimination of duplicative systems (whether existing or proposed).

As part of its effort to help protect human health and the environment, EPA is coordinating with the states and tribes to improve the collection, management, and sharing of environmental information. A key component of these efforts is EPA's participation in the State/EPA Information Management Workgroup and Network Steering Board. As a member of the Board, EPA participates in action teams comprised of EPA, state, and Tribal members, designed to identify information projects that can resolve information issues and to arrive at consensus solutions. Two of the areas that this forum has worked on extensively are developing environmental data standards and implementing new technologies for collecting and reporting information.

In addition to protecting human health and the environment, EPA also supports homeland security by coordinating extensively with a number of other Federal agencies to develop and expand the use of geographically based information. These efforts include coordination with the U. S. Geological Survey (USGS), Federal Geographic Data Committee, Chief Information Officer (CIO) Council (http://www.cio.gov), DHS, Council on Environmental Quality, Environmental Council of States, other national security agencies, and state agencies. Much of this work is done by multi-agency workgroups designed to ensure consistent implementation of standards and technologies across the Federal government to support efficient sharing of data, especially the sharing of geographically based data and Geographic Information Systems. A key aspect of this work is developing and implementing the infrastructure to support an assortment of national spatial data – data that can be attached to and portrayed on maps. This work has several key applications, including ensuring that human health and environmental conditions are represented in the appropriate contexts, supporting the assessment of environmental conditions and changes, and supporting first responders and other homeland security situations. Additionally, EPA coordinates with the CIO Council and other Federal agencies on projects

related to information security, capital planning, workforce development, interoperability, and infrastructure related to homeland security.

Another area where EPA actively coordinates with other Governmental entities is public access to information. In addition to the E-Gov initiatives described above, EPA also coordinates with the USGS, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Fish and Wildlife Service, and state and local government partners to expand and improve public access to information affecting their lives. EPA also works with states, tribes, local agencies, and non-governmental organizations to design and implement specific community-based information projects.

Office of the Inspector General (OIG)

The EPA Inspector General is a member of the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE), an organization comprised of Presidentially-appointed Federal Inspectors General (IG), GAO, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The PCIE coordinates and improves the way IGs conduct audits, investigations and internal operations. The PCIE also promotes joint projects of government-wide interest, and reports annually to the President on the collective performance of the OIG community. The OIG Special Operations Division coordinates computer crime activities with other law enforcement organizations such as the FBI, Secret Service and Department of Justice. In addition, the OIG participates with various inter-governmental audit forums and professional associations to exchange information, share best practices, and obtain/provide training. The OIG further promotes collaboration among EPA's partners and stakeholders in the application of technology, information, resources and law enforcement efforts through its outreach activities. The EPA OIG initiates and participates in individual collaborative audits, evaluations and investigations with OIGs of agencies with an environmental mission such as the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, and with other Federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies as prescribed by the IG Act, as amended. The OIG also promotes public awareness of opportunities to report possible fraud, waste and abuse through the OIG Hotline.

MAJOR MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

Introduction

Management challenges represent potential vulnerabilities in program operations and susceptibilities to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. The Reports Consolidation Act of 2000 requires the Inspector General to identify the most serious management challenges facing EPA, briefly assess the Agency's progress in addressing them, and report annually. EPA has established a mechanism for identifying and addressing its key management challenges before they become serious problems. As part of its management integrity process, EPA senior managers meet with representatives from EPA's Office of Inspector General (OIG), the General Accountability Office (GAO), and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to hear their views on EPA's key management challenges. EPA managers also use audits, reviews, and program evaluations conducted internally and by GAO, OMB, and OIG to assess program effectiveness and identify potential management issues.

EPA remains committed to maintaining effective and efficient internal controls to ensure that program and financial activities are carried out effectively and according to applicable laws and sound management policy. The discussion that follows lists management challenges that OIG, GAO, and OMB have identified and summarizes actions EPA is taking to address these issues.

1. Emission Factors for Sources of Air Pollution

Scope of Challenge: *While the Agency has made some progress in improving its emission factors (e.g., developing a Quality Management Plan), challenges remain. A 2006 OIG evaluation found (1) conflicting guidance on appropriately using emissions factors, (2) a rating system that did not quantify the uncertainty associated with emissions factors, (3) inadequate funding of the program, and (4) the lack of a comprehensive plan to improve data collection and set priorities, and OIG concluded that emissions factors are being used inappropriately for key environmental decisions. EPA needs to address the large number of emission factors rated low, ensure sufficient funding to address data gaps and limitations, limit decisions being made with poor quality emissions factors, and provide industry and state or local agencies with significant non-regulatory incentives to obtain the data needed to improve emissions factors. (OIG)*

The Agency has made significant progress in addressing the issues identified in OIG's March 2006 evaluation report, *EPA Can Improve Emissions Factors Development and Management.* EPA remains on track in implementing its plan to make it easier for others to transmit and transform their emissions data into emissions factors that account for uncertainty. Building on previous success, the Agency continues to re-engineer the emissions factor program to develop emissions factors faster, increase the number of emission factors, and account for uncertainty in emissions factors.

With respect to developing guidance for using emissions factors, EPA agrees that the Agency needs to be clearer about the regulatory and environmental risks of using emissions factors, including the risks associated with their original intended application and for programs that have adopted their use as an expeditious means of achieving their goals. The Agency has developed a

new, streamlined emissions factor development process that is currently undergoing public review, and we expect to finalize these new procedures later this year.

In response to OIG's finding that the current emissions factor rating system did not quantify the uncertainty associated with emissions factors, the Agency has completed a statistical study of the uncertainty associated with published emissions factors that are based on emissions testing data, such as those contained in AP-42. We presented our approach and study results to internal reviewers and a panel of expert peer reviewers and addressed their comments and suggestions. In February 2007, EPA submitted a report describing the technical approach and the results to Congress and OMB. The report is currently available on the web for public review and comment. EPA is now beginning to analyze various policy options available for accounting for uncertainty.

The OIG has recommended the development of a comprehensive plan to improve data collection and set emission factor priorities. We have developed and submitted a comprehensive strategic plan meeting those recommendations, which is currently under review by OIG. The plan focuses on advancing direct, continuous site-specific measurements of the pollutant of concern and addresses the development and use of emissions factors for situations where site-specific measurements are infeasible or the risks of adverse program decisions are unacceptable.

Highlights of progress include:

- Launched WebFIRE, an interactive website that combines AP-42 and FIRE data so that users are no longer required to conduct independent checks while searching for emission factors.
- Conducted an analysis to determine the uncertainty of highly-rated emissions factors.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Enhance WebFIRE to allow users independently to check and verify background information for emissions factors.
- Develop emissions factors for coke ovens, landfills, municipal waste combustors, steel mini-mills, landing losses for external floating roofs, and low pressure petroleum storage tanks.
- Initiate development of emissions factors for natural gas engines, rubber manufacturers, and animal feeding operations.

2. <u>Voluntary Climate Change Program/ Voluntary Climate Change Programs Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reporting</u>

Scope of Challenge: *Climate Leaders and Climate VISION, two voluntary programs aimed at securing private sector agreements to voluntarily reduce greenhouse gas emissions or emissions intensity, need to be better managed to achieve desired results. While many participants have completed program steps in a timely manner, some participants appear not to be progressing at the rate expected. GAO recommends that EPA develop written policies establishing the consequences for not completing program steps on schedule. OMB is concerned about the reliability of the estimates of GHG reduction attributable to voluntary programs such as Energy Star. (GAO and OMB)*

In its April 2006 report on climate change, GAO recommended that EPA develop written policy for increasing progress under the EPA Climate Leaders program. EPA believes GAO's recommendation was addressed in the initial design of the program. The Agency has detailed its existing policy in an internal memorandum which documents the steps that EPA will take if it believes a participant is not completing the program requirements in a timely manner. When EPA believes a participant is not making a good faith effort to complete program requirements, the Agency will telephone the participant to re-invigorate the process; send an official letter urging the participant to act more expeditiously; and, if necessary, remove the participant from the program for noncompliance. EPA will continue to monitor participants' progress through its program tracking system, which includes a goal tracking spreadsheet and inventory of calls conducted to discuss progress.

In response to OMB's concerns about the reliability of the estimates of GHG, a recent Program Assessment Rating Tool review found EPA's climate programs to be achieving their goals. The review also highlighted the ENERGY STAR program as among the more successful in collecting and presenting performance information and using the data for management decision making. EPA publishes an annual report on the accomplishments of its voluntary programs for reducing GHG emissions. This report outlines EPA's robust methods to estimate the benefits of these programs and explains how the Agency is addressing evaluation issues. The report shows that ENERGY STAR, in particular, relies on robust, peer-reviewed methods.

Highlights of progress include:

- Developed new peer-reviewed methods for documenting the benefits of ENERGY STAR, including energy savings and GHG reductions.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Continue to assess the progress of Climate Leader partners and request that they leave the program if they are not making sufficient progress in a reasonable period of time.
- Improve the methods that EPA employs to assess the impacts of its climate protection programs.
- Participate in interagency efforts to assess and report on the impacts of the federal climate protection policy and program.
- Review recent legislation, including the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 and the Fiscal Year 2008 Omnibus Appropriations Act, to determine the impacts of their provisions on EPA's methods for estimating the benefits of these programs.

3. Capacity to Manage Climate Change Activities

Scope of Challenge: *Recent developments in climate change science and policy (e.g., Massachusetts vs. EPA) will affect EPA's ability to protect public health and the environment. GAO believes EPA could benefit from assessing its capacity to manage climate change issues and the impact of a changing climate on existing Agency programs. EPA should evaluate its scientific and technical capacity to interpret scientific findings and incorporate them into regulatory decisions; assess its capacity to implement mandatory programs should Congress pass binding climate*

legislation; and review the administration of existing programs (air and water pollution) to determine implications of a changing climate on the Agency's ongoing regulatory efforts. (GAO)

EPA agrees that recent developments in climate change science and policy will impact the Agency's programs and capacity needs. While we have already begun the type of management and resource analyses recommended by GAO, we believe it is premature to conduct a full assessment at this time, given the uncertainty of future Congressional actions. The scope of possible future legislation under development is unknown (e.g., there is not yet consensus regarding the sectors to be covered by a possible policy or the type of "binding" measure to be used). Moreover, it is unclear when such legislation will pass and what kind of lead time EPA would have in terms of implementing the enacted policies. Under the circumstances, EPA believes Agency resources could be better used to track developments in Congress and provide technical support and analyses as requested.

Highlights of progress include:

- Completed short-term realignment of resources to respond to the Massachusetts v. EPA decision and the President's subsequent Executive Order to regulate GHG emissions from motor vehicles.
- With extensive senior management involvement, continue to assess the implications of Supreme Court decisions.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Continue to identify the potential air quality and climate policy implications of research on air programs.

4. Challenges in Addressing Air Toxic Regulatory Programs Goals

Scope of Challenge: *OMB believes EPA needs to continue focusing on addressing the backlog of residual risk standards and developing air toxics exposure data. (OMB)*

The 1990 Amendments to the Clean Air Act (CAA) required EPA to develop and issue Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standards to reduce emissions of air toxics from certain categories of stationary sources. EPA completed its obligation to develop initial MACT standards (96 standards for 174 source categories) in 2004. EPA anticipates that when fully implemented in 2007, the MACT standards will reduce air toxics emissions from stationary sources by 1.7 million tons per year. The CAA also requires EPA to evaluate air toxic emissions further and evaluate whether post-MACT emissions pose a risk to public health. These residual risk reviews and standards are to be developed for each source category within 8 years of promulgation of the MACT standard. In addition to the residual risk reviews, the CAA requires EPA to conduct technology reviews for each MACT standard within 8 years of promulgation. For each technology review EPA is to review and revise the MACT standard, if necessary, taking into account developments in practices, processes and control technologies.

EPA is combining the risk and technology reviews for each MACT standard. The Agency has completed risk and technology reviews for 8 MACT standards to date under consent decree orders. Sierra Club filed a notice of intent to sue on 17 additional MACT standards, and we are now beyond the 8 years for an additional 16 for a total of 33 MACT standards.

EPA has developed a new approach of streamlining the risk and technology reviews for the MACT standards. Under the new risk and technology review EPA will perform the risk and technology reviews for groups of MACT standards rather than individually. Post-MACT emissions contained in the NEI database will be used as the basis to model risk. To conduct risk analyses, data will be reviewed by EPA and supplemented with additional data for the source category. EPA will then solicit public comment on the data and any anomalies noted to obtain the best representation of emissions from the source category. Through the residual risk and technology review (RTR) process, EPA believes it can complete the residual risk standards in a timely, scientifically creditable and cost-effective manner.

Highlights of progress include:

- Completed 6 residual risk and technology reviews.
- Completed the Halogenated Solvents Residual Risk Rule.
- Developed datasets for each source category from NEI and risk data.
- Performed screening assessments for 34 MACT standards (50 source categories).
- Completed the Halogenated Solvents Residual Risk Rule.
- Published advanced notice of proposed rulemaking (currently reviewing comments and adding corrections to the datasets).

Plans for further improvements include:

- Continue to conduct residual risk reviews and rules under RTR process in an accelerated manner.

5. Efficiently Managing Water and Wastewater Resources and Infrastructure/Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds

Scope of Challenge: *The Agency faces a continuing challenge in reaching thousands of small utilities and influencing their management behavior, skills, and abilities. EPA needs to be more innovative on the finance and management fronts to assist states and communities in overcoming infrastructure issues. The Agency also needs to define its role as part of a long-term national strategy on sustainable water infrastructure that addresses financial and management issues. OIG questions whether EPA's "Four Pillars of Sustained Infrastructure" approach adequately addresses the infrastructure challenge. OMB and OIG agree that EPA's regulation policy on state match options should no longer allow states to use bonds repaid from SRF to meet state match requirements. (OIG and OMB)*

EPA believes it has taken and will continue to take effective steps to define and pursue its role in ensuring that the nation's water and wastewater infrastructure is sustainable in the future. While much of the change is needed at the local level, EPA provides leadership, tools, innovation, and momentum to encourage a shift toward financial and managerial sustainability. The Agency's role is to provide education and outreach and to serve as a "wholesaler" of information to our state and national professional association partners. EPA's Four Pillars of Sustainable Infrastructure (SI) have provided the structure to define the sustainability challenge, raised the visibility of the issue to a national scale, and offered a suite of approaches to move towards sustainability. Water infrastructure has been further elevated on the national stage as one of the Administrator's top four priorities.

EPA is leading by example by breaking down barriers to progress in its own programs and partnerships and working toward policies that foster sustainability, while protecting human health and the environment. Internally, EPA is speaking with one voice—reaching across offices to promote the innovation needed to address the sustainability challenge. SI has been a major topic for the national Water Division Directors' and SES meetings, helping the Agency work across traditional organizational lines to allow and promote innovation. The Agency is promoting SI through permits, Special Environmental Projects, and injunctive relief. The Agency is also coordinating efforts in its Performance Track and Smart Growth programs to foster aspects of sustainability, energy, and infrastructure related to climate change.

EPA's efforts go well beyond the areas of focus under the Four Pillars. In the area of innovative finance, the Agency is working to allow the expanded use of Private Activity Bonds to bring more private capital into the sector and exploring and promoting innovative uses of SRF loans. In March 2007, in partnership with 14 other organizations, EPA convened a national conference on Paying for Sustainable Water Infrastructure that brought stakeholders from all levels of government and the private sector together to explore creative methods of paying for sustainable water infrastructure. Four conference tracks covered topics related to reducing costs and increasing investment in drinking water and wastewater systems and programs. The conference looked beyond the Four Pillars to broader issues and expanding all stakeholders' efforts, since solutions to the sustainability challenge will require joint and collaborative effort. EPA has since met with conference co-sponsors to consolidate learning and define critical areas for additional collaborative action, such as improved outreach to local officials.

On July 2, 2007, EPA responded to OIG's audit recommendations and agreed to assess the effects on states of its state match bond policy and the potential impact of changes to the current policy. Our assessment indicates that states show near unanimous support for the current policy and believe that its cumulative effect on the SRF program has been highly beneficial. Some states that take advantage of the current policy believe they would be unable to procure state appropriations for match, and therefore unable to apply for federal funds. EPA will continue to work with the OIG and states to analyze the effects of this policy.

Highlights of progress include:

- Launched WaterSense, a market enhancement program that is increasing national awareness of water-efficient choices and the value of clean and safe water.
- Signed a ground-breaking agreement with six major water and wastewater associations jointly to promote effective utility management based on a series of *Attributes of Effectively Managed Utilities*, other management tools, and utility performance measures.
- Co-sponsored the Water Quality Trading Conference with USDA that brought utility companies and the agricultural community together to build momentum for trading programs that maximize impact from infrastructure investments.
- Continued to produce assistance documents and tools targeting the needs and special circumstances of small utilities (e.g., Simple Tools for Effective Performance and Total Electronic Asset Management Software).

- Convened a *Watershed Forum* with several major utilities to discuss ways to promote adoption of various watershed tools, such as green infrastructure, into local infrastructure decisions.
- Convened a panel of experts to discuss the importance of full cost pricing of water and wastewater services by utilities.
- Co-sponsored the *Paying for Sustainable Water Infrastructure: Innovations for the 21st Century Conference* which brought together stakeholders from all levels of government and the private sector to explore creative methods for paying for sustainable water infrastructure today and into the future.
- Issued the *Water Quality Trading Toolkit for Permit Writers*, which explains how to implement the National Water Quality Trading Policy and is the first "how to trade" guidance published by the Agency (August 2007).

Plans for further improvements include:

- Develop a *Small Communities Team* work plan focused on better management of wastewater for small communities and disadvantaged or underserved populations.
- Prepare a *Drinking Water Capacity Development Strategic Plan* to ensure that the Agency's outreach efforts to small utilities are well coordinated and effective.
- By end of summer of 2008, publish a series of "technical guides" that will provide technical information for establishing trading programs in such areas as water quality monitoring and developing scientifically-based trade ratios.
- By winter 2008, complete the *Check Up Program for Small Systems* software, an asset management tool designed to help small systems.
- Work with the Green Infrastructure Collaborative workgroup on a strategy to expand the use of green infrastructure solutions.
- Host a National Capacity Development Program workshop to expand outreach and explore solutions to the challenges faced by small systems.

6. Safe Drinking Water Information Systems (SDWIS)

Scope of Challenge: *EPA's database for collecting drinking water information is populated by data from states on drinking water violations. The database was designed to served as a compliance tracking system; however, the system depends solely on what states report to EPA as drinking water violations. OMB is concerned that the database is unable to determine definitively such questions as the number of systems in compliance, posing a problem for EPA's Office of Water managers as they try to run a program based upon limited non-compliance information from states. OMB recommends that EPA identify better methods to account for violations, such as the stratified sampling of community water systems approach that the IG suggested in March 2004. (OMB)*

EPA has worked to improve the SDWIS database, completing a major software modernization in 2005 on-time and under-budget. Additionally, EPA has assessed data quality and outlined improvement in our triennial Data Reliability Implementation/Action Plan. In collaboration with states and the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators (ASDWA), we are now implementing a comprehensive data quality improvement plan. EPA and ASDWA have agreed on a data quality goal of 90 percent for health-based violation data by the 2008-2010 triennial

evaluation period: 10 states have already met this goal, and the Agency is tracking progress through its annual performance goals and measures.

EPA has focused its efforts to improve data quality on two objectives: (1) ensuring that the system that receives and maintains the data is technologically robust and user friendly; and (2) ensuring that the compliance decisions made at the state level are appropriate and accurately entered into the data system. EPA has undertaken considerable effort in the last several years to modernize the SDWIS/FED database and improve the SDWIS/STATE application. The Agency has identified completeness of data as an important issue affecting data quality. On-site data verifications (DVs) have proven critical to identifying data quality gaps and potential root causes. OGWDW has adhered to a robust data verification audit process, conducting 15 DV audits in each of FYs 2005, 2006, and 2007, and plans an additional 15 per year in FYs 2008 and 2009.

Highlights of progress include:

- Completed SDWIS modernization.
- Implemented a comprehensive data quality improvement plan for the SDWIS/FED.
- Provided extensive training to primacy agencies on making compliance determinations.
- Developed an electronic tool that allows states to validate their data in advance of data submission to EPA in order to ensure data completeness and enhance data quality.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Continue efforts related to training, tool development, and completion of the next Data Reliability Improvement/Action Plan.
- Continue to review the results of DVs, both on-site and eDVs.
- In FY 2008, pilot the use of the eDV tool as a means to allow states to validate their data in advance of submission to SDWIS/FED.
- Continue to work with ASDWA to address documentation of a subset of state policy decisions on compliance determinations that deviate from regulatory requirements.

7. Water Quality Monitoring and Data

Scope of Challenge: *While EPA has made progress in monitoring water quality, OMB remains concerned about EPA's ability to provide a statistically valid national assessment of water quality for decision-making at the national, state, and regional levels. OMB believes EPA's allowance of states to use Section 106 funds to assess non-statistically valid water quality monitoring has exacerbated the water quality data problem by extending the time it will take EPA and states to have complete probabilistic programs in place. EPA needs to limit the use of the additional Section 106 funds to probabilistic monitoring activities. (OMB)*

EPA believes the use of 106 funds for non-probabilistic monitoring efforts provides regions and states with flexibility they need in assessing water quality. On March 29, 2006, EPA published "Guidelines for the Award of Monitoring Initiative Funds under Section 106 Grant to States,

Interstate Agencies, and Tribes" in the *Federal Register.* These guidelines outline eligibility requirements and allocation of Monitoring Initiative funds (e.g., $8.5M for state/tribal participation in national surveys, less minor rescission, and $10.0M for enhancements to state monitoring programs, less minor rescission). In May 2007, the Deputy Administrator negotiated an agreement allowing EPA to continue allocating the funds using this approach and incorporating a performance-based standard that will provide EPA and states with the incentive to undertake additional statistical survey programs.

EPA's regional monitoring and grants programs have been working with states to distribute Monitoring Initiative funds based on these guidelines. We are making steady progress in working with states to adopt probability surveys and are on track for meeting the performance measure for 50 states implementing state surveys by 2011.

Highlights of progress include:

- Issued the Wadeable Streams Assessment, which lays out the baseline conditions of streams in the lower 48 states.
- Completed the monitoring design for a national lakes survey (field sampling is underway).

Plans for further improvements include:

- Complete the monitoring design for the national rivers survey.
- Issue the third National Coastal Condition Report, which will further our understanding of the trends in costal water conditions.

8. Strategies for Managing Watersheds

Scope of Challenge: *EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program has over 100 measures to assess progress in meeting restoration commitments, but the Agency does not have an approach to translate the measures or a strategy to target limited resources to activities outlined in Chesapeake 2000. While EPA is currently developing a Web-based system to unify its planning documents, these activities do not fully address GAO's recommendations. Additionally, EPA has made progress in guiding the development of an overall strategy for restoring environmental conditions in the Great Lakes Basin. However, it is unclear whether the strategy will be the guiding document for Great Lakes restoration. The Agency needs a clearly defined organizational structure with measurable basin-wide goals and a monitoring system as called for in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement and the Clean Water Act. The Agency also needs to follow through to ensure that progress is made on achieving the goals of the strategy. (GAO)*

In May 2004, President Bush signed Executive Order 13340, creating a cabinet-level interagency task force to bring an unprecedented level of collaboration and coordination to restore and protect the Great Lakes. EPA's Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) was cited in the Order and given the responsibility for providing assistance in carrying out the goals of the Order. In addition, the Order created a Federal Interagency Task Force to bring the many governmental partners together to protect and restore the Great Lakes. In December 2005, the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration developed a strategy to guide federal, state, tribal and other partners' action to restore the Great Lakes. Federal commitments have been identified in the Federal Near-Term Action Plan and are being implemented. GLNPO is tracking performance in

improving the Great Lakes and progress toward commitments in the Federal Near-Term Action Plan.

To address GAO concerns regarding the Chesapeake Bay Program, EPA has taken steps to enhance assessment and reporting on the health and restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program Office is developing a strategic implementation plan (SIP) that identifies activities for achieving health and restoration goals for the Chesapeake Bay. This plan, which will be completed in phases, includes five overarching goals and ten key commitments. The first phase focuses on federal actions and is expected to be completed by the end of CY 2007. To date, federal partners (regional and national) have agreed to the goals in the SIP, determined the leads for each of the goals, and agreed to develop a strategic plan that includes annual goals and targets (based on federal funding). The next phase of the SIP will focus on integrating state and federal activities.

Highlights of progress include:

- Issued an assessment report on the Chesapeake Bay which describes the current health of the Bay and progress made in implementing management actions.
- Redesigned how the Agency presents indicator information on its Bay Trends and Indicators website (refer to http://www.chesapeakebay.net/indicators.htm).
- Supported the Great Lakes Interagency Task Force in meeting its requirement to submit a report that summarizes task force activities and recommendations that advance the policy of Executive Order 13340.
- Completed 13 of 48 near term actions, with almost all of the rest on track toward completion. Completed projects include a standardized sanitary survey tool for beach managers to identify pollution sources at beaches and $525,000 in grants piloting the tool to assess 60 beaches in the Great Lakes. In addition, Asian Silver Carp, Largescale Silver Carp, and Black Carp were listed as injurious under the Lacey Act; and the operation of the electric carp barrier in Illinois was continued, to prevent the spread of these species into the Great Lakes.
- Coordinated with NOAA, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, NRCS, and EPA to collectively provide almost $2 million in federal funding, and even more in leveraged non-federal funds, to support 36 projects to make on-the-ground gains in protecting and restoring watersheds in the Great Lakes.
- Remediated over 800,000 cubic yards of contaminated sediment at five sites under the Great Lakes Legacy Act. Through leveraging, we have utilized federal, state, and private dollars to remove 1.5 million pounds of contaminated sediments from the environment, thereby reducing risk to aquatic life and human health, including over 25,000 pounds of PCBs, over one million pounds of chromium, about 400 pounds of mercury, and 171 pounds of lead.
- Coordinated and leveraged resources with relevant agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, pursuant to the Great Lakes Habitat/Wetlands Initiative to restore, protect or improve approximately 65,000 acres of wetlands towards a 100,000 acre near-term goal. Great Lakes States have committed to meet a similar 100,000 acre wetlands goal.
- Established the Federal Aquatic Invasive Species Rapid Response Subcommittee to coordinate Federal efforts to respond to aquatic invasive species entering the Great Lakes. The Subcommittee and Collaboration partners

have developed a Communication Protocol that will assist in coordinating efforts and communication to stem new invaders to the Lakes and to ensure resources and expertise can be brought to bear to the problems of new invaders.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Continue to work with partners to develop basin-wide goals and indicators for the Great Lakes.
- Continue to work with Environment Canada to develop indicators for measuring the health of the Great Lakes.
- Conduct an independent scientific review of the 2006 assessment report.

9. Management of Leaking Underground Storage Tank(LUST)

Scope of Challenge*: EPA relies on states to ensure that tank owners and operators are in compliance with federal financial responsibility regulations under the underground storage tank program, but does not provide specific guidance to states as to whether or how frequently they should verify coverage. GAO believes EPA lacks assurance that states are adequately overseeing and enforcing financial responsibility provisions and that the Agency's method of monitoring whether state assurance funds provide adequate financial responsibility coverage is limited. In addition, GAO finds that EPA's distribution of Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund money to states depends on data that may be inaccurate, due to state reporting requirements. (GAO)*

In response to GAO's report, *Leaking Underground Storage Tanks: EPA Should Take Steps to Better Ensure the Effective Use of Public Funding for Cleanups,* EPA agrees that regular verification of financial responsibility coverage is important to ensure adequate funding for cleaning up future releases. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct) requires EPA or states, as appropriate, to conduct on-site inspections of USTs every 3 years to determine compliance with requirements imposed by Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act. On April 24, 2007, EPA issued final grant guidelines to implement those requirements. These guidelines require that the inspections assess compliance with the financial responsibility requirements.[10]

Additionally, EPA agrees that increased oversight of state assurance fund (state fund) solvency is necessary and important. As the report indicates, EPA recently developed a monitoring tool to assess the financial condition of state funds. EPA is working to improve implementation and utility of that tool. Also, in response to EPAct, EPA is working on guidance to revise and improve its process for monitoring the financial soundness of state funds and work with less solvent funds to improve solvency. EPA expects to complete this guidance in 2008.

Each year EPA distributes LUST Trust Fund money, under an allocation formula that reflects state performance and need, using information reported by states in their end-of-year activity reports. The information contained in these reports, including the number of releases and the population of active tanks, indicates program need and program performance. Nonetheless, EPA agrees with GAO that it is important to ensure the accuracy of information used to support the LUST allocation formula. EPA will continue to work with regions and states to implement

[10] Grant Guidelines to States for Implementing the Inspection Provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, EPA 510-R-07-004, April 2007, http://www.epa.gov/OUST/fedlaws/final_i.htm

quality control measures and, in particular, work toward ensuring that reported data is consistent with existing EPA definitions and is limited to federally-regulated USTs. In addition, as EPA begins working on the EPAct requirements pertaining to the LUST Trust Fund allocation, it will work with regions and states to consider other changes to improve the distribution of future LUST money, including changes that more specifically reflect the need at abandoned LUST sites.

Highlights of progress include:

- Issued final Grant Guidelines on Inspection Requirements, Grant Guidelines to States for Implementing the Inspection Provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. http://www.epa.gov/OUST/fedlaws/final_i.htm
- Continued to emphasize regions' use of the "Quality Assurance/Quality Control Evaluation Checklist" prior to submitting their states' mid-year and annual performance activities. This checklist is a tool to ensure the quality of state and regional data.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Increase efforts to assess the solvency of state funds by raising the level of attention to this issue at national level and providing guidance to regions on increasing their oversight of state funds and reporting annually on their findings.

10. Chemical Regulation

Scope of Challenge: *Recent GAO reviews found that EPA does not routinely assess the risks of all existing chemicals and faces challenges in obtaining the information necessary to do so. Although EPA initiated the High Production Volume (HPV) Challenge Program, it is not yet clear whether the program will produce sufficient information for EPA to determine chemicals' risks to human health and the environment. Furthermore, EPA's reviews of new chemicals provide only limited assurance that health and environmental risks are identified before the chemicals enter commerce. In addition, EPA has limited ability to publicly share the information it receives from chemical companies under TSCA. GAO has recommended that Congress consider providing EPA additional authorities under TSCA to improve its ability to assess chemical risks. GAO recommends that EPA develop and implement a methodology for using information collected through the HPV Challenge Program to prioritize chemicals for further review and identify information needed to assess their risks; promulgate a rule requiring chemical companies to submit to EPA copies of health and safety studies they submit to foreign governments; develop a strategy for validating risk assessment models; and revise regulations to require companies to reassert claims of confidentiality within a certain time period. (GAO)*

EPA will continue work initiated in FY 2007 to evaluate the screening level chemical hazard data obtained through the U.S. High Production Volume (HPV) Challenge Program and companion Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Screening Information Data Set (SIDS) Program. These efforts, combined with the expanded exposure information reported under the 2006 TSCA Inventory Update Reporting (IUR) rule, will lead to the development of risk-based prioritization documents for HPV chemicals. Similar work was initiated in FY 2008, and will continue in 2009, to develop prioritization documents on Moderate Production Volume (MPV) chemicals (25,000 – 1 million pounds/year). This work is included in the Security and Prosperity Partnership agreement between the U.S., Canada and Mexico,

under which the U.S. committed to assess and initiate action on over 9,000 HPV and MPV chemicals by 2012. The risk– and hazard-based prioritization documents identify needed actions on chemicals presenting potential risks. Actions initiated by EPA could involve voluntary information collection, chemical testing, or risk reduction efforts and regulatory actions such as Significant New Use Rules (SNURs), Section 4 Test Rules, or other rules to prevent unreasonable risks.

In addition, EPA continues to follow the Council on Regulatory Environmental Monitoring guidance for evaluating environmental models. EPA is also working internally to validate the use of Structure Activity Relationships assessment tools, giving the Agency confidence in the models and tools it uses to investigate potential risks from new chemicals.

Highlights of progress include:

- Completed screening-level hazard characterization reports for 301 HPV chemicals, exceeding the FY 2007 target of 259. Cumulative progress is 931.
- Completed 33 Proposed Acute Exposure Guideline Levels (AEGLs) which emergency planners and first responders use to prepare for and deal with chemical emergencies by determining safe exposure levels. (This brings the cumulative total since 2006 to 56.)
- Developed and released a Global Data Portal, which allows searching, viewing, and exchanging of test data between the United States, European Union, and other governments (2008). (See http://cs3-hq.oecd.org/scripts/hpv/ for more information.)
- Hosted the "National HPV Chemical Data Users Conference" in December 2006 and two regional conferences in 2007, and used feedback to improve public accessibility to the HPV data.
- Collected expanded screening level exposure-related data on an estimated 7 to 8 thousand chemicals, including processing and use exposure-related data on approximately 40% of those chemicals, under IUR.
- Initiated the Nanoscale Materials Stewardship Program (NMSP) to better characterize existing chemical risks from nanoscale materials.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Increase the production of HPV risk-based decisions to bring the cumulative total to from 150 to 490 chemicals in FY 2009.
- Increase the number of MPV hazard-based decisions from 55 anticipated in FY 2008 to 650 planned for FY 2009.
- Industry will contribute as well to the 3,000 HPV chemical component of the SPP commitments through the industry-led Extended High Production Volume Challenge Program (EHPV), which focuses on approximately 500 chemicals that achieved HPV status after the HPV Challenge Program had commenced.
- Implement its NMSP, which will gather existing data on manufactured nanoscale materials and encourage the development of additional test data.
- Complete the development of a final HPV Challenge report and make it publicly available.

- Evaluate options to change the Voluntary Children's Chemical Evaluation Program (VCCEP) based on experience gained during the pilot phase of the program. Options include modifying certain features of the program to enable VCCEP to operate more rapidly and efficiently, and applying the VCCEP approach to further evaluate HPV Challenge chemicals for which EPA has special concerns after completing screening-level hazard, exposure and risk characterizations.

11. Enforcement and Compliance Activities

Scope of Challenge: *With budget constraints and limited resources and the Nation's high expectations for environmental protection, EPA must develop more flexible and cost-effective approaches for managing environmental enforcement and compliance programs. The Agency needs to intensify efforts to move from a performance management system focused on inspections toward a system focused on achieving measurable improvements; ensure that funds are used to achieve consistent and equitable enforcement; and develop an effective workforce strategy and assessment system to ensure resources are appropriately allocated. Additionally, EPA needs to improve its enforcement data to determine the universe of regulated entities and their characteristics and address apparent inconsistencies in program delivery among EPA's regional offices. (GAO)*

EPA has made considerable progress in recent years in developing and implementing a performance and results-based national enforcement and compliance program. In FY 2005, the Agency began to focus its national enforcement and compliance program on "national enforcement priority" areas of noncompliance that have the most significant effects on public health and the environment. These priorities were determined in consultation with the regions and states and were set for an initial 3-year cycle of 2005-2007. For each priority area, the Agency developed a specific strategy for targeting and achieving results. The Agency also developed specific measures of success, including the key outcome measure of "pounds of pollution reduced or treated" and used a limited number of key management measures, developed in concert with regional measures, to monitor its progress and ensure the accomplishment of its annual goals.

In FY07, the Agency again consulted with regions and states to determine whether the current set of priorities should remain in place for the next 3-year cycle, and whether additional environmental risk and noncompliance problems should be considered. The consensus indicated that the current priorities remain the highest priority problems of national significance. The Agency evaluated progress toward the goals set for each of the national priorities using data derived from key measures. Based on that analysis, strategies were adjusted where needed to ensure efforts are focused appropriately, and goals and measures were refined to better articulate and measure the effectiveness of the Agency's national enforcement program.

EPA has implemented several measures and management practices to ensure equitable and consistent enforcement across the nation. We have established national enforcement priorities; created national Strategy Implementation Teams, with regional and headquarters members, to develop the implementation plans for each national priority area; issued national policies and guidance; and implemented the State Review Framework to enhance the Agency's ability to evaluate and oversee state programs.

EPA continues work to ensure that its resources are directed to the most significant risks to public health and the environment. Identifying national enforcement priorities is critical to this effort, and EPA has used a collaborative process that examines noncompliance in a particular candidate area, the environmental gains from reducing or eliminating the problem, and the appropriateness of an active Federal role in achieving compliance. For the past 5 years, the Agency has reserved funds for addressing resource gaps in implementing these national priorities. Teams responsible for overseeing the implementation of each of the priorities develop competitive proposals to fund activities, tools, and technology to support implementation. Preference in funding is given to proposals that leverage existing resources, improve efficiency, address unmet needs, and have the greatest potential to produce results.

Highlights of progress include:

- Reduced, treated, or eliminated 890 million pounds of pollutants and 1.5 million cubic yards of contaminated soil and water in FY 2007.
- Issued the *Guide for Addressing Environmental Problems: Using an Integrated Strategic Approach*, which provides guidance on selecting the appropriate tools to address noncompliance and environmental problems in a specific context in order to achieve the best outcome.
- Conducted a detailed data-driven review of the performance of each region's compliance and enforcement program including fact-based discussion with regions regarding their results.
- Implemented the SRF to ensure that regional offices conduct consistent oversight of states, and that states consistently implement environmental enforcement programs. The SRF provides critical information on a state's or region's core environmental and compliance assurance performance based on existing data available in EPA's national database. With funding from OPEI, began an in-depth program evaluation of the SRF to enable adjustments aimed at maximizing its effectiveness. The review process has included state and regional participation to ensure all stakeholders' experiences and perspectives are considered.
- Developed the *Key Management Measures Report* for senior managers, which highlights key data on significant noncompliance, raising the visibility and scrutiny of such information.
- In December 2007, held a workshop in which experts discussed white papers on the state of the science of measuring compliance assistance outcomes as well as general and specific deterrent impacts of monitoring and enforcement.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Work toward developing an environmental problem-based strategic architecture centered on enforcement, monitoring, and assistance. This will replace the current tool-based objectives.
- Building on the findings and recommendations in the white papers discussed above, the Agency will explore the feasibility of a pilot project aimed at developing a methodology for measuring general deterrence within specific sectors.

12. Workforce Planning/Human Capital Management

Scope of Challenge: *OIG and GAO believe that EPA continues to face challenges in managing human capital and workforce planning, including its ability to attract, develop, and retain a skilled, diverse, and results-oriented workforce. Although EPA has completed a comprehensive Strategic Workforce Plan for maintaining the right people, at the right location, and at the right time, an OIG review of the Agency's workforce planning effort reveals challenges which may affect the Agency's ability to get to "green" status on the PMA scorecard. GAO finds that despite EPA's progress in improving the management of its human capital, the Agency has not effectively implemented its human capital strategic plan and needs to comprehensively assess its workforce and continue monitoring its progress to ensure a well-trained and motivated workforce with the right mix of skills and experience. GAO further notes that if EPA is to improve its resource planning process, the Agency needs to obtain reliable data on key workload indicators and design budget and cost accounting systems that can isolate resources needed and allocated to key activities. (OIG and GAO)*

In FY 2001, EPA acknowledged human capital (HC) as an Agency-level weakness. Over the years, the Agency has made significant progress in strengthening its HC program. This included developing a robust HC accountability program, improving the HC audit program, expanding the Agency's leadership development programs to enhance skills and ensure continuity of leadership, and establishment of a workforce planning system. As of FY 2007, the Agency had completed all of its improvements except for a few final improvements to address the workforce planning component of the human capital weakness identified in FY 2001. To address the workforce planning concerns identified by OIG and GAO, EPA developed a workforce planning/competency management system that gauges skill gaps and guides the design of strategies for closing the gaps. EPA has worked closely with OMB and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to align the Agency's Human Capital Strategy to meet the objectives outlined in the President's Management Agenda (PMA) as it relates to the Strategic Management of Human Capital. The Agency expects to complete all final corrective actions related to this weakness in FY 2008.

Highlights of progress include:

- In FY 2007, retained a "green" progress score for Human Capital under the PMA in every quarter, and remained on target to attain a "green" status score in December 2008.
- Completed implementation of all cycles of the workforce planning process for EPA's priority Mission Critical Occupations, resulting in no major competency or resource gaps.
- Completed implementation of a complete, self-directed Human Capital Accountability system for EPA.
- Continued preparation for full implementation of the electronic Official Personnel Folders (e-OPF).
- Completed initial cost-benefit analysis on HR LoB initiative options for EPA HR IT systems and completed initial analysis of EPA HR consolidation options for EPA HR operations.
- Launched the *"Successful Leaders Program"* as the new EPA-wide mandatory new supervisors training program.
- Achieved EPA's objective for SES time-to-hire of less than 73 days between advertisement and offer.

- Implemented the second successful round of the EPA Agency-wide SES mobility program.
- Achieved full certification from OPM for EPA's SES pay and performance system.
- Completed a full succession planning analysis for EPA SES critical positions, exceeding targets for bench-strength.
- Completed a new EPA Recruiting Plan.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Complete all final corrective actions for workforce planning related to this weakness in FY 2008.

13. <u>Grants Management</u>

Scope of Challenge: *GAO believes that while EPA has issued a 5-year grants management plan and made progress in achieving reforms, weaknesses in implementation and accountability continue to hamper effective grants management. In particular, GAO cites problems remaining in documenting ongoing monitoring of grantee performance and in closing out grants. EPA's lack of monitoring documentation hinders the Agency's ability to collect important data and ensure that grant recipients have met all financial requirements. (OIG and GAO)*

In FY 2000, EPA acknowledged assistance agreements as an Agency-level weakness. Over the years, the Agency has taken substantial actions to improve its management of assistance agreements through updated policies, increased training, and improved accountability. While grants management will continue to require sustained management attention, the Agency has in place an infrastructure responsive to the concerns identified by OIG and GAO. EPA has completed and validated the effectiveness of all corrective actions associated with this weakness. The Agency closed this weakness in September 2007.

Highlights of progress include:

- Continued to enhance grant management skills of EPA employees through mandatory training. As a result, virtually all EPA grants are now managed by certified project officers.
- To strengthen oversight and respond to GAO and internal EPA recommendations, EPA developed a revised Post-Award Monitoring Order that becomes effective January 2008.
- Implemented the Agency's Green Plan for the improvement of financial data, specifically the interface between the Integrated Grants Management System and the Integrated Financial Management System.
- Conducted a two-phase study to review the identified output and outcomes of grant work plans and the progress reports that follow these work plans.
- Continued to implement the Agency's revised competition policy, having competed almost 92 percent of new grants, exceeding performance targets in the Grants Management Plan.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Sustain management attention to grants management.

- Maintain the infrastructure the Agency has established in response to issues identified by GAO and OIG.

14. Financial Management Practices

Scope of Challenge: *GAO annual reviews of EPA's budget justification and related financial management practices have identified several management challenges: the need for enhancing oversight of processes for conducting and tracking closeouts of expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements and limitations in the Agency's ability to account for its spending on voluntary programs or certain fixed costs, including security and utilities. GAO believes EPA also needs to better account for and report on deobligations and recertifications of expired funds. (GAO)*

EPA currently uses several financial systems to account for Agency spending. The Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS) is based on 1980s technology and has required several work-around databases and modules to track expenditures effectively. The Budget Automation System (BAS) system, for example, tracks program budgets in more detail than IFMS permits. The Agency's Business Intelligence Tool (ORBIT) was recently upgraded, and some program offices have been unable to utilize fully the system's capabilities. EPA is developing a replacement system for IFMS that will enable better practices in financial management. While a temporary interim fix would be to create additional sub-object class codes for fixed costs, the Agency already tracks utility costs closely and is taking steps to further improve the oversight of utility and security charges.

In response to GAO's concerns regarding closeout of expired contracts, EPA's contracting officers review all expired contracts on a monthly basis and report to Office Directors and Deputy Directors on the status of closeout actions. Whenever possible, the Agency performs desk reviews to expedite contract closeouts. However, when we encounter issues with a contractor's direct or indirect cost rates or potential claims about the completion of work or deliverables under a contract, we cannot close the contract and deobligate all unliquidated obligations immediately after it expires. In these cases, not only EPA but either party may recover funds.

Highlights of progress include:

- Installed advanced web-based metering systems at the Research Triangle Park field office, which covers 40 percent of EPA's total energy usage.
- Completed advance metering site visits at 75 percent of its other field offices.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Continue to review energy usage quarterly for each reporting laboratory.
- Complete remaining 25 percent of advance metering site visits.
- Begin implementing the EPAct 2005 requirements to install "advance metering at all appropriate facilities by 2012.

15. Managing for Results

Scope of Challenge: *OIG states that while many of EPA's programs received high PART scores in areas such as program purpose and program management, the Agency continues to face challenges*

in demonstrating program results due to the lack of independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality; the failure to collect timely and credible performance information; the lack of ambitious targets and timeframes for long-term measures; and the failure to tie budget requests to accomplishing performance goals. OIG believes EPA needs to focus on the logic of program design to ensure that programs and processes have clear and measurable results that allow for transparency and accountability for program performance. Further, OIG believes EPA needs to develop a systematic process for conducting its program evaluations, including leveraging resources for program evaluation competitions and establishing a community of knowledgeable and experienced evaluators from which to draw. Additionally, EPA must continue its efforts to improve strategic planning and tracking of accomplishments and their associated costs. (OIG)

Over the past years, national programs, regional offices, and the Agency's external stakeholders have worked collaboratively to strengthen results-based management at EPA. In FY 2006, the Agency issued its *2006-2011 Strategic Plan*, which charts an ambitious course for environmental protection over the next 5 years and focuses on achieving measurable results that will help advance the protection of human health and the environment. The revised *Strategic Plan* reflects more outcome-oriented goals and objectives and benefits from information on environmental indicators and from futures analysis. The Agency continues to improve the quality of its performance measures as well as its ability to track the cost of achieving environmental results by reducing reporting burden, strengthening data quality, and reinforcing accountability.

OMB acknowledges EPA's significant accomplishments in the area of Financial Performance and Budget and Performance Integration under the PMA. For the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarters of FY 2007, EPA received status and progress scores of "green" for its continued use of financial and performance information in day-to-day program management and decision making. EPA also continued efforts to streamline efficiency measures.

Highlights of progress include:

- Enhanced the Annual Commitment System (ACS) to track three new classes of measures (Senior Executive Service organizational assessment, state grant template, and regional priorities). The system also flags measures that contribute to OMB's PART reviews.
- Launched a new intranet website (http://intranet.epa.gov/ocfo/acs) to provide Agency staff with information on ACS development and the annual performance commitment process.
- Developed new detailed performance reports through the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's Reporting and Business Intelligence Tool (ORBIT).
- Retired the Management and Accounting Reporting Systems (MARS), saving $1 million annually and improving Agency access to key budget and financial management reports.
- Achieved OMB approval of efficiency measures for all 51 of EPA's completed PART programs.
- Issued the *2006-2011 Strategic Plan,* which reflects a sharper focus on priorities established by the Administrator (i.e., environmental justice, innovation and collaboration, environmental stewardship, and the role of state and tribal partners).
- Received a "green" status score for Budget and Performance Integration under the PMA for the 2nd and 3rd Quarters of FY 2007.

- Maintained and improved the ACS as a management tool for senior managers to support more effective program management and use of results in Agency decision making.

Plans for further improvements:

- Identify and implement initiatives that support the Agency's vision for greater central governance of performance measures and stronger program and organizational accountability.
- Improve senior managers' access to the Agency's performance information by modifying data systems (BAS, PERS, ACS) to include a "measures central" screen. The screen will improve the usability of the data system and serve as a filter for all Agency performance measures (GPRA, QMR, and senior management measures).
- Identify and endorse a limited set of "top tier" measures and integrate them in the FY 2008 National Program Managers Guidance, FY 2008 annual commitment process, and FY 2009 budget.
- Continue to promote and maintain ORBIT as a primary reporting tool for Agency budget, financial, and performance data.
- Expand the Agency's use of the state grant template to report on FY 2007 results, increasing transparency and ensuring that state grants are accountable for achieving EPA's mission.

16. Data Gaps/Environmental Information

Scope of Challenge: *While noting EPA's progress in addressing critical data gaps in its environmental information, both OIG and GAO believe the Agency still lacks the data it needs to manage for environmental results. OIG notes that data needed to measure program success, to improve risk assessments, and to understand the effectiveness of specific controls are not always available and recommends that EPA continue efforts to set priorities for filling data gaps and that it develop new and strengthen existing outreach programs to leverage data collection efforts with states, tribes, territories, and industries. GAO cites challenges the Agency faces in filling critical data gaps to incorporate better scientific understanding into assessments of environmental trends and conditions and to develop better performance measures for managing programs and measuring program effectiveness. (OIG and GAO)*

As part of its strategic planning, EPA continues to implement and refine processes to identify data gaps and to set priorities for addressing them. For example, the Agency is coordinating the draft Report of the Environment (ROE) with its strategic planning and budgeting process. As part of developing EPA's *2006-2011 Strategic Plan*, national program managers (NPMs) considered the suite of ROE questions and indicators to help develop better environmental performance goals and measures and to identify and set priorities for filling gaps in the information needed to manage programs. NPMs were also required to develop preliminary strategies for improving performance measures to make them more environmental-outcome oriented. Each strategy identified priorities for filling key data gaps to meet the most critical needs and provided a brief recommendation on how to address critical gaps in program data.

Highlights of progress include:

- Developed a pilot (endorsed by Indicators Steering Committee) that assesses how the ROE and strategic planning efforts can best inform and support one another.
- Completed the Water pilot, as part of the ROE/Strategic Plan pilots.
- Briefed the Indicators Steering Committee on the preliminary accomplishments of the ROE/Strategic Plan Pilot.
- Implemented a comprehensive work plan to measure the performance of the Exchange Network.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Continue to further refine the process to identify and prioritize data gaps identified in the ROE as part of the Agency's *Strategic Plan* and budgeting planning processes.

17. Data Standards and Data Quality

Scope of Challenge: *OIG acknowledges that EPA has a substantive effort in place to develop data standards and guide their implementation but notes that standards are not yet incorporated into all information collections. OIG also notes the need for EPA and its partners to continue to focus on ensuring that data are of sufficient quality for decision-making (e.g., assess the integrity of laboratories' drinking water data and incorporate techniques into the laboratory oversight process to identify improper practices and fraud into the laboratory oversight process). OIG recommends EPA set protocols for data system training (e.g., data entry) to ensure that decision makers will have immediate access to reliable water quality data during an emergency. (OIG)*

EPA declared "Implementation of Data Standards" an Agency-level weakness under FMFIA in FY 2005, and has since made progress in addressing challenges related to data standards and data quality. The Agency currently has in place a corrective action strategy that addresses issues identified by OIG. In response to OIG concerns regarding the integrity of laboratories, EPA continues to require laboratories to submit Quality Assurance Reports and Work Plans annually. In accordance with a February 2004 policy directive developed by the Agency's Science Policy Council, laboratories are to seek accreditation from independent accrediting organizations or conduct independent external assessments of their laboratory practices to demonstrate competency. As of April 2007, nine laboratories have achieved accreditation. While EPA has completed the milestones associated with correcting its "Implementation of Data Standards" weakness, we will continue to monitor and verify performance, promote awareness, and develop training modules to implement data standards.

As part of its strategic planning, EPA continues to implement and refine processes to identify data gaps and to set priorities for addressing them. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) directed the Office of Research and Development (ORD) to work with the Office of Environmental Information (OEI) and the Report on the Environment (ROE) Steering Committee to identify Agency priorities for environmental indicators, monitoring, and related information. This effort includes consideration of the Preliminary Strategies developed as part of the 2006-2011 strategic planning process and the ongoing ROE Pilots. In response to the CFO's direction, the ROE Steering Committee is working to identify the most strategic monitoring/data-

development or informational priorities that should be taken into account in future Agency budget strategies as well as the next round of strategic planning.

Highlights of progress include:

- Initiated a ranking process to identify the priorities for environmental indicators, monitoring and related information. Results from the ranking process will be reviewed by the ROE Steering Committee, the Science Policy Council Steering Committee, ad the Regional Planners. A report will be completed in early 2008 and will be used to inform the FY 2010 planning and budgeting and the 2009-2014 strategic planning process.
- Developed a communications plan promoting implementation of upcoming standards and awareness of associated documentation, including implementation strategy, procedures, and best practices.
- Issued a semi-annual Data Standards "Report Card" designed to track program implementation of data standards.
- Reviewed data standards implementation for all systems managed under one prime contractor.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Continue to refine the process to identify and rank data gaps identified in the ROE as part of the Agency's *Strategic Plan* and budget and planning processes.
- Design and launch a new EPA data standards website that will provide data standards and implementation information for EPA program offices and system developers.
- Continue to monitor implementation of data standards within the Registry of EPA Application and Databases and publish the semi-annual Data Standards Report Card.

18. <u>Information Technology Systems Development and Implementation</u>

Scope of Challenge: *While EPA has made some improvements in IT system development and implementation, the Agency needs more management controls and oversight to ensure that IT projects meet the performance standards established by OMB. OIG believes EPA needs to: (1) ensure high-risk IT projects do not exceed prescribed cost and schedule variances; (2) ensure that offices complete system life cycle documentation in a timely manner; and (3) finalize its draft November 2006 Earned Value Management Procedures, which are used to assist project managers in collecting and reporting on performance of major IT investments. (OIG)*

In its September 2005 report, "EPA Needs to Improve Oversight of Its Information Technology Projects," OIG noted that EPA has experienced system development and implementation problems and did not sufficiently oversee information technology (IT) projects to ensure they met planned budgets and schedules.

In response to OIG's audit findings, EPA developed an action plan to enhance management control and oversight. The action plan calls for formally delegating the responsibility for independent oversight review, adding a question in the Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process focusing on System Life Cycle documentation and approvals, and further

emphasizing the importance of reviewing solutions architecture documents. It also calls for revising the System Life Cycle Management Procedures and continued outreach and education for senior management and Senior Information Officials. While EPA's Chief Information Officer (CIO) has the lead for ensuring effective IT project management, primary authority and responsibility lies with the senior manager in the office that owns the IT project, with appropriate oversight by the CIO.

Highlights of progress include:

- Received certification from program and regional Senior Information Officials that all IT acquisitions of $2 million or more had undergone an E-Gov, Line of Business, and SmartBuy review.
- Ensured that program offices completed Earned Value Management (EVM) analysis and reporting for on-going development projects.
- Developed Enterprise Architecture Governance Procedures that require review, approval, and certification that solutions architectures are aligned with both federal and EPA enterprise architectures.
- Conducted outreach briefings for Agency Senior Information Officials, discussing CPIC and project management.
- Issued the draft *Enterprise Architecture Program 2007 Architecture Development Standard and Guidance*.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Finalize the draft *Earned Value Management Procedures* by the end of FY 2008. The draft is currently being reviewed by program managers.
- Continue to conduct outreach briefings with senior management.
- Conduct annual EVM program reviews with project managers.
- Continue to work with the appropriate office to ensure that EVM systems are included in contracts and to establish guidelines for project/program compliance and system certification.

19. Privacy Programs

Scope of Challenge: *The protection of personally identifiable information (PII) has become the subject of recent oversight by OMB. Like many agencies, EPA is challenged in focusing on its privacy responsibilities and integrating privacy into E-Gov and other mandated privacy activities. EPA needs to update overarching policies outlining administration and management of the privacy program; complete plans to ensure compliance with privacy program policies and procedures and establish oversight; and continue to establish practices to help privacy program managers measure the success of the program. EPA program and regional offices must work together to ensure program success. EPA needs to complete and implement privacy program guidance and other planned activities. (OIG)*

EPA acknowledges that it faces challenges in establishing privacy programs, including revising and developing policies, establishing oversight and accountability, ensuring compliance, and measuring success. However, over the past year, EPA has made significant progress in integrating its privacy and security reporting responsibilities into its business processes.

In June 2006, the Agency established a Personal Identifiable Information (PII) Workgroup under the Quality Information Council to identify and implement short- and long-term actions to protect PII from unauthorized access and disclosure. The workgroup developed an action plan to ensure that key privacy initiatives are met and that the critical tenets of the privacy program are accomplished. The action plan, which includes milestones and expected outcomes, will help the Agency better understand its risks for PII breaches by knowing where its privacy collections are located, managed, and accessed and whether the Agency is storing and collecting unnecessary PII. EPA has already completed several critical activities within the action plan and will continue to monitor progress in this area.

Highlights of progress include:

- Reviewed the Agency's technical controls to ensure consistency with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and OMB requirements.
- Prepared System of Records for new system (on-going).
- Established and implemented guidance for preparing Privacy Impact Assessments on all new Agency systems (on-going).
- Reviewed Agency privacy policies to ensure they address the controls identified by NIST.
- Reviewed all Agency Privacy Act Systems of Records to determine which systems are remotely accessed, are downloaded, and/or collect sensitive PII, and whether stringent controls are required.
- Reviewed and submitted draft language for the Agency's new telework policy to ensure that employees are aware of their responsibilities to protect PII when working offsite.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Develop a privacy intranet website that will make privacy documents available to employees.
- Continue to monitor progress to ensure the Agency is in compliance with NIST and OMB standards and/or requirements.

20. Agency Efforts in Support of Homeland Security

Scope of Challenge: *An OIG evaluation of the Agency's Emergency Response Business Plan identified planning assumptions and aspects of the planning process that may challenge EPA's ability to rely on the Plan as a valid assessment of its readiness. OIG believes the plan does not: (1) provide the rationale for the incidents of national significance on which it is based; (2) document the methodology used to determine the required emergency response resources; (3) address the involvement of other federal or state and local emergency response agency resources; (4) incorporate lessons learned; and (5) address the criteria or responsible agencies for deciding when residents may return to an area impacted by an incident. GAO also raises concerns regarding EPA's communications about potential health risks residents may face and protective gear they should have when returning to their homes after an emergency. (OIG and GAO)*

EPA developed an Emergency Response Business (ER) Plan to increase the Agency's preparedness in responding to environmental and homeland security related disasters. The plan provides a framework for the Agency to address simultaneous incidents of national significance

while maintaining effective day-to-day emergency response and removal operations. In preparing the plan, headquarters and regions use five simultaneous incidents in a "worst case" planning scenario around which to develop detailed assessments, gap analyses, and program activities.

EPA is currently working on an agency wide National Approach to Response (NAR) Implementation Plan to address the overall preparedness framework for five simultaneous incidents of national significance. This plan will build on the 2006 ER Business Plan. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has developed 15 nationally significant scenarios, many of which will require a substantial response effort by EPA. The five DHS scenarios selected for agency planning are: a chemical incident (blister agent), a radiation incident (RDD), a biological incident (anthrax), and two natural disasters (earthquake and hurricane). A workgroup is currently preparing resource estimates for each of the scenarios.

These estimates will then be used by regional groupings to develop response plans that consider among other things, state and local relationships, unique challenges and regional response assets. The development of the NAR Implementation Plan will be an iterative process. It will identify any gaps and be used to prioritize future preparedness activities.

Highlights of progress include:

- Developed an *Incident Management Handbook* that provides guidance on organizational structure and outlines the communications flow during an incident of national significance.
- Developed and implemented an *Information Technology Strategy* that allows EPA to share information with its partners through the Emergency Management Portal and with the general public from its public web site.
- Formed an *Administrative and Finance Workgroup* to address procurement, property tracking, and pay issues.
- Developed a draft plan for acquiring and maintaining field communications equipment for EPA's emergency response programs.
- Issued the final version of EPA's National Approach to Response (NAR) Crisis Communication Plan. The plan addresses roles and responsibilities for incidents of national significance.
- Developed draft guidance for the Response Support Corps which will support the emergency response staff.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Implement the Emergency Response Business Plan's approach for making the necessary changes in the management of personnel, financial, and other resources through NAR priority projects.
- Continue to develop training courses related to weapons of mass destruction and pandemic and avian influenza.

21. <u>Voluntary Programs</u>

Scope of Challenge: *EPA supports and advocates a range of voluntary programs addressing a wide variety of environmental challenges. However, the growth of these programs has not been*

matched by appropriate organization and oversight. OIG work has found that EPA does not have (1) Agency-wide policies on key evaluative elements; (2) consistent and reliable data; (3) operational guidelines that allow for comparative assessments; (4) definitions that help staff categorize or identify voluntary programs; and (5) a systematic process to develop, test, market, and evaluate the effectiveness of voluntary programs. (OIG)

EPA programs and regions support a range of voluntary/partnership programs, which function as an adjunct to regulatory programs or fill in where a regulatory approach is not practicable. These programs are diverse in size, scope, environmental media, target environmental issue, and stakeholder base. They range from high-profile programs such as ENERGY STAR and Performance Track to smaller, more targeted programs such as Sunwise or Natural Gas STAR. There are more than 50 partnership programs Agency-wide which are managed by many different program offices and regions, each of which is responsible for ensuring that programs are well designed and well run. Thus, it is difficult for any single office response to address such a broadly-defined management challenge.

However, the Agency's Innovation Action Council (IAC), which directs and oversees the Agency's innovation agenda, has initiated a number of efforts to clarify the goals and measures and evaluate the results of innovative and "voluntary" partnership programs. As part of this initiative, a Partnership Program Coordination Team has been formed within OPEI's National Center for Environmental Innovation.

Highlights of progress include:

- Issued guidelines on optimal program design, performance measurement, and marketing.
- Implemented a notification system for new and expanding programs.
- Established a charter that includes an Agency-wide workgroup and network to maximize uniform understanding of and compliance with relevant policies and procedures.
- Established a coordination function in the Office of the Administrator to encourage sound program design and management, with a special emphasis on performance measurement.
- Finalized guidelines for marketing partnership programs, and issued a compilation of previous guidelines. Guidelines are available on the Partners intranet website at: http://www.epa.gov/partners.
- Formed a cross-agency Partnership Program Review Workgroup, charged with developing a framework for the systematic evaluation and assessment of partnership programs.

Plans for further improvements include:

- Initiate the development of a new set of Guidelines on Program Evaluation for partnership programs.
- Finalize a Progress/Accomplishments Report that will compile the environmental results reported by programs across the Agency.
- Conduct training on best practices and procedures, and arrange seminars and discussion groups on new research on trends and strategies.

EPA USER FEE PROGRAM

In FY 2009, EPA will have several user fee programs in operation. These user fee programs and proposals are as follows:

Current Fees: Pesticides

The FY 2009 President's Budget reflects the continued collection of Maintenance fees for review of existing pesticide registrations, and Enhanced Registration Service Fees for the accelerated review of new pesticide registration applications.

- **Pesticides Maintenance Fee Extension**

The Maintenance fee provides funding for the Reregistration program and a certain percentage supports the processing of applications involving "me-too" or inert ingredients. In FY 2009, the Agency expects to collect $22 million in Maintenance fees under current law.

- **Enhanced Registration Services**

Entities seeking to register pesticides for use in the United States pay a fee at the time the registration action request is submitted to EPA specifically for accelerated pesticide registration decision service. This process has introduced new pesticides to the market more quickly. In FY 2009, the Agency expects to collect $6 million in Enhanced Registration Service fees under current law.

Current Fees: Other

- **Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee**

Since 1989, the Pre-Manufacturing Notifications (PMN) fee has been collected for the review and processing of new chemical pre-manufacturing notifications submitted to EPA by the chemical industry. These fees are paid at the time of submission of the PMN for review by EPA's Toxic Substances program. PMN fees are authorized by the Toxic Substances Control Act and contain a cap on the amount the Agency may charge for a PMN review. EPA is authorized to collect up to $1.8 million in PMN fees in FY 2009 under current law.

- **Lead Accreditation and Certification Fee**

The Toxic Substances Control Act, Title IV, Section 402(a)(3), mandates the development of a schedule of fees for persons operating lead training programs accredited under the 402/404 rule and for lead-based paint contractors certified under this rule. The training programs ensure that lead paint abatement is done safely. Fees
collected for this activity are deposited in the U.S. Treasury. EPA estimates that $1 million will be deposited in FY 2009.

- **Motor Vehicle and Engine Compliance Program Fee**

This fee is authorized by the Clean Air Act of 1990 and is managed by the Air and Radiation program. Fee collections began in August 1992. This fee is imposed on manufacturers of light-duty vehicles, light and heavy trucks and motorcycles. The fees cover EPA's cost of certifying new engines and vehicles and monitoring compliance of in-use engines and vehicles.

In 2004, EPA promulgated a rule that updated existing fees and established fees for newly-regulated vehicles and engines. In addition to cars and trucks, the fees for new compliance programs are also imposed on heavy-duty, in-use, and nonroad industries, including large diesel and gas equipment (earthmovers, tractors, forklifts, compressors, etc), handheld and non-handheld utility engines (chainsaws, weed-whackers, leaf-blowers, lawnmowers, tillers, etc.), marine (boat motors, watercraft, jet-skis), locomotive, aircraft and recreational vehicles (off-road motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles). Since then, EPA has added or proposed to apply certification fees to additional industry sectors as new programs are developed, such as for stationary engines and for evaporative requirements for nonroad engines. In FY 2009, EPA expects to collect $19.4 million from this fee.

Fee Proposals: Pesticides

- **Pesticides Tolerance Fee**

A tolerance is the maximum legal limit of a pesticide residue in and on food commodities and animal feed. In 1954, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) authorized the collection of fees for the establishment of tolerances on raw agricultural commodities and in food commodities. The collection of this fee has been blocked by the Pesticides Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) through 2012. Legislative language will be submitted to allow for the collection of Pesticide Tolerance fees in FY 2009 and the Administration will submit legislative language proposing to collect $13 million in Pesticide Tolerance fees in FY 2009.

- **Enhanced Registration Services**

Legislative language will be submitted proposing to publish a new fee schedule to collect an additional $12 million in FY 2009 to better align fee collections with program costs. Currently those who directly benefit from EPA's registration services cover only a fraction of the costs to operate the program, leaving the general taxpayer to shoulder the remaining burden.

- **Pesticides Maintenance Fee Extension**

Under current law, the Agency expects to collect $22 million in Maintenance fees in FY 2009. Legislative language will be submitted to allow the collection of an additional $23 million in order to more closely align fee collections with program costs. The President's Budget proposes to relieve the burden on the general taxpayer and finance the costs of operating the Reregistration program from those who directly benefit from EPA's reregistration activities.

Fee Proposals: Other

- **Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee**

Under the current fee structure, the Agency would collect $1.8 million in FY 2009. Legislative language will be submitted to remove the statutory cap in the Toxic Substances Control Act on Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fees. In FY 2009, EPA expects to collect an additional $4 million by removing the statutory cap.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

In FY 2009, the Agency begins its thirteenth year of operation of the Working Capital Fund (WCF). It is a revolving fund authorized by law to finance a cycle of operations, where the costs of goods and services provided are charged to users on a fee-for-service basis. The funds received are available without fiscal year limitation, to continue operations and to replace capital equipment. EPA's WCF was implemented under the authority of Section 403 of the Government Management Reform Act of 1994 and EPA's FY 1997 Appropriations Act. Permanent WCF authority was contained in the Agency's FY 1998 Appropriations Act.

The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) initiated the WCF in FY 1997 as part of an effort to: (1) be accountable to Agency offices, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congress; (2) increase the efficiency of the administrative services provided to program offices; and (3) increase customer service and responsiveness. The Agency has a WCF Board which provides policy and planning oversight and advises the CFO regarding the WCF financial position. The Board, chaired by the Associate Chief Financial Officer, is composed of eighteen permanent members from the program and regional offices.

Four Agency activities provided in FY 2008 will continue into FY 2009. These are the Agency's information technology and telecommunications operations, managed by the Office of Environmental Information, Agency postage costs, managed by the Office of Administration, and the Agency's core accounting system and relocation services, which are both managed by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

The Agency's FY 2009 budget request includes resources for these four activities in each National Program Manager's submission, totaling approximately $185.0 million. These estimated resources may be increased to incorporate the additional service needs of program offices during the operating year. To the extent that these increases are subject to Congressional reprogramming notifications, the Agency will comply with all applicable requirements. In FY 2009, the Agency will continue to market its information technology and relocation services to other Federal agencies in an effort to deliver high quality services external to EPA, which will result in lower costs to EPA customers.

ACRONYMS FOR STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

AEA: Atomic Energy Act, as amended, and Reorganization Plan #3

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

ADEA: Age Discrimination in Employment Act

AHERA: Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act

AHPA: Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act

ASHAA: Asbestos in Schools Hazard Abatement Act

APA: Administrative Procedures Act

ASTCA: Antarctic Science, Tourism, and Conservation Act

BEACH Act of 2000: Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act

BRERA: Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act

CAA: Clean Air Act

CAAA: Clean Air Act Amendments

CCA: Clinger Cohen Act

CCAA: Canadian Clean Air Act

CEPA: Canadian Environmental Protection Act

CERCLA: Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (1980)

CFOA: Chief Financial Officers Act

CFR: Code of Federal Regulations

CICA: Competition in Contracting Act

CRA: Civil Rights Act

CSA: Computer Security Act

CWPPR: Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act of 1990

CWA: Clean Water Act

CZARA: Coastal Zone Management Act Reauthorization Amendments

CZMA: Coastal Zone Management Act

DPA: Deepwater Ports Act

DREAA: Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act

ECRA: Economic Cleanup Responsibility Act

EFOIA: Electronic Freedom of Information Act

EPAA: Environmental Programs Assistance Act

EPAAR: EPA Acquisition Regulations

EPCA: Energy Policy and Conservation Act

EPACT: Energy Policy Act

EPCRA: Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act

ERD&DAA: Environmental Research, Development and Demonstration Authorization Act

ESA: Endangered Species Act

ESECA: Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act

FACA: Federal Advisory Committee Act

FAIR: Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act

FCMA: Fishery Conservation and Management Act

FEPCA: Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act; enacted as amendments to FIFRA.

FFDCA: Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act

FGCAA: Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act

FIFRA: Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

FLPMA: Federal Land Policy and Management Act

FMFIA: Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act

FOIA: Freedom of Information Act

FPAS: Federal Property and Administration Services Ac

FPA: Federal Pesticide Act

FPPA: Federal Pollution Prevention Act

FPR: Federal Procurement Regulation

FQPA: Food Quality Protection Act

FRA: Federal Register Act

FSA: Food Security Act

FUA: Fuel Use Act

FWCA: Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

FWPCA: Federal Water Pollution and Control Act (aka CWA)

GISRA: Government Information Security Reform Act

GMRA: Government Management Reform Act

GPRA: Government Performance and Results Act

HMTA: Hazardous Materials Transportation Act

HSWA: Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments

IGA: Inspector General Act

IPA: Intergovernmental Personnel Act

IPIA: Improper Payments Information Act

ISTEA: Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act

LPA-US/MX-BR: 1983 La Paz Agreement on US/Mexico Border Region

MPPRCA: Marine Plastic Pollution, Research and Control Act of 1987

MPRSA: Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act

NAAEC: North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation

NAAQS: National Ambient Air Quality Standard

NAWCA: North American Wetlands Conservation Act,

NEPA: National Environmental Policy Act

NHPA: National Historic Preservation Act

NIPDWR: National Interim Primary Drinking Water Regulations

NISA: National Invasive Species Act of 1996

ODA: Ocean Dumping Act

OPA: The Oil Pollution Act

OWBPA: Older Workers Benefit Protection Act

PBA: Public Building Act

PFCRA: Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act

PHSA: Public Health Service Act

PLIRRA: Pollution Liability Insurance and Risk Retention Act

PR: Privacy Act

PRA: Paperwork Reduction Act

QCA: Quiet Communities Act

RCRA: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

RLBPHRA: Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act

RFA: Regulatory Flexibility Act

RICO: Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act

SARA: Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986

SBREFA: Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

SBLRBRERA: Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act

SDWA: Safe Drinking Water Act

SICEA: Steel Industry Compliance Extension Act

SMCRA: Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act

SPA: Shore Protection Act of 1988

SWDA: Solid Waste Disposal Act

TCA: Tribal Cooperative Agreement

TSCA: Toxic Substances Control Act

UMRA: Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

UMTRLWA: Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Land Withdrawal Act

USC: United States Code

USTCA: Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act

WQA: Water Quality Act of 1987

WRDA: Water Resources Development Act

WSRA: Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

WWWQA: Wet Weather Water Quality Act of 2000

STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS

Statutory Authority and Eligible Uses
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Section 103	Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and Tribal representatives and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states)	Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to addressing regional haze.	$1,000.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	$0.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Sections 103, 105, 106	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA; Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states); Interstate air quality control region designated pursuant to section 107 of the CAA or of implementing section 176A, or section 184 NOTE: only the Ozone Transport Commission is eligible	Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program support costs, including monitoring activities (section 105); Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA (sections 103 and 106); Supporting training for CAA section 302(b) air pollution control agency staff (sections 103 and 105); Supporting research, investigative and demonstration projects(section 103)	$215,825.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	$185,580.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Tribal Air Quality Management	CAA, Sections 103 and 105; Tribal Cooperative Agreements (TCA) in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribes; Intertribal Consortia; State/ Tribal College or University	Conducting air quality assessment activities to determine a Tribe's need to develop a CAA program; Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program costs; Supporting training for CAA for Federally-recognized Tribes	$10,769.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	$13,300.0
Radon	TSCA, Sections 10 and 306; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	State Agencies, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in the development and implementation of programs for the assessment and mitigation of radon	$7,948.0	Goal 1, Obj. 2	$8,074.0
Water Pollution Control (Section 106)	FWPCA, as amended, Section 106; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Interstate Agencies	Develop and carry out surface and ground water pollution control programs, including NPDES permits, TMDL's, WQ standards, monitoring, and NPS control activities.	$218,206.0	Goal 2, Obj. 2	$221,664.0
Nonpoint Source (NPS – Section 319)	FWPCA, as amended, Section 319(h); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement EPA-approved state and Tribal nonpoint source management programs and fund priority projects as selected by the state.	$200,857.0	Goal 2, Obj. 2	$184,540.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Wetlands Program Development	FWPCA, as amended, Section 104 (b)(3); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Interstate Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, Non-Profit Organizations	To develop new wetland programs or enhance existing programs for the protection, management and restoration of wetland resources.	$16,567.0	Goal 4, Obj. 3	$16,830.0
Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	SDWA, Section 1443(a); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assistance to implement and enforce National Primary Drinking Water Regulations to ensure the safety of the Nation's drinking water resources and to protect public health.	$97,554.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	$99,100.0
Homeland Security Grants	SDWA, Section 1442; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	To assist states and Tribes in coordinating their water security activities with other homeland security efforts.	$4,873.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	$4,950.0
Underground Injection Control (UIC)	SDWA, Section 1443(b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement and enforce regulations that protect underground sources of drinking water by controlling Class I-V underground injection wells.	$10,721.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	$10,891.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Beaches Protection	BEACH Act of 2000; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Local Governments	Develop and implement programs for monitoring and notification of conditions for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public.	$9,746.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	$9,900.0
Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	RCRA, Section 3011; FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Development & Implementation of Hazardous Waste Programs	$101,734.0	Goal 3, Obj. 1 Obj. 2	$103,346.0
Brownfields	CERCLA, as amended by the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (P.L. 107-118); GMRA (1990); FGCAA.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Build and support Brownfields programs which will assess contaminated properties, oversee private party cleanups, provide cleanup support through low interest loans, and provide certainty for liability related issues.	$48,723.0	Goal 4, Obj. 2	$49,495.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Underground Storage Tanks (UST)	SWDA, as amended by the Superfund Reauthorization Amendments of 1986 (Subtitle I), Section 2007(f), 42 U.S.C. 6916(f)(2); EPAct of 2005, Title XV – Ethanol and Motor Fuels, Subtitle B – Underground Storage Tank Compliance, Sections 1521-1533, P.L. 109-58, 42 U.S.C. 15801; Tribal Grants -P.L. 105-276.	States, Federally-Recognized Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Develop and/or implement state or Indian UST program; provide funding for SEE enrollees to work on the states' underground storage tanks and to support direct UST implementation programs.	$2,461.0	Goal 3, Obj. 1	$22,800.0
Pesticides Program Implementation	FIFRA, Sections 20 and 23; the FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement the following programs through grants to states, Tribes, partners, and supporters: Certification and Training / Worker Protection, Endangered Species Protection Program (ESPP) Field Activities, Tribal Program, and Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program.	$12,768.0	Goal 4, Obj. 1	$12,970.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Lead	TSCA, Sections 10 and 404 (g); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement the lead-based paint activities in the Training and Certification program through EPA-authorized state, territorial and Tribal programs and, in areas without authorization, through direct implementation by the Agency. Activities conducted as part of this program include issuing grants for the training and certification of individuals and firms engaged in lead-based paint abatement and inspection activities and the accreditation of qualified training providers.	$13,352.0	Goal 4, Obj. 1	$13,564.0
Toxic Substances Compliance	TSCA, Sections 28(a) and 404 (g); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in developing and implementing toxic substances enforcement programs for PCBs, asbestos, and lead-based paint	$5,019.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	$5,099.0
Pesticide Enforcement	FIFRA § 23(a)(1); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in implementing cooperative pesticide enforcement programs	$18,419.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	$18,711.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN, aka "the Exchange Network")	As appropriate, CAA, Section 103; CWA, Section 104; RCRA, Section 8001; FIFRA, Section 20; TSCA, Sections 10 and 28; MPRSA, Section 203; SDWA, Section 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, Section 6605; FY 2002 Appropriations Act and FY 2003 Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Interstate Agencies, Tribal Consortium, Other Agencies with Related Environmental Information Activities	Helps states, territories, tribes, and intertribal consortia develop the information management and technology (IM/IT) capabilities they need to participate in the Exchange Network, to continue and expand data-sharing programs, and to improve access to environmental information.	$9,844.0	Goal 5, Obj. 2	$11,000.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Pollution Prevention	Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, Section 6605; TSCA Section 10; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Provides assistance to states and state entities (i.e., colleges and universities) and Federally-recognized Tribes and intertribal consortia in order to deliver pollution prevention technical assistance to small and medium-sized businesses. A goal of the program is to assist businesses and industries with identifying improved environmental strategies and solutions for reducing waste at the source.	$4,863.0	Goal 5, Obj. 2	$4,940.0
Sector Program (previously Enforcement & Compliance Assurance)	As appropriate, CAA, Section 103; CWA, Section 104; FIFRA, Section 20; TSCA, Sections 10 and 28; MPRSA, Section 203; SDWA, Section 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	State, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Multi-Jurisdictional Organizations, Universities, Associations of Environmental Regulatory Personnel	Assist in developing innovative sector-based, multi-media, or single-media approaches to enforcement and compliance assurance. Provide training on sectors, compliance and enforcement, and single or multi-media programs.	$1,209.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	$1,828.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2008 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2009 Goal/ Objective	FY 2009 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Tribal General Assistance Program	Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act (42 U.S.C. 4368b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribal Governments, Intertribal Consortia	Plan and develop Tribal environmental protection programs.	$56,037.0	Goal 5, Obj. 3	$57,925.0

PROGRAM PROJECTS BY APPROPRIATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Acquisition Management	**$54,802.0**	**$53,118.0**	**$56,345.0**	**$3,227.0**
EPM	$29,992.0	$28,629.0	$31,195.0	$2,566.0
LUST	$165.0	$162.0	$165.0	$3.0
Superfund	$24,645.0	$24,327.0	$24,985.0	$658.0
Administrative Law	**$5,260.0**	**$5,178.0**	**$4,949.0**	**($229.0)**
EPM	$5,260.0	$5,178.0	$4,949.0	($229.0)
Alternative Dispute Resolution	**$2,012.0**	**$1,985.0**	**$2,110.0**	**$125.0**
EPM	$1,175.0	$1,160.0	$1,264.0	$104.0
Superfund	$837.0	$825.0	$846.0	$21.0
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	**$45,157.0**	**$52,585.0**	**$46,647.0**	**($5,938.0)**
IG	$38,008.0	$41,099.0	$39,483.0	($1,616.0)
Superfund	$7,149.0	$11,486.0	$7,164.0	($4,322.0)
Beach / Fish Programs	**$2,830.0**	**$2,789.0**	**$2,795.0**	**$6.0**
EPM	$2,830.0	$2,789.0	$2,795.0	$6.0
Brownfields	**$23,450.0**	**$23,665.0**	**$22,732.0**	**($933.0)**
EPM	$23,450.0	$23,665.0	$22,732.0	($933.0)
Brownfields Projects	**$89,258.0**	**$93,518.0**	**$93,558.0**	**$40.0**
STAG	$89,258.0	$93,518.0	$93,558.0	$40.0
Categorical Grant: Beaches Protection	**$9,900.0**	**$9,746.0**	**$9,900.0**	**$154.0**
STAG	$9,900.0	$9,746.0	$9,900.0	$154.0

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Categorical Grant: Brownfields	**$49,495.0**	**$48,723.0**	**$49,495.0**	**$772.0**
STAG	$49,495.0	$48,723.0	$49,495.0	$772.0
Categorical Grant: Environmental Information	**$12,850.0**	**$9,844.0**	**$11,000.0**	**$1,156.0**
STAG	$12,850.0	$9,844.0	$11,000.0	$1,156.0
Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	**$103,346.0**	**$101,734.0**	**$103,346.0**	**$1,612.0**
STAG	$103,346.0	$101,734.0	$103,346.0	$1,612.0
Categorical Grant: Homeland Security	**$4,950.0**	**$4,873.0**	**$4,950.0**	**$77.0**
STAG	$4,950.0	$4,873.0	$4,950.0	$77.0
Categorical Grant: Lead	**$13,564.0**	**$13,352.0**	**$13,564.0**	**$212.0**
STAG	$13,564.0	$13,352.0	$13,564.0	$212.0
Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)	**$194,040.0**	**$200,857.0**	**$184,540.0**	**($16,317.0)**
STAG	$194,040.0	$200,857.0	$184,540.0	($16,317.0)
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Enforcement	**$18,711.0**	**$18,419.0**	**$18,711.0**	**$292.0**
STAG	$18,711.0	$18,419.0	$18,711.0	$292.0
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Program Implementation	**$12,970.0**	**$12,768.0**	**$12,970.0**	**$202.0**
STAG	$12,970.0	$12,768.0	$12,970.0	$202.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)	**$221,664.0**	**$218,206.0**	**$221,664.0**	**$3,458.0**

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
STAG	$221,664.0	$218,206.0	$221,664.0	$3,458.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention	**$5,940.0**	**$4,863.0**	**$4,940.0**	**$77.0**
STAG	$5,940.0	$4,863.0	$4,940.0	$77.0
Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	**$99,100.0**	**$97,554.0**	**$99,100.0**	**$1,546.0**
STAG	$99,100.0	$97,554.0	$99,100.0	$1,546.0
Categorical Grant: Radon	**$8,074.0**	**$7,948.0**	**$8,074.0**	**$126.0**
STAG	$8,074.0	$7,948.0	$8,074.0	$126.0
Categorical Grant: Sector Program	**$2,228.0**	**$1,209.0**	**$1,828.0**	**$619.0**
STAG	$2,228.0	$1,209.0	$1,828.0	$619.0
Categorical Grant: State and Local Air Quality Management	**$185,180.0**	**$216,825.0**	**$185,580.0**	**($31,245.0)**
STAG	$185,180.0	$216,825.0	$185,580.0	($31,245.0)
Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds	**$0.0**	**$9,844.0**	**$0.0**	**($9,844.0)**
STAG	$0.0	$9,844.0	$0.0	($9,844.0)
Categorical Grant: Toxics Substances Compliance	**$5,099.0**	**$5,019.0**	**$5,099.0**	**$80.0**
STAG	$5,099.0	$5,019.0	$5,099.0	$80.0
Categorical Grant: Tribal Air Quality Management	**$10,940.0**	**$10,769.0**	**$13,300.0**	**$2,531.0**
STAG	$10,940.0	$10,769.0	$13,300.0	$2,531.0
Categorical Grant: Tribal General	**$56,925.0**	**$56,037.0**	**$57,925.0**	**$1,888.0**

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Assistance Program				
STAG	$56,925.0	$56,037.0	$57,925.0	$1,888.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Injection Control (UIC)	**$10,891.0**	**$10,721.0**	**$10,891.0**	**$170.0**
STAG	$10,891.0	$10,721.0	$10,891.0	$170.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks	**$22,274.0**	**$2,461.0**	**$22,800.0**	**$20,339.0**
STAG	$22,274.0	$2,461.0	$22,800.0	$20,339.0
Categorical Grant: Wetlands Program Development	**$16,830.0**	**$16,567.0**	**$16,830.0**	**$263.0**
STAG	$16,830.0	$16,567.0	$16,830.0	$263.0
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	**$100,368.0**	**$99,042.0**	**$107,856.0**	**$8,814.0**
EPM	$74,960.0	$73,949.0	$80,623.0	$6,674.0
LUST	$1,102.0	$1,085.0	$1,131.0	$46.0
Superfund	$24,306.0	$24,008.0	$26,102.0	$2,094.0
Children and Other Sensitive Populations: Agency Coordination	**$6,203.0**	**$6,144.0**	**$6,309.0**	**$165.0**
EPM	$6,203.0	$6,144.0	$6,309.0	$165.0
Civil Enforcement	**$129,594.0**	**$132,828.0**	**$135,250.0**	**$2,422.0**
EPM	$126,645.0	$129,886.0	$133,017.0	$3,131.0
Oil Spills	$2,065.0	$2,072.0	$2,233.0	$161.0
Superfund	$884.0	$870.0	$0.0	($870.0)
Civil Rights / Title VI Compliance	**$11,240.0**	**$11,065.0**	**$11,097.0**	**$32.0**
EPM	$11,240.0	$11,065.0	$11,097.0	$32.0

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	**$27,647.0**	**$28,246.0**	**$28,157.0**	**($89.0)**
EPM	$19,388.0	$19,131.0	$19,898.0	$767.0
S&T	$8,259.0	$9,115.0	$8,259.0	($856.0)
Climate Protection Program	**$101,031.0**	**$108,705.0**	**$98,410.0**	**($10,295.0)**
EPM	$87,927.0	$90,374.0	$87,008.0	($3,366.0)
S&T	$13,104.0	$18,331.0	$11,402.0	($6,929.0)
Commission for Environmental Cooperation	**$4,022.0**	**$3,962.0**	**$0.0**	**($3,962.0)**
EPM	$4,022.0	$3,962.0	$0.0	($3,962.0)
Compliance Assistance and Centers	**$30,548.0**	**$28,742.0**	**$27,513.0**	**($1,229.0)**
EPM	$29,547.0	$27,725.0	$26,435.0	($1,290.0)
LUST	$688.0	$709.0	$753.0	$44.0
Oil Spills	$291.0	$286.0	$303.0	$17.0
Superfund	$22.0	$22.0	$22.0	$0.0
Compliance Incentives	**$9,930.0**	**$10,777.0**	**$10,409.0**	**($368.0)**
EPM	$9,786.0	$10,618.0	$10,263.0	($355.0)
Superfund	$144.0	$159.0	$146.0	($13.0)
Compliance Monitoring	**$94,610.0**	**$89,891.0**	**$97,217.0**	**$7,326.0**
EPM	$93,428.0	$88,726.0	$96,025.0	$7,299.0
Superfund	$1,182.0	$1,165.0	$1,192.0	$27.0
Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations	**$49,902.0**	**$49,125.0**	**$49,756.0**	**$631.0**
EPM	$49,747.0	$48,971.0	$49,756.0	$785.0

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Superfund	$155.0	$154.0	$0.0	($154.0)
Congressionally Mandated Projects	**$0.0**	**$162,476.0**	**$0.0**	**($162,476.0)**
EPM	$0.0	$13,437.0	$0.0	($13,437.0)
S&T	$0.0	$5,316.0	$0.0	($5,316.0)
STAG	$0.0	$143,723.0	$0.0	($143,723.0)
Criminal Enforcement	**$48,855.0**	**$49,795.0**	**$52,214.0**	**$2,419.0**
EPM	$39,688.0	$40,742.0	$44,384.0	$3,642.0
Superfund	$9,167.0	$9,053.0	$7,830.0	($1,223.0)
Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program	**$35,000.0**	**$59,064.0**	**$49,220.0**	**($9,844.0)**
STAG	$35,000.0	$59,064.0	$49,220.0	($9,844.0)
Drinking Water Programs	**$100,383.0**	**$100,097.0**	**$103,035.0**	**$2,938.0**
EPM	$96,967.0	$96,722.0	$99,476.0	$2,754.0
S&T	$3,416.0	$3,375.0	$3,559.0	$184.0
Endocrine Disruptors	**$5,890.0**	**$8,663.0**	**$5,847.0**	**($2,816.0)**
EPM	$5,890.0	$8,663.0	$5,847.0	($2,816.0)
Enforcement Training	**$3,985.0**	**$3,923.0**	**$3,901.0**	**($22.0)**
EPM	$3,145.0	$3,096.0	$3,043.0	($53.0)
Superfund	$840.0	$827.0	$858.0	$31.0
Environment and Trade	**$1,945.0**	**$1,920.0**	**$0.0**	**($1,920.0)**
EPM	$1,945.0	$1,920.0	$0.0	($1,920.0)
Environmental Education	**$0.0**	**$8,860.0**	**$0.0**	**($8,860.0)**
EPM	$0.0	$8,860.0	$0.0	($8,860.0)

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Environmental Justice	**$4,579.0**	**$7,144.0**	**$4,568.0**	**($2,576.0)**
EPM	$3,822.0	$6,399.0	$3,811.0	($2,588.0)
Superfund	$757.0	$745.0	$757.0	$12.0
Exchange Network	**$16,797.0**	**$16,548.0**	**$19,491.0**	**$2,943.0**
EPM	$15,364.0	$15,137.0	$18,058.0	$2,921.0
Superfund	$1,433.0	$1,411.0	$1,433.0	$22.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	**$480,865.0**	**$471,569.0**	**$490,551.0**	**$18,982.0**
B&F	$26,931.0	$26,511.0	$26,931.0	$420.0
EPM	$303,728.0	$297,189.0	$311,068.0	$13,879.0
LUST	$901.0	$887.0	$902.0	$15.0
Oil Spills	$490.0	$488.0	$496.0	$8.0
S&T	$73,859.0	$72,707.0	$74,884.0	$2,177.0
Superfund	$74,956.0	$73,787.0	$76,270.0	$2,483.0
Federal Stationary Source Regulations	**$26,504.0**	**$26,091.0**	**$26,787.0**	**$696.0**
EPM	$26,504.0	$26,091.0	$26,787.0	$696.0
Federal Support for Air Quality Management	**$101,376.0**	**$101,582.0**	**$106,624.0**	**$5,042.0**
EPM	$90,490.0	$89,464.0	$95,538.0	$6,074.0
S&T	$10,886.0	$12,118.0	$11,086.0	($1,032.0)
Federal Support for Air Toxics Program	**$26,963.0**	**$26,610.0**	**$24,996.0**	**($1,614.0)**
EPM	$24,711.0	$24,390.0	$22,693.0	($1,697.0)
S&T	$2,252.0	$2,220.0	$2,303.0	$83.0
Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification	**$65,722.0**	**$66,796.0**	**$69,543.0**	**$2,747.0**

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
S&T	$65,722.0	$66,796.0	$69,543.0	$2,747.0
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	**$26,488.0**	**$26,243.0**	**$29,093.0**	**$2,850.0**
EPM	$23,439.0	$23,242.0	$25,977.0	$2,735.0
Superfund	$3,049.0	$3,001.0	$3,116.0	$115.0
Forensics Support	**$17,385.0**	**$18,632.0**	**$17,998.0**	**($634.0)**
S&T	$15,075.0	$14,882.0	$15,557.0	$675.0
Superfund	$2,310.0	$3,750.0	$2,441.0	($1,309.0)
Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay	**$28,768.0**	**$30,528.0**	**$29,001.0**	**($1,527.0)**
EPM	$28,768.0	$30,528.0	$29,001.0	($1,527.0)
Geographic Program: Great Lakes	**$21,757.0**	**$21,686.0**	**$22,261.0**	**$575.0**
EPM	$21,757.0	$21,686.0	$22,261.0	$575.0
Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico	**$4,457.0**	**$5,618.0**	**$4,578.0**	**($1,040.0)**
EPM	$4,457.0	$5,618.0	$4,578.0	($1,040.0)
Geographic Program: Lake Champlain	**$934.0**	**$2,707.0**	**$934.0**	**($1,773.0)**
EPM	$934.0	$2,707.0	$934.0	($1,773.0)
Geographic Program: Long Island Sound	**$467.0**	**$4,922.0**	**$467.0**	**($4,455.0)**
EPM	$467.0	$4,922.0	$467.0	($4,455.0)
Geographic Program: Other	**$8,575.0**	**$32,072.0**	**$7,715.0**	**($24,357.0)**
EPM	$8,575.0	$32,072.0	$7,715.0	($24,357.0)
Great Lakes Legacy Act	**$35,000.0**	**$34,454.0**	**$35,000.0**	**$546.0**

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
EPM	$35,000.0	$34,454.0	$35,000.0	$546.0
Homeland Security: Communication and Information	**$6,906.0**	**$6,822.0**	**$6,940.0**	**$118.0**
EPM	$6,906.0	$6,822.0	$6,940.0	$118.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	**$35,230.0**	**$24,850.0**	**$35,569.0**	**$10,719.0**
EPM	$7,787.0	$7,665.0	$6,759.0	($906.0)
S&T	$25,586.0	$15,357.0	$27,131.0	$11,774.0
Superfund	$1,857.0	$1,828.0	$1,679.0	($149.0)
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	**$89,429.0**	**$86,151.0**	**$106,298.0**	**$20,147.0**
EPM	$3,381.0	$3,329.0	$3,412.0	$83.0
S&T	$40,768.0	$38,193.0	$46,210.0	$8,017.0
Superfund	$45,280.0	$44,629.0	$56,676.0	$12,047.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	**$15,403.0**	**$15,165.0**	**$16,273.0**	**$1,108.0**
B&F	$7,870.0	$7,747.0	$8,070.0	$323.0
EPM	$6,345.0	$6,248.0	$6,415.0	$167.0
S&T	$594.0	$585.0	$594.0	$9.0
Superfund	$594.0	$585.0	$1,194.0	$609.0
Human Health Risk Assessment	**$42,828.0**	**$42,244.0**	**$42,648.0**	**$404.0**
S&T	$38,856.0	$38,334.0	$39,323.0	$989.0
Superfund	$3,972.0	$3,910.0	$3,325.0	($585.0)
Human Resources Management	**$45,214.0**	**$44,732.0**	**$48,712.0**	**$3,980.0**

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
EPM	$40,175.0	$39,760.0	$43,646.0	$3,886.0
LUST	$3.0	$3.0	$3.0	$0.0
Superfund	$5,036.0	$4,969.0	$5,063.0	$94.0
IT / Data Management	**$111,067.0**	**$110,496.0**	**$115,277.0**	**$4,781.0**
EPM	$91,019.0	$90,753.0	$94,360.0	$3,607.0
LUST	$177.0	$174.0	$162.0	($12.0)
Oil Spills	$34.0	$33.0	$24.0	($9.0)
S&T	$3,499.0	$3,453.0	$3,859.0	$406.0
Superfund	$16,338.0	$16,083.0	$16,872.0	$789.0
Indoor Air: Radon Program	**$5,857.0**	**$5,785.0**	**$5,929.0**	**$144.0**
EPM	$5,429.0	$5,363.0	$5,488.0	$125.0
S&T	$428.0	$422.0	$441.0	$19.0
Information Security	**$6,375.0**	**$6,284.0**	**$6,591.0**	**$307.0**
EPM	$5,583.0	$5,504.0	$5,790.0	$286.0
Superfund	$792.0	$780.0	$801.0	$21.0
Infrastructure Assistance: Alaska Native Villages	**$15,500.0**	**$24,610.0**	**$15,500.0**	**($9,110.0)**
STAG	$15,500.0	$24,610.0	$15,500.0	($9,110.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water SRF	**$687,554.0**	**$689,080.0**	**$555,000.0**	**($134,080.0)**
STAG	$687,554.0	$689,080.0	$555,000.0	($134,080.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Drinking Water SRF	**$842,167.0**	**$829,029.0**	**$842,167.0**	**$13,138.0**
STAG	$842,167.0	$829,029.0	$842,167.0	$13,138.0
Infrastructure Assistance: Mexico	**$10,000.0**	**$19,688.0**	**$10,000.0**	**($9,688.0)**

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Border				
STAG	$10,000.0	$19,688.0	$10,000.0	($9,688.0)
International Capacity Building	**$5,311.0**	**$5,228.0**	**$0.0**	**($5,228.0)**
EPM	$5,311.0	$5,228.0	$0.0	($5,228.0)
International Sources of Pollution	**$0.0**	**$0.0**	**$12,408.0**	**$12,408.0**
EPM	$0.0	$0.0	$12,408.0	$12,408.0
LUST / UST	**$22,277.0**	**$23,540.0**	**$22,804.0**	**($736.0)**
EPM	$11,719.0	$11,572.0	$12,256.0	$684.0
LUST	$10,558.0	$11,968.0	$10,548.0	($1,420.0)
LUST Cooperative Agreements	**$58,207.0**	**$90,178.0**	**$58,207.0**	**($31,971.0)**
LUST	$58,207.0	$90,178.0	$58,207.0	($31,971.0)
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	**$39,972.0**	**$40,220.0**	**$40,556.0**	**$336.0**
EPM	$39,366.0	$39,480.0	$39,925.0	$445.0
Superfund	$606.0	$740.0	$631.0	($109.0)
Legal Advice: Support Program	**$13,986.0**	**$14,117.0**	**$14,442.0**	**$325.0**
EPM	$13,986.0	$14,117.0	$14,442.0	$325.0
Marine Pollution	**$12,851.0**	**$12,674.0**	**$13,185.0**	**$511.0**
EPM	$12,851.0	$12,674.0	$13,185.0	$511.0
NEPA Implementation	**$14,366.0**	**$14,142.0**	**$16,295.0**	**$2,153.0**
EPM	$14,366.0	$14,142.0	$16,295.0	$2,153.0
National Estuary Program / Coastal	**$17,203.0**	**$26,779.0**	**$17,239.0**	**($9,540.0)**

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Waterways				
EPM	$17,203.0	$26,779.0	$17,239.0	($9,540.0)
Not Specified	**($5,000.0)**	**($5,000.0)**	**($10,000.0)**	**($5,000.0)**
Rescissions	($5,000.0)	($5,000.0)	($10,000.0)	($5,000.0)
Oil Spill: Prevention, Preparedness and Response	**$13,499.0**	**$13,290.0**	**$13,927.0**	**$637.0**
Oil Spills	$13,499.0	$13,290.0	$13,927.0	$637.0
POPs Implementation	**$1,831.0**	**$1,808.0**	**$0.0**	**($1,808.0)**
EPM	$1,831.0	$1,808.0	$0.0	($1,808.0)
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	**$65,808.0**	**$65,069.0**	**$64,059.0**	**($1,010.0)**
EPM	$62,514.0	$61,819.0	$60,606.0	($1,213.0)
S&T	$3,294.0	$3,250.0	$3,453.0	$203.0
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	**$43,865.0**	**$43,301.0**	**$43,431.0**	**$130.0**
EPM	$41,750.0	$41,214.0	$41,215.0	$1.0
S&T	$2,115.0	$2,087.0	$2,216.0	$129.0
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	**$12,586.0**	**$12,424.0**	**$13,365.0**	**$941.0**
EPM	$12,114.0	$11,959.0	$12,870.0	$911.0
S&T	$472.0	$465.0	$495.0	$30.0
Pollution Prevention Program	**$19,935.0**	**$16,362.0**	**$18,398.0**	**$2,036.0**
EPM	$19,935.0	$16,362.0	$18,398.0	$2,036.0
RCRA: Corrective Action	**$39,573.0**	**$39,076.0**	**$39,018.0**	**($58.0)**

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
EPM	$39,573.0	$39,076.0	$39,018.0	($58.0)
RCRA: Waste Management	**$69,158.0**	**$66,297.0**	**$67,111.0**	**$814.0**
EPM	$69,158.0	$66,297.0	$67,111.0	$814.0
RCRA: Waste Minimization & Recycling	**$13,666.0**	**$13,495.0**	**$14,397.0**	**$902.0**
EPM	$13,666.0	$13,495.0	$14,397.0	$902.0
Radiation: Protection	**$14,679.0**	**$14,486.0**	**$15,056.0**	**$570.0**
EPM	$10,186.0	$10,057.0	$10,533.0	$476.0
S&T	$2,120.0	$2,087.0	$2,109.0	$22.0
Superfund	$2,373.0	$2,342.0	$2,414.0	$72.0
Radiation: Response Preparedness	**$6,649.0**	**$6,561.0**	**$6,957.0**	**$396.0**
EPM	$2,928.0	$2,882.0	$2,941.0	$59.0
S&T	$3,721.0	$3,679.0	$4,016.0	$337.0
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	**$22,228.0**	**$22,409.0**	**$19,970.0**	**($2,439.0)**
EPM	$21,440.0	$21,632.0	$19,180.0	($2,452.0)
S&T	$788.0	$777.0	$790.0	$13.0
Regional Geographic Initiatives	**$9,553.0**	**$0.0**	**$4,844.0**	**$4,844.0**
EPM	$9,553.0	$0.0	$4,844.0	$4,844.0
Regional Science and Technology	**$3,574.0**	**$3,518.0**	**$3,318.0**	**($200.0)**
EPM	$3,574.0	$3,518.0	$3,318.0	($200.0)
Regulatory Innovation	**$23,866.0**	**$21,327.0**	**$24,405.0**	**$3,078.0**
EPM	$23,866.0	$21,327.0	$24,405.0	$3,078.0

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Regulatory/Economic-Management and Analysis	**$20,104.0**	**$16,381.0**	**$20,588.0**	**$4,207.0**
EPM	$20,104.0	$16,381.0	$20,588.0	$4,207.0
Research: Computational Toxicology	**$15,103.0**	**$12,135.0**	**$14,863.0**	**$2,728.0**
S&T	$15,103.0	$12,135.0	$14,863.0	$2,728.0
Research: Drinking Water	**$48,548.0**	**$48,775.0**	**$45,283.0**	**($3,492.0)**
S&T	$48,548.0	$48,775.0	$45,283.0	($3,492.0)
Research: Endocrine Disruptor	**$10,131.0**	**$10,317.0**	**$9,502.0**	**($815.0)**
S&T	$10,131.0	$10,317.0	$9,502.0	($815.0)
Research: Fellowships	**$8,438.0**	**$9,845.0**	**$8,887.0**	**($958.0)**
S&T	$8,438.0	$9,845.0	$8,887.0	($958.0)
Research: Global Change	**$16,908.0**	**$19,688.0**	**$16,365.0**	**($3,323.0)**
S&T	$16,908.0	$19,688.0	$16,365.0	($3,323.0)
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems	**$145,046.0**	**$153,032.0**	**$144,742.0**	**($8,290.0)**
S&T	$145,046.0	$153,032.0	$144,742.0	($8,290.0)
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	**$32,379.0**	**$31,896.0**	**$35,488.0**	**$3,592.0**
LUST	$660.0	$650.0	$413.0	($237.0)
Oil Spills	$901.0	$887.0	$704.0	($183.0)
S&T	$10,737.0	$10,591.0	$13,350.0	$2,759.0
Superfund	$20,081.0	$19,768.0	$21,021.0	$1,253.0

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Research: Pesticides and Toxics	**$24,795.0**	**$24,459.0**	**$26,568.0**	**$2,109.0**
S&T	$24,795.0	$24,459.0	$26,568.0	$2,109.0
Research: Water Quality	**$56,454.0**	**$55,573.0**	**$56,179.0**	**$606.0**
S&T	$56,454.0	$55,573.0	$56,179.0	$606.0
Research: Clean Air	**$81,054.0**	**$79,993.0**	**$80,588.0**	**$595.0**
S&T	$81,054.0	$79,993.0	$80,588.0	$595.0
Research: Sustainability	**$22,478.0**	**$22,127.0**	**$19,970.0**	**($2,157.0)**
S&T	$22,478.0	$22,127.0	$19,970.0	($2,157.0)
Science Advisory Board	**$4,790.0**	**$4,727.0**	**$5,083.0**	**$356.0**
EPM	$4,790.0	$4,727.0	$5,083.0	$356.0
Science Policy and Biotechnology	**$1,780.0**	**$1,752.0**	**$1,675.0**	**($77.0)**
EPM	$1,780.0	$1,752.0	$1,675.0	($77.0)
Small Business Ombudsman	**$3,261.0**	**$3,210.0**	**$3,217.0**	**$7.0**
EPM	$3,261.0	$3,210.0	$3,217.0	$7.0
Small Minority Business Assistance	**$2,466.0**	**$2,428.0**	**$2,411.0**	**($17.0)**
EPM	$2,466.0	$2,428.0	$2,411.0	($17.0)
State and Local Prevention and Preparedness	**$12,960.0**	**$12,784.0**	**$13,298.0**	**$514.0**
EPM	$12,960.0	$12,784.0	$13,298.0	$514.0
Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic Programs	**$4,489.0**	**$5,119.0**	**$4,696.0**	**($423.0)**

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
EPM	$4,489.0	$5,119.0	$4,696.0	($423.0)
Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund	**$9,865.0**	**$9,711.0**	**$9,865.0**	**$154.0**
EPM	$9,865.0	$9,711.0	$9,865.0	$154.0
Superfund: EPA Emergency Preparedness	**$9,318.0**	**$9,195.0**	**$9,504.0**	**$309.0**
Superfund	$9,318.0	$9,195.0	$9,504.0	$309.0
Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal	**$191,880.0**	**$190,011.0**	**$193,853.0**	**$3,842.0**
Superfund	$191,880.0	$190,011.0	$193,853.0	$3,842.0
Superfund: Enforcement	**$161,610.0**	**$164,845.0**	**$163,678.0**	**($1,167.0)**
Superfund	$161,610.0	$164,845.0	$163,678.0	($1,167.0)
Superfund: Federal Facilities	**$31,879.0**	**$31,447.0**	**$31,440.0**	**($7.0)**
Superfund	$31,879.0	$31,447.0	$31,440.0	($7.0)
Superfund: Remedial	**$584,836.0**	**$591,078.0**	**$586,120.0**	**($4,958.0)**
Superfund	$584,836.0	$591,078.0	$586,120.0	($4,958.0)
Superfund: Support to Other Federal Agencies	**$6,575.0**	**$6,472.0**	**$6,575.0**	**$103.0**
Superfund	$6,575.0	$6,472.0	$6,575.0	$103.0
Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement	**$9,843.0**	**$9,726.0**	**$10,225.0**	**$499.0**
Superfund	$9,843.0	$9,726.0	$10,225.0	$499.0
Surface Water Protection	**$196,092.0**	**$193,546.0**	**$198,706.0**	**$5,160.0**

	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
EPM	$196,092.0	$193,546.0	$198,706.0	$5,160.0
TRI / Right to Know	**$15,728.0**	**$15,504.0**	**$15,109.0**	**($395.0)**
EPM	$15,728.0	$15,504.0	$15,109.0	($395.0)
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Management	**$5,654.0**	**$5,585.0**	**$6,027.0**	**$442.0**
EPM	$5,654.0	$5,585.0	$6,027.0	$442.0
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction	**$45,046.0**	**$45,672.0**	**$46,477.0**	**$805.0**
EPM	$45,046.0	$45,672.0	$46,477.0	$805.0
Toxic Substances: Lead Risk Reduction Program	**$13,546.0**	**$13,335.0**	**$13,652.0**	**$317.0**
EPM	$13,546.0	$13,335.0	$13,652.0	$317.0
Trade and Governance	**$0.0**	**$0.0**	**$6,216.0**	**$6,216.0**
EPM	$0.0	$0.0	$6,216.0	$6,216.0
Tribal - Capacity Building	**$11,477.0**	**$11,328.0**	**$11,710.0**	**$382.0**
EPM	$11,477.0	$11,328.0	$11,710.0	$382.0
US Mexico Border	**$4,646.0**	**$5,439.0**	**$0.0**	**($5,439.0)**
EPM	$4,646.0	$5,439.0	$0.0	($5,439.0)
Wetlands	**$21,518.0**	**$21,248.0**	**$22,223.0**	**$975.0**
EPM	$21,518.0	$21,248.0	$22,223.0	$975.0
TOTAL, EPA	**$7,199,400.0**	**$7,472,324.0**	**$7,142,520.0**	**($329,804.0)**

PROGRAM PROJECTS BY PROGRAM AREA
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Science & Technology					
Air Toxics and Quality					
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	$8,661.1	$8,259.0	$9,115.0	$8,259.0	($856.0)
Federal Support for Air Quality Management	$9,104.1	$10,886.0	$12,118.0	$11,086.0	($1,032.0)
Federal Support for Air Toxics Program	$1,804.1	$2,252.0	$2,220.0	$2,303.0	$83.0
Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification	$58,196.0	$65,722.0	$66,796.0	$69,543.0	$2,747.0
Radiation: Protection	$2,126.1	$2,120.0	$2,087.0	$2,109.0	$22.0
Radiation: Response Preparedness	$3,375.6	$3,721.0	$3,679.0	$4,016.0	$337.0
Subtotal, Air Toxics and Quality	**$83,267.0**	**$92,960.0**	**$96,015.0**	**$97,316.0**	**$1,301.0**
Climate Protection Program					
Climate Protection Program	$14,624.1	$13,104.0	$18,331.0	$11,402.0	($6,929.0)
Enforcement					
Forensics Support	$13,949.3	$15,075.0	$14,882.0	$15,557.0	$675.0
Homeland Security					
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection					
Water Sentinel	$3,183.6	$21,884.0	$11,705.0	$22,637.0	$10,932.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)	$7,391.8	$3,702.0	$3,652.0	$4,494.0	$842.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	$10,575.4	$25,586.0	$15,357.0	$27,131.0	$11,774.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery					
Decontamination	$21,025.2	$20,738.0	$20,444.0	$28,805.0	$8,361.0
Laboratory Preparedness and Response	$618.6	$600.0	$591.0	$500.0	($91.0)
Safe Buildings	$4,242.2	$4,000.0	$1,969.0	$2,000.0	$31.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)	$13,117.6	$15,430.0	$15,189.0	$14,905.0	($284.0)
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	$39,003.6	$40,768.0	$38,193.0	$46,210.0	$8,017.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	$2,023.9	$594.0	$585.0	$594.0	$9.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security	**$51,602.9**	**$66,948.0**	**$54,135.0**	**$73,935.0**	**$19,800.0**
Indoor Air					

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Indoor Air: Radon Program	$434.1	$428.0	$422.0	$441.0	$19.0
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	$791.2	$788.0	$777.0	$790.0	$13.0
Subtotal, Indoor Air	**$1,225.3**	**$1,216.0**	**$1,199.0**	**$1,231.0**	**$32.0**
IT / Data Management / Security					
IT / Data Management	$4,522.1	$3,499.0	$3,453.0	$3,859.0	$406.0
Operations and Administration					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations					
Rent	$13,085.0	$35,521.0	$34,967.0	$35,521.0	$554.0
Utilities	$9,110.1	$18,392.0	$18,105.0	$18,547.0	$442.0
Security	$3,403.6	$11,179.0	$11,005.0	$11,989.0	$984.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)	$7,287.5	$8,767.0	$8,630.0	$8,827.0	$197.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$32,886.2	$73,859.0	$72,707.0	$74,884.0	$2,177.0
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	**$32,886.2**	**$73,859.0**	**$72,707.0**	**$74,884.0**	**$2,177.0**
Pesticides Licensing					
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	$0.0	$3,294.0	$3,250.0	$3,453.0	$203.0
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	$0.0	$2,115.0	$2,087.0	$2,216.0	$129.0
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	$0.0	$472.0	$465.0	$495.0	$30.0
Pesticides: Registration of New Pesticides	$2,570.3	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Pesticides: Review / Reregistration of Existing Pesticides	$2,885.8	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing	**$5,456.1**	**$5,881.0**	**$5,802.0**	**$6,164.0**	**$362.0**
Research: Clean Air					
Research: Air Toxics	$13,521.3	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Research: Clean Air	$0.0	$81,054.0	$79,993.0	$80,588.0	$595.0
Research: Global Change	$20,449.9	$16,908.0	$19,688.0	$16,365.0	($3,323.0)
Research: NAAQS	$61,664.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Subtotal, Research: Clean Air	**$95,635.2**	**$97,962.0**	**$99,681.0**	**$96,953.0**	**($2,728.0)**
Research: Clean Water					
Research: Drinking Water	$44,342.9	$48,548.0	$48,775.0	$45,283.0	($3,492.0)
Research: Water Quality	$54,428.5	$56,454.0	$55,573.0	$56,179.0	$606.0
Subtotal, Research: Clean Water	**$98,771.4**	**$105,002.0**	**$104,348.0**	**$101,462.0**	**($2,886.0)**

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Research / Congressional Priorities					
Congressionally Mandated Projects	$16,456.4	$0.0	$5,316.0	$0.0	($5,316.0)
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems					
Human Health Risk Assessment	$35,018.0	$38,856.0	$38,334.0	$39,323.0	$989.0
Research: Computational Toxicology	$12,159.5	$15,103.0	$12,135.0	$14,863.0	$2,728.0
Research: Endocrine Disruptor	$10,476.7	$10,131.0	$10,317.0	$9,502.0	($815.0)
Research: Fellowships	$12,231.1	$8,438.0	$9,845.0	$8,887.0	($958.0)
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems					
Human Health	$0.0	$72,285.0	$77,260.0	$74,752.0	($2,508.0)
Ecosystems	$0.0	$72,761.0	$75,772.0	$69,990.0	($5,782.0)
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems (other activities)	$167,910.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Subtotal, Research: Human Health and Ecosystems	$167,910.0	$145,046.0	$153,032.0	$144,742.0	($8,290.0)
Subtotal, Research: Human Health and Ecosystems	**$237,795.3**	**$217,574.0**	**$223,663.0**	**$217,317.0**	**($6,346.0)**
Research: Land Protection					
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	$10,907.3	$10,737.0	$10,591.0	$13,350.0	$2,759.0
Research: Sustainability					
Research: Economics and Decision Science(EDS)	$2,284.9	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Research: Environmental Technology Verification (ETV)	$1,410.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Research: Sustainability	$24,864.5	$22,478.0	$22,127.0	$19,970.0	($2,157.0)
Subtotal, Research: Sustainability	**$28,559.5**	**$22,478.0**	**$22,127.0**	**$19,970.0**	**($2,157.0)**
Toxic Research and Prevention					
Research: Pesticides and Toxics	$29,425.2	$24,795.0	$24,459.0	$26,568.0	$2,109.0
Water: Human Health Protection					
Drinking Water Programs	$3,256.6	$3,416.0	$3,375.0	$3,559.0	$184.0
Total, Science & Technology	**$728,339.9**	**$754,506.0**	**$760,084.0**	**$763,527.0**	**$3,443.0**
Environmental Program & Management					
Air Toxics and Quality					
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	$18,621.2	$19,388.0	$19,131.0	$19,898.0	$767.0
Federal Stationary Source Regulations	$22,744.8	$26,504.0	$26,091.0	$26,787.0	$696.0
Federal Support for Air Quality Management					
Clean Diesel Initiative	$97.9	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Federal Support for Air Quality Management (other activities)	$95,478.1	$90,490.0	$89,464.0	$95,538.0	$6,074.0
Subtotal, Federal Support for Air Quality Management	$95,576.0	$90,490.0	$89,464.0	$95,538.0	$6,074.0
Federal Support for Air Toxics Program	$25,081.8	$24,711.0	$24,390.0	$22,693.0	($1,697.0)
Radiation: Protection	$10,172.7	$10,186.0	$10,057.0	$10,533.0	$476.0
Radiation: Response Preparedness	$2,809.7	$2,928.0	$2,882.0	$2,941.0	$59.0
Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic Programs	$5,280.0	$4,489.0	$5,119.0	$4,696.0	($423.0)
Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund	$11,315.0	$9,865.0	$9,711.0	$9,865.0	$154.0
Subtotal, Air Toxics and Quality	**$191,601.2**	**$188,561.0**	**$186,845.0**	**$192,951.0**	**$6,106.0**
Brownfields					
Brownfields	$25,838.4	$23,450.0	$23,665.0	$22,732.0	($933.0)
Climate Protection Program					
Climate Protection Program					
Energy STAR	$38,573.4	$43,926.0	$48,236.0	$44,221.0	($4,015.0)
Methane to markets	$2,351.1	$4,436.0	$4,369.0	$4,546.6	$177.6
Asian Pacific Partnership	$3,203.0	$5,000.0	$0.0	$5,000.0	$5,000.0
Greenhouse Gas Reporting Registry	$0.0	$0.0	$3,445.0	$0.0	($3,445.0)
Climate Protection Program (other activities)	$47,124.6	$34,565.0	$34,324.0	$33,240.4	($1,083.6)
Subtotal, Climate Protection Program	$91,252.1	$87,927.0	$90,374.0	$87,008.0	($3,366.0)
Subtotal, Climate Protection Program	**$91,252.1**	**$87,927.0**	**$90,374.0**	**$87,008.0**	**($3,366.0)**
Compliance					
Compliance Assistance and Centers	$28,226.9	$29,547.0	$27,725.0	$26,435.0	($1,290.0)
Compliance Incentives	$9,448.8	$9,786.0	$10,618.0	$10,263.0	($355.0)
Compliance Monitoring	$90,724.6	$93,428.0	$88,726.0	$96,025.0	$7,299.0
Subtotal, Compliance	**$128,400.3**	**$132,761.0**	**$127,069.0**	**$132,723.0**	**$5,654.0**
Enforcement					
Civil Enforcement	$123,003.7	$126,645.0	$129,886.0	$133,017.0	$3,131.0
Criminal Enforcement	$39,721.6	$39,688.0	$40,742.0	$44,384.0	$3,642.0
Enforcement Training	$2,668.3	$3,145.0	$3,096.0	$3,043.0	($53.0)
Environmental Justice	$6,319.2	$3,822.0	$6,399.0	$3,811.0	($2,588.0)
NEPA Implementation	$13,863.5	$14,366.0	$14,142.0	$16,295.0	$2,153.0
Subtotal, Enforcement	**$185,576.3**	**$187,666.0**	**$194,265.0**	**$200,550.0**	**$6,285.0**
Environmental Protection / Congressional Priorities					
Congressionally Mandated Projects	$25,478.3	$0.0	$13,437.0	$0.0	($13,437.0)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Geographic Programs					
Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay	$20,274.1	$28,768.0	$30,528.0	$29,001.0	($1,527.0)
Geographic Program: Great Lakes	$23,522.7	$21,757.0	$21,686.0	$22,261.0	$575.0
Geographic Program: Long Island Sound	$1,361.4	$467.0	$4,922.0	$467.0	($4,455.0)
Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico	$4,407.4	$4,457.0	$5,618.0	$4,578.0	($1,040.0)
Geographic Program: Lake Champlain	$997.0	$934.0	$2,707.0	$934.0	($1,773.0)
Geographic Program: Other					
San Francisco Bay	$0.0	$0.0	$4,922.0	$0.0	($4,922.0)
Geographic Program: Puget Sound	$1,162.3	$1,000.0	$19,688.0	$1,000.0	($18,688.0)
Lake Pontchartrain	$969.4	$978.0	$963.0	$978.0	$15.0
Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE)	$2,515.0	$3,448.0	$3,394.0	$2,448.0	($946.0)
Geographic Program: Other (other activities)	$5,057.5	$3,149.0	$3,105.0	$3,289.0	$184.0
Subtotal, Geographic Program: Other	$9,704.2	$8,575.0	$32,072.0	$7,715.0	($24,357.0)
Regional Geographic Initiatives	$6,302.5	$9,553.0	$0.0	$4,844.0	$4,844.0
Subtotal, Geographic Programs	**$66,569.3**	**$74,511.0**	**$97,533.0**	**$69,800.0**	**($27,733.0)**
Homeland Security					
Homeland Security: Communication and Information					
Laboratory Preparedness and Response	$888.7	$500.0	$492.0	$0.0	($492.0)
Homeland Security: Communication and Information (other activities)	$7,230.3	$6,406.0	$6,330.0	$6,940.0	$610.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Communication and Information	$8,119.0	$6,906.0	$6,822.0	$6,940.0	$118.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection					
Decontamination	$52.8	$99.0	$97.0	$99.0	$2.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)	$9,502.7	$7,688.0	$7,568.0	$6,660.0	($908.0)
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	$9,555.5	$7,787.0	$7,665.0	$6,759.0	($906.0)
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery					
Decontamination	($2.5)	$3,380.0	$3,329.0	$3,412.0	$83.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)	$3,396.8	$1.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	$3,394.3	$3,381.0	$3,329.0	$3,412.0	$83.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	$6,219.1	$6,345.0	$6,248.0	$6,415.0	$167.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security	**$27,287.9**	**$24,419.0**	**$24,064.0**	**$23,526.0**	**($538.0)**

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Indoor Air					
Indoor Air: Radon Program	$5,201.2	$5,429.0	$5,363.0	$5,488.0	$125.0
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	$21,425.6	$21,440.0	$21,632.0	$19,180.0	($2,452.0)
Subtotal, Indoor Air	**$26,626.8**	**$26,869.0**	**$26,995.0**	**$24,668.0**	**($2,327.0)**
Information Exchange / Outreach					
Children and Other Sensitive Populations: Agency Coordination	$4,968.5	$6,203.0	$6,144.0	$6,309.0	$165.0
Environmental Education	$7,807.2	$0.0	$8,860.0	$0.0	($8,860.0)
Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations	$49,193.3	$49,747.0	$48,971.0	$49,756.0	$785.0
Exchange Network	$17,541.7	$15,364.0	$15,137.0	$18,058.0	$2,921.0
Small Business Ombudsman	$3,761.9	$3,261.0	$3,210.0	$3,217.0	$7.0
Small Minority Business Assistance	$2,437.3	$2,466.0	$2,428.0	$2,411.0	($17.0)
State and Local Prevention and Preparedness	$12,867.6	$12,960.0	$12,784.0	$13,298.0	$514.0
TRI / Right to Know	$14,605.5	$15,728.0	$15,504.0	$15,109.0	($395.0)
Tribal - Capacity Building	$10,861.3	$11,477.0	$11,328.0	$11,710.0	$382.0
Subtotal, Information Exchange / Outreach	**$124,044.3**	**$117,206.0**	**$124,366.0**	**$119,868.0**	**($4,498.0)**
International Programs					
US Mexico Border	$5,790.7	$4,646.0	$5,439.0	$0.0	($5,439.0)
Commission for Environmental Cooperation	$4,208.8	$4,022.0	$3,962.0	$0.0	($3,962.0)
Environment and Trade	$1,817.4	$1,945.0	$1,920.0	$0.0	($1,920.0)
International Capacity Building	$7,210.8	$5,311.0	$5,228.0	$0.0	($5,228.0)
POPs Implementation	$1,682.4	$1,831.0	$1,808.0	$0.0	($1,808.0)
International Sources of Pollution					
Mexico Border	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$4,902.0	$4,902.0
International Sources of Pollution (other activities)	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$7,506.0	$7,506.0
Subtotal, International Sources of Pollution	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$12,408.0	$12,408.0
Trade and Governance	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$6,216.0	$6,216.0
Subtotal, International Programs	**$20,710.1**	**$17,755.0**	**$18,357.0**	**$18,624.0**	**$267.0**
IT / Data Management / Security					
Information Security	$4,291.9	$5,583.0	$5,504.0	$5,790.0	$286.0
IT / Data Management	$99,196.3	$91,019.0	$90,753.0	$94,360.0	$3,607.0
Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security	**$103,488.2**	**$96,602.0**	**$96,257.0**	**$100,150.0**	**$3,893.0**
Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review					
Administrative Law	$4,891.0	$5,260.0	$5,178.0	$4,949.0	($229.0)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Alternative Dispute Resolution	$970.5	$1,175.0	$1,160.0	$1,264.0	$104.0
Civil Rights / Title VI Compliance	$10,796.0	$11,240.0	$11,065.0	$11,097.0	$32.0
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	$38,242.4	$39,366.0	$39,480.0	$39,925.0	$445.0
Legal Advice: Support Program	$12,435.8	$13,986.0	$14,117.0	$14,442.0	$325.0
Regional Science and Technology	$3,399.8	$3,574.0	$3,518.0	$3,318.0	($200.0)
Regulatory Innovation	$22,498.4	$23,866.0	$21,327.0	$24,405.0	$3,078.0
Regulatory/Economic-Management and Analysis	$17,755.0	$20,104.0	$16,381.0	$20,588.0	$4,207.0
Science Advisory Board	$4,983.3	$4,790.0	$4,727.0	$5,083.0	$356.0
Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review	**$115,972.2**	**$123,361.0**	**$116,953.0**	**$125,071.0**	**$8,118.0**
Operations and Administration					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations					
Rent	$176,479.1	$165,817.0	$161,261.0	$164,866.0	$3,605.0
Utilities	$14,682.7	$8,210.0	$8,082.0	$11,333.0	$3,251.0
Security	$28,897.4	$25,344.0	$24,949.0	$25,676.0	$727.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)	$107,894.9	$104,357.0	$102,897.0	$109,193.0	$6,296.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$327,954.1	$303,728.0	$297,189.0	$311,068.0	$13,879.0
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	$64,431.2	$74,960.0	$73,949.0	$80,623.0	$6,674.0
Acquisition Management	$23,654.1	$29,992.0	$28,629.0	$31,195.0	$2,566.0
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	$20,564.5	$23,439.0	$23,242.0	$25,977.0	$2,735.0
Human Resources Management	$39,740.2	$40,175.0	$39,760.0	$43,646.0	$3,886.0
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	**$476,344.1**	**$472,294.0**	**$462,769.0**	**$492,509.0**	**$29,740.0**
Pesticides Licensing					
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	$0.0	$62,514.0	$61,819.0	$60,606.0	($1,213.0)
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	$0.0	$41,750.0	$41,214.0	$41,215.0	$1.0
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	$0.0	$12,114.0	$11,959.0	$12,870.0	$911.0
Pesticides: Field Programs	$21,436.3	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Pesticides: Registration of New Pesticides	$42,098.9	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Pesticides: Review / Reregistration of Existing Pesticides	$54,442.2	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Science Policy and Biotechnology	$1,202.9	$1,780.0	$1,752.0	$1,675.0	($77.0)
Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing	**$119,180.3**	**$118,158.0**	**$116,744.0**	**$116,366.0**	**($378.0)**
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)					
RCRA: Waste Management					

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
eManifest	$0.0	$4,000.0	$0.0	$2,000.0	$2,000.0
RCRA: Waste Management (other activities)	$65,599.8	$65,158.0	$66,297.0	$65,111.0	($1,186.0)
Subtotal, RCRA: Waste Management	$65,599.8	$69,158.0	$66,297.0	$67,111.0	$814.0
RCRA: Corrective Action	$39,373.3	$39,573.0	$39,076.0	$39,018.0	($58.0)
RCRA: Waste Minimization & Recycling	$12,506.2	$13,666.0	$13,495.0	$14,397.0	$902.0
Subtotal, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)	**$117,479.3**	**$122,397.0**	**$118,868.0**	**$120,526.0**	**$1,658.0**
Toxics Risk Review and Prevention					
Endocrine Disruptors	$9,855.8	$5,890.0	$8,663.0	$5,847.0	($2,816.0)
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction					
HPV/VCCEP	$12,239.0	$11,015.0	$12,049.0	$11,381.0	($668.0)
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction (other activities)	$32,462.7	$34,031.0	$33,623.0	$35,096.0	$1,473.0
Subtotal, Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction	$44,701.7	$45,046.0	$45,672.0	$46,477.0	$805.0
Pollution Prevention Program	$17,548.6	$19,935.0	$16,362.0	$18,398.0	$2,036.0
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Management	$8,249.6	$5,654.0	$5,585.0	$6,027.0	$442.0
Toxic Substances: Lead Risk Reduction Program	$12,589.8	$13,546.0	$13,335.0	$13,652.0	$317.0
Subtotal, Toxics Risk Review and Prevention	**$92,945.5**	**$90,071.0**	**$89,617.0**	**$90,401.0**	**$784.0**
Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)					
LUST / UST	$9,836.7	$11,719.0	$11,572.0	$12,256.0	$684.0
Water: Ecosystems					
Great Lakes Legacy Act	$24,296.7	$35,000.0	$34,454.0	$35,000.0	$546.0
National Estuary Program / Coastal Waterways	$21,474.8	$17,203.0	$26,779.0	$17,239.0	($9,540.0)
Wetlands	$19,641.9	$21,518.0	$21,248.0	$22,223.0	$975.0
Subtotal, Water: Ecosystems	**$65,413.4**	**$73,721.0**	**$82,481.0**	**$74,462.0**	**($8,019.0)**
Water: Human Health Protection					
Beach / Fish Programs	$2,821.4	$2,830.0	$2,789.0	$2,795.0	$6.0
Drinking Water Programs	$100,323.2	$96,967.0	$96,722.0	$99,476.0	$2,754.0
Subtotal, Water: Human Health Protection	**$103,144.6**	**$99,797.0**	**$99,511.0**	**$102,271.0**	**$2,760.0**
Water Quality Protection					
Marine Pollution	$12,890.5	$12,851.0	$12,674.0	$13,185.0	$511.0
Surface Water Protection	$191,797.2	$196,092.0	$193,546.0	$198,706.0	$5,160.0
Subtotal, Water Quality Protection	**$204,687.7**	**$208,943.0**	**$206,220.0**	**$211,891.0**	**$5,671.0**

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Total, Environmental Program & Management	**$2,321,877.0**	**$2,298,188.0**	**$2,327,962.0**	**$2,338,353.0**	**$10,391.0**
Inspector General					
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations					
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	$32,288.4	$38,008.0	$41,099.0	$39,483.0	($1,616.0)
Total, Inspector General	**$32,288.4**	**$38,008.0**	**$41,099.0**	**$39,483.0**	**($1,616.0)**
Building and Facilities					
Homeland Security					
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	$10,372.2	$7,870.0	$7,747.0	$8,070.0	$323.0
Operations and Administration					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$28,672.1	$26,931.0	$26,511.0	$26,931.0	$420.0
Total, Building and Facilities	**$39,044.3**	**$34,801.0**	**$34,258.0**	**$35,001.0**	**$743.0**
Hazardous Substance Superfund					
Air Toxics and Quality					
Radiation: Protection	$1,960.9	$2,373.0	$2,342.0	$2,414.0	$72.0
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations					
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	$12,286.2	$7,149.0	$11,486.0	$7,164.0	($4,322.0)
Compliance					
Compliance Assistance and Centers	$11.1	$22.0	$22.0	$22.0	$0.0
Compliance Incentives	$139.4	$144.0	$159.0	$146.0	($13.0)
Compliance Monitoring	$1,487.0	$1,182.0	$1,165.0	$1,192.0	$27.0
Subtotal, Compliance	**$1,637.5**	**$1,348.0**	**$1,346.0**	**$1,360.0**	**$14.0**
Enforcement					
Environmental Justice	$911.1	$757.0	$745.0	$757.0	$12.0
Superfund: Enforcement	$164,108.2	$161,610.0	$164,845.0	$163,678.0	($1,167.0)
Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement	$8,846.2	$9,843.0	$9,726.0	$10,225.0	$499.0
Civil Enforcement	$739.2	$884.0	$870.0	$0.0	($870.0)
Criminal Enforcement	$7,895.7	$9,167.0	$9,053.0	$7,830.0	($1,223.0)
Enforcement Training	$630.7	$840.0	$827.0	$858.0	$31.0
Forensics Support	$2,805.2	$2,310.0	$3,750.0	$2,441.0	($1,309.0)
Subtotal, Enforcement	**$185,936.3**	**$185,411.0**	**$189,816.0**	**$185,789.0**	**($4,027.0)**

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Homeland Security					
Homeland Security: Communication and Information	$300.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection					
Decontamination	$61.8	$198.0	$195.0	$198.0	$3.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)	$1,575.4	$1,659.0	$1,633.0	$1,481.0	($152.0)
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	$1,637.2	$1,857.0	$1,828.0	$1,679.0	($149.0)
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery					
Decontamination	$6,913.3	$10,527.0	$10,371.0	$10,620.0	$249.0
Laboratory Preparedness and Response	$8,519.1	$6,064.0	$5,971.0	$9,589.0	$3,618.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)	$34,885.7	$28,689.0	$28,287.0	$36,467.0	$8,180.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	$50,318.1	$45,280.0	$44,629.0	$56,676.0	$12,047.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	$636.7	$594.0	$585.0	$1,194.0	$609.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security	**$52,892.0**	**$47,731.0**	**$47,042.0**	**$59,549.0**	**$12,507.0**
Information Exchange / Outreach					
Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations	$137.5	$155.0	$154.0	$0.0	($154.0)
Exchange Network	$1,374.2	$1,433.0	$1,411.0	$1,433.0	$22.0
Subtotal, Information Exchange / Outreach	**$1,511.7**	**$1,588.0**	**$1,565.0**	**$1,433.0**	**($132.0)**
IT / Data Management / Security					
Information Security	$562.3	$792.0	$780.0	$801.0	$21.0
IT / Data Management	$15,975.5	$16,338.0	$16,083.0	$16,872.0	$789.0
Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security	**$16,537.8**	**$17,130.0**	**$16,863.0**	**$17,673.0**	**$810.0**
Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review					
Alternative Dispute Resolution	$1,020.6	$837.0	$825.0	$846.0	$21.0
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	$826.8	$606.0	$740.0	$631.0	($109.0)
Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review	**$1,847.4**	**$1,443.0**	**$1,565.0**	**$1,477.0**	**($88.0)**
Operations and Administration					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations					

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Rent	$46,016.9	$44,997.0	$44,295.0	$45,353.0	$1,058.0
Utilities	$1,619.3	$2,466.0	$2,428.0	$3,042.0	$614.0
Security	$4,308.9	$6,767.0	$6,661.0	$6,524.0	($137.0)
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)	$18,319.9	$20,726.0	$20,403.0	$21,351.0	$948.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$70,265.0	$74,956.0	$73,787.0	$76,270.0	$2,483.0
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	$2,671.4	$3,049.0	$3,001.0	$3,116.0	$115.0
Acquisition Management	$19,129.3	$24,645.0	$24,327.0	$24,985.0	$658.0
Human Resources Management	$5,203.0	$5,036.0	$4,969.0	$5,063.0	$94.0
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	$20,428.7	$24,306.0	$24,008.0	$26,102.0	$2,094.0
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	**$117,697.4**	**$131,992.0**	**$130,092.0**	**$135,536.0**	**$5,444.0**
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems					
Human Health Risk Assessment	$3,926.4	$3,972.0	$3,910.0	$3,325.0	($585.0)
Research: Land Protection					
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	$23,859.1	$20,081.0	$19,768.0	$21,021.0	$1,253.0
Research: SITE Program	$255.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Subtotal, Research: Land Protection	**$24,114.2**	**$20,081.0**	**$19,768.0**	**$21,021.0**	**$1,253.0**
Research: Sustainability					
Research: Sustainability	$212.3	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Superfund Cleanup					
Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal	$222,093.7	$191,880.0	$190,011.0	$193,853.0	$3,842.0
Superfund: EPA Emergency Preparedness	$9,101.6	$9,318.0	$9,195.0	$9,504.0	$309.0
Superfund: Federal Facilities	$31,763.5	$31,879.0	$31,447.0	$31,440.0	($7.0)
Superfund: Remedial	$659,513.4	$584,836.0	$591,078.0	$586,120.0	($4,958.0)
Superfund: Support to Other Federal Agencies	$4,967.0	$6,575.0	$6,472.0	$6,575.0	$103.0
Brownfields Projects	$4,420.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Subtotal, Superfund Cleanup	**$931,859.2**	**$824,488.0**	**$828,203.0**	**$827,492.0**	**($711.0)**
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund	**$1,352,419.3**	**$1,244,706.0**	**$1,253,998.0**	**$1,264,233.0**	**$10,235.0**
(Transfer to Office of Inspector General)	**($12,286.2)**	**($7,149.0)**	**($11,486.0)**	**($7,164.0)**	**$4,322.0**
(Transfer to Science and Technology)	**($29,312.3)**	**($26,126.0)**	**($25,718.0)**	**($26,417.0)**	**($699.0)**
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks					
Compliance					
Compliance Assistance and Centers	$644.1	$688.0	$709.0	$753.0	$44.0

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
IT / Data Management / Security					
IT / Data Management	$136.5	$177.0	$174.0	$162.0	($12.0)
Operations and Administration					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations					
Rent	$717.1	$696.0	$685.0	$696.0	$11.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)	$131.4	$205.0	$202.0	$206.0	$4.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$848.5	$901.0	$887.0	$902.0	$15.0
Acquisition Management	$223.1	$165.0	$162.0	$165.0	$3.0
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	$812.6	$1,102.0	$1,085.0	$1,131.0	$46.0
Human Resources Management	$3.0	$3.0	$3.0	$3.0	$0.0
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	**$1,887.2**	**$2,171.0**	**$2,137.0**	**$2,201.0**	**$64.0**
Research: Land Protection					
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	$657.0	$660.0	$650.0	$413.0	($237.0)
Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)					
LUST / UST					
EPAct & Related Authorities Implemention	$0.0	$0.0	$1,575.0	$0.0	($1,575.0)
LUST / UST (other activities)	$14,996.1	$10,558.0	$10,393.0	$10,548.0	$155.0
Subtotal, LUST / UST	$14,996.1	$10,558.0	$11,968.0	$10,548.0	($1,420.0)
LUST Cooperative Agreements					
EPAct & Related Authorities Implemention	$0.0	$0.0	$28,941.0	$0.0	($28,941.0)
LUST Cooperative Agreements (other activities)	$65,353.0	$58,207.0	$61,237.0	$58,207.0	($3,030.0)
Subtotal, LUST Cooperative Agreements	$65,353.0	$58,207.0	$90,178.0	$58,207.0	($31,971.0)
Subtotal, Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)	**$80,349.1**	**$68,765.0**	**$102,146.0**	**$68,755.0**	**($33,391.0)**
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	**$83,673.9**	**$72,461.0**	**$105,816.0**	**$72,284.0**	**($33,532.0)**
Oil Spill Response					
Compliance					
Compliance Assistance and Centers	$267.9	$291.0	$286.0	$303.0	$17.0
Enforcement					
Civil Enforcement	$1,661.5	$2,065.0	$2,072.0	$2,233.0	$161.0
IT / Data Management / Security					

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
IT / Data Management	$23.8	$34.0	$33.0	$24.0	($9.0)
Oil					
Oil Spill: Prevention, Preparedness and Response	$12,890.3	$13,499.0	$13,290.0	$13,927.0	$637.0
Operations and Administration					
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations					
Rent	$447.0	$438.0	$431.0	$438.0	$7.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)	$53.4	$52.0	$57.0	$58.0	$1.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$500.4	$490.0	$488.0	$496.0	$8.0
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	**$500.4**	**$490.0**	**$488.0**	**$496.0**	**$8.0**
Research: Land Protection					
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	$841.3	$901.0	$887.0	$704.0	($183.0)
Total, Oil Spill Response	**$16,185.2**	**$17,280.0**	**$17,056.0**	**$17,687.0**	**$631.0**
State and Tribal Assistance Grants					
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)					
Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water SRF	$1,039,998.4	$687,554.0	$689,080.0	$555,000.0	($134,080.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Drinking Water SRF	$800,695.0	$842,167.0	$829,029.0	$842,167.0	$13,138.0
Congressionally Mandated Projects	$150,200.2	$0.0	$143,723.0	$0.0	($143,723.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Alaska Native Villages	$34,907.5	$15,500.0	$24,610.0	$15,500.0	($9,110.0)
Brownfields Projects	$85,865.8	$89,258.0	$93,518.0	$93,558.0	$40.0
Clean School Bus Initiative	$4,523.6	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program					
EPAct & Related Authorities Implemention	$0.0	$35,000.0	$49,220.0	$49,220.0	$0.0
CA Emission Reduction Project Grants	$0.0	$0.0	$9,844.0	$0.0	($9,844.0)
Subtotal, Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program	$0.0	$35,000.0	$59,064.0	$49,220.0	($9,844.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Mexico Border	$96,452.7	$10,000.0	$19,688.0	$10,000.0	($9,688.0)
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)	**$2,212,643.2**	**$1,679,479.0**	**$1,858,712.0**	**$1,565,445.0**	**($293,267.0)**
Categorical Grants					
Categorical Grant: Beaches Protection	$10,573.4	$9,900.0	$9,746.0	$9,900.0	$154.0
Categorical Grant: Brownfields	$50,556.9	$49,495.0	$48,723.0	$49,495.0	$772.0
Categorical Grant: Environmental Information	$15,830.8	$12,850.0	$9,844.0	$11,000.0	$1,156.0
Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	$104,650.9	$103,346.0	$101,734.0	$103,346.0	$1,612.0
Categorical Grant: Homeland Security	$3,730.2	$4,950.0	$4,873.0	$4,950.0	$77.0

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Categorical Grant: Lead	$22,935.5	$13,564.0	$13,352.0	$13,564.0	$212.0
Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)	$209,889.6	$194,040.0	$200,857.0	$184,540.0	($16,317.0)
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Enforcement	$19,063.6	$18,711.0	$18,419.0	$18,711.0	$292.0
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Program Implementation	$13,319.3	$12,970.0	$12,768.0	$12,970.0	$202.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)					
Monitoring Grants	$13,246.5	$18,500.0	$18,211.0	$18,500.0	$289.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106) (other activities)	$197,964.3	$203,164.0	$199,995.0	$203,164.0	$3,169.0
Subtotal, Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)	$211,210.8	$221,664.0	$218,206.0	$221,664.0	$3,458.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention	$6,121.9	$5,940.0	$4,863.0	$4,940.0	$77.0
Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	$97,461.9	$99,100.0	$97,554.0	$99,100.0	$1,546.0
Categorical Grant: Radon	$7,915.0	$8,074.0	$7,948.0	$8,074.0	$126.0
Categorical Grant: Sector Program	$1,360.9	$2,228.0	$1,209.0	$1,828.0	$619.0
Categorical Grant: State and Local Air Quality Management	$208,567.3	$185,180.0	$216,825.0	$185,580.0	($31,245.0)
Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds	$4,582.0	$0.0	$9,844.0	$0.0	($9,844.0)
Categorical Grant: Toxics Substances Compliance	$5,710.3	$5,099.0	$5,019.0	$5,099.0	$80.0
Categorical Grant: Tribal Air Quality Management	$11,840.5	$10,940.0	$10,769.0	$13,300.0	$2,531.0
Categorical Grant: Tribal General Assistance Program	$61,569.8	$56,925.0	$56,037.0	$57,925.0	$1,888.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Injection Control (UIC)	$10,150.8	$10,891.0	$10,721.0	$10,891.0	$170.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks	$29,459.4	$22,274.0	$2,461.0	$22,800.0	$20,339.0
Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training	$828.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Categorical Grant: Water Quality Cooperative Agreements	$1,258.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Categorical Grant: Wetlands Program Development	$16,313.7	$16,830.0	$16,567.0	$16,830.0	$263.0
Subtotal, Categorical Grants	**$1,124,900.7**	**$1,064,971.0**	**$1,078,339.0**	**$1,056,507.0**	**($21,832.0)**
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants	**$3,337,543.9**	**$2,744,450.0**	**$2,937,051.0**	**$2,621,952.0**	**($315,099.0)**
Total, Rescission of Prior Year Funds	**$0.0**	**($5,000.0)**	**($5,000.0)**	**($10,000.0)**	**($5,000.0)**
TOTAL, EPA	**$7,911,371.9**	**$7,199,400.0**	**$7,472,324.0**	**$7,142,520.0**	**($329,804.0)**

DISCONTINUED PROGRAMS

Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds
Program Area: Categorical Grants
Goal: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems
Objective(s): Ecosystems

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	***$4,582.0***	***$0.0***	***$9,844.0***	***$0.0***	***($9,844.0)***
Total Budget Authority / Obligations	$4,582.0	$0.0	$9,844.0	$0.0	($9,844.0)
Total Workyears	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Program Project Description:

The Targeted Watersheds Grant Program encourages successful community-based approaches and management techniques to protect and restore the nation's waters.

The Targeted Watersheds Grant Program enhances community watershed groups' efforts through two different types of competitive grants. Implementation grants provide monetary assistance directly to watershed organizations to implement restoration/protection activities within their watershed. Resources are used to stabilize stream banks, demonstrate nutrient management schemes, establish pollutant credits and trading projects, and work with local governments and private citizens to promote sustainable practices and strategies. Capacity building grants support established watershed service providers in their effort to increase the viability, sustainability and effectiveness of local watershed groups by providing tools, training, and education.

FY 2009 Activities and Performance Plan:

There is no request for this program in FY 2009.

FY 2009 Change from FY 2008 Enacted Budget (Dollars in Thousands):

- (-$9,844.0) This reduction reflects elimination of congressionally directed funding provided in the FY 2008 Omnibus.

Statutory Authority:

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006, Public Law 109-54.

Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training

Program Area: Categorical Grants
Goal: Clean and Safe Water
Objective(s): Protect Water Quality

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	***$828.1***	***$0.0***	***$0.0***	***$0.0***	***$0.0***
Total Budget Authority / Obligations	$828.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Total Workyears	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Program Project Description:

Section 104(g)(1) of the Clean Water Act authorizes funding for the Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator On-site Assistance Training program. This program targets small publicly-owned wastewater treatment plants, with a discharge of less than 5,000,000 gallons per day. Federal funding for this program is administered through grants to states, often in cooperation with educational institutions or non-profit agencies. In most cases, assistance is administered through an environmental training center.

The goal of the program is to provide direct on-site assistance to operators at these small wastewater treatment facilities. The assistance focuses on issues such as wastewater treatment plant capacity, operation training, maintenance, administrative management, financial management, trouble-shooting, and laboratory operations.

FY 2009 Activities and Performance Highlights:

There is no request for this program in FY 2009.

FY 2009 Change from FY 2008 Enacted Budget (Dollars in Thousands):

- No change in program funding.

Statutory Authority:

CWA.

Categorical Grant: Water Quality Cooperative Agreements

Program Area: Categorical Grants
Goal: Clean and Safe Water
Objective(s): Protect Water Quality

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Actuals	FY 2008 Pres Bud	FY 2008 Enacted	FY 2009 Pres Bud	FY 2009 Pres Bud v. FY 2008 Enacted
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	***$1,258.1***	***$0.0***	***$0.0***	***$0.0***	***$0.0***
Total Budget Authority / Obligations	$1,258.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Total Workyears	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Program Project Description:

Under authority of Section 104(b)(3) of the Clean Water Act, EPA makes grants to a wide variety of recipients, including states, Tribes, state water pollution control agencies, interstate agencies, and other nonprofit institutions, organizations, and individuals to promote the coordination of environmentally beneficial activities. This competitive funding vehicle is used by EPA's partners to further the Agency's goals of providing clean and safe water. The program is designed to fund a broad range of projects, including: innovative water efficiency programs, research, training and education, demonstration, best management practices, stormwater management planning, and innovative permitting programs and studies related to the causes, effects, extent, and prevention of pollution.

FY 2009 Activities and Performance Highlights:

There is no request for this program in FY 2009.

FY 2009 Change from FY 2008 Enacted Budget (Dollars in Thousands):

- No change in program funding.

Statutory Authority:

CWA.

EXPECTED BENEFITS OF THE PRESIDENT'S E-GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

Grants.gov

The Grants.gov Initiative benefits EPA and its grant programs by providing a single location to publish grant opportunities and application packages, and by providing a single site for the grants community to apply for grants using common forms, processes and systems. EPA believes that the central site raises the visibility of our grants opportunities to a wider diversity of applicants. Grants.gov has also allowed EPA to discontinue support for its own electronic grant application system, saving operational, training, and account management costs.

The grants community benefits from savings in postal costs, paper and envelopes. Applicants save time in searching for Agency grant opportunities and in learning the application systems of various agencies. At the request of the state environmental agencies, EPA has begun to offer Grants.gov application packages for mandatory grants (i.e. Continuing Environmental Program Grants). States requested that we extend usage to mandatory programs to streamline their application process.

During FY07 EPA posted 173 grant opportunities on Grants.gov Find and linked 100% of those competitive opportunities to electronic application packages on Apply. EPA received 2,942 applications through Grants.gov in 2007, a 28% increase over the number of applications received in 2007.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2008	020-00-04-00-04-1316-24-402-16	$536.2
2009	020-00-04-00-04-1316-24	$517.7

Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE)

The Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) is comprised of nine government-wide automated applications and/or databases that have contributed to streamlining the acquisition business process across the government. EPA leverages the usefulness of some of these systems via electronic linkages between EPA's acquisition systems and the IAE shared systems. Other IAE systems are not linked directly to EPA's acquisition systems, but benefit the Agency's contracting staff and vendor community as stand-alone resources.

EPA's acquisition systems use data provided by the Central Contractor Registry (CCR) to replace internally maintained vendor data. Contracting officers can download vendor-provided representation and certification information electronically, via the Online Representations and Certifications (ORCA) database, which allows vendors to submit this information once, rather than separately for every contract proposal. Contracting officers are able to access the Excluded Parties List System (EPLS) via links in EPA's acquisition systems to identify vendors that are debarred from receiving contract awards.

Contracting officers can also link to the Wage Determination Online (WDOL) to obtain information required under the Service Contract Act and the Davis-Bacon Act. EPA's acquisition systems link to the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG) for submission of contract actions at the time of award. FPDS-NG provides public access to government-wide contract information. The Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS) supports vendor submission of subcontracting data for contracts identified as requiring this information. EPA submits synopses of procurement opportunities over $25,000 to the Federal Business Opportunities (FBO) website, where the information is accessible to the public. Vendors use this website to identify business opportunities in federal contracting.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	$127.278
2009	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	$151.282

Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) Grants and Loans

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) requires the agencies to unambiguously identify contract, grant, and loan recipients and determine parent/child relationship, address information, etc. The FFATA taskforce determined that using both the Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) DUNS Number (standard identifier for all business lines) and Central Contractor Registration (CCR), the single point of entry for data collection and dissemination, is the most appropriate way to accomplish this. This fee will pay for EPA's use of this service in the course of reporting grants and/or loans.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-16-02-0231-24	$89.9
2009	020-00-01-16-02-0231-24	$89.9

Note: FY 2008 amount is for Agency contribution and FY 2009 amount is for service fee.

Enterprise Human Resource Integration Initiative

The Enterprise Human Resource Integration's (EHRI) Electronic Official Personnel Folder (eOPF) is designed to provide a consolidated repository that digitally documents the employment actions and history of individuals employed by the Federal government. EPA plans to migrate from a manual Official Personnel File (OPF) process to the federal eOPF system by April 2008. This initiative will benefit the Agency by reducing contract support costs for file room maintenance and improve customer service for employees and productivity for HR specialists.

The Agency plans to reduce the Headquarters OPF contract once the eOPF is implemented. The contract will be evaluated one year from the actual eOPF deployment to determine if additional cost reductions are feasible or if the contract could be eliminated. In addition, customer service will improve for employees since they will have 24/7 access to view and print their official

personnel documents and HR specialists will no longer be required to manually file, retrieve or mail personnel actions to employees thus improving productivity.

EPA benefits from EHRI in FY09 are anticipated to be the same as those described for FY08.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-16-01-1219-21	$406.0
2009	020-00-01-16-01-1219-21	$474.2

Recruitment One-Stop (ROS)

Recruitment One-Stop (ROS) simplifies the process of locating and applying for Federal jobs. USAJOBS is a standard job announcement and resume builder. It is the one-stop for Federal job seekers to search for and apply to positions on-line. This integrated process benefits citizens by providing a more efficient process to locate and apply for jobs, and assists Federal agencies in hiring top talent in a competitive marketplace. The Recruitment One-Stop initiative has increased job seeker satisfaction with the Federal job application process and is helping the Agency to locate highly-qualified candidates and improve response times to applicants.

By integrating with ROS, the Agency has eliminated the need for applicants to maintain multiple user IDs to apply for Federal jobs through various systems. The vacancy announcement format has been improved for easier readability. The system can maintain up to 5 resumes per applicant, which allows them to create and store resumes tailored to specific skills -- this is an improvement from our previous system that only allowed one resume per applicant. In addition, ROS has a notification feature that keeps applicants updated on the current status of the application, and provides a link to the agency website for detailed information. This self-help ROS feature allows applicants to obtain up-to-date information on the status of their application upon request.

EPA benefits from Recruitment One-Stop in FY09 are anticipated to be the same as those described for FY08.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-16-04-0010-24	$102.2
2009	020-00-01-16-04-0010-24	$106.3

eTraining

The President's Management Agenda encourages e-learning to improve training, efficiency and financial performance. EPA recently exercised its option to renew the current Interagency Agreement with OPM-GoLearn that provides licenses to online training for employees. EPA purchased 5,000 licenses to prevent any interruption in service to current users.

EPA benefits from eTraining in FY09 are anticipated to be the same as those described for FY08.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24-403-250	$80.0
2009	020-00-01-16-1217-24	$80.0

Human Resources LoB

The Human Resources Line of Business (HR LoB) provides federal government the infrastructure to support pay-for-performance systems, modernized HR systems, and the core functionality necessary for the strategic management of human capital.

The HR LoB offers common solutions that will enable Federal departments and agencies to work more effectively, and it provides managers and executives across the Federal Government improved means to meet strategic objectives. EPA benefits by supporting an effective program management activity which will deliver more tangible results in 2009 and beyond.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24-403-250	$65.217
2009	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	$65.217

Grants Management LoB

EPA manages 6,288 grant awards equaling approximately $4.1 billion. EPA anticipates the key benefit will be having a centralized location to download all applications, make awards, and track awards to closeout. Automated business processes available through consortium service providers will decrease agency reliance on manual and paper-based processing. Consortium lead agencies will spread operations and maintenance (O&M) costs, and development, modernization, and enhancement (DME) costs across agencies, decreasing the burden that any one agency must bear.

GM LoB will lead to a reduction in the number of systems of record for grants data across EPA and the government and the development of common reporting standards, improving EPA's ability to provide agency- and government-wide reports on grant activities and results. Migrating to a consortium lead agency will help EPA comply with the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999 and the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006.

Service to constituents will be improved through the standardization and streamlining of government-wide grants business processes. The public will save time a result of quicker notification and faster payments due to an automated system for grants processing. Furthermore, GM LoB will minimize complex and varying agency-specific requirements and increase grantee

ease of use on Federal grants management systems. Constituents will benefit as they will have fewer unique agency systems and processes to learn; grantees' ability to learn how to use the system will be improved and reliance on call center technical support will be reduced. Consortium lead agencies will also provide grantees with online access to standard post-award reports, decreasing the number of unique agency-specific reporting requirements.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2008	020-00-04-00-04-1300-24-108-025	$59.3
2009	020-00-04-00-04-1300-24	$59.3

Geospatial LoB

The Geospatial Line of Business (GeoLoB) will reduce EPA costs and improve our operations in several areas. The investment in FY08 and FY09 will provide the necessary planning and coordination to begin providing significant benefits to EPA in FY10 and beyond in the following ways:

EPA's mission requires the use of a broad range of data on places (e.g. facilities, roads, waste sites, etc.) and geographic features (wetlands, sols, hydrography, etc) to support our decision making processes. OMB circular A-16 identified over 30 critical datasets, many of which are needed to support environmental decisions. The GeoLoB Program Management Office, established in late FY07, will help EPA by providing much needed planning and coordination across the A-16 data stewards to complete these critical data sets.

EPA is moving towards deployment of a service-oriented architecture that will facilitate flexible access to data to support a variety of business applications. Implementing a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) requires the establishment of common standards and policies. The GeoLoB will advance the establishment of a geospatial segment architecture as part of the Federal Enterprise Architecture that can expose geospatial data and capabilities across vertical lines of business. In the process of establishing the geospatial segment architecture, the GeoLoB will promote the implementation of standards and policies to support an SOA.

EPA's geospatial program has saved approximately $2 million per year by consolidating procurements for data and tools into multi-year enterprise licenses. The GeoLoB will reduce costs by providing an opportunity for EPA and other agencies to share approaches on procurement consolidation that other agencies can follow. In FY08, EPA is leading a GeoLoB initiative to explore opportunities for Federal-wide acquisition of key geospatial software and data.

EPA benefits from Geospatial LoB in FY09 are anticipated to be the same as those described for FY08.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-16-04-3100-24	$43.2
2009	020-00-01-16-04-3100-24	$42.0

eRulemaking

The eRulemaking program is designed to enhance public access and participation in the regulatory process through electronic systems; reduce burden for citizens and businesses in finding relevant regulations and commenting on proposed rulemaking actions; consolidate redundant docket systems; and improve agency regulatory processes and the timeliness of regulatory decisions.

The Federal Docket Management System, which was launched under eRulemaking, has simplified the public's participation in the rulemaking process and made EPA's rulemaking business processes more accessible as well as transparent. FDMS provides EPA's 1,430 registered users with a secure, centralized electronic repository for managing the Agency's rulemaking development via distributed management of data and robust role-based user access. EPA posts regulatory and non-regulatory documents in *Regulations.gov* for public viewing, downloading, and commenting. From January through October 2007, *Regulations.gov* posted 1,374 Federal Register notices, 1,171 rules and proposed rules, and 24,461 public submissions. During the same time-frame, EPA posted 13,429 supporting and related materials.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-16-04-0060-24-306-113	$535.0
2009	020-00-01016-04-0060-24	$1,531.1

E-Authentication

Public trust in the security of information exchanged over the Internet plays a vital role in the success of E-Gov initiatives. E-Authentication is setting the standards for the identity proofing of individuals and businesses, based on risk of online services used. The initiative focuses on meeting the authentication business needs of the E-Gov initiatives and building the necessary infrastructure to support common, unified processes and systems for government-wide use. This will help build the trust that must be an inherent part of every online exchange between citizens and government.

The only web-based E-Authentication that EPA is currently implementing is for Central Data Exchange Web Portal (CDX-Web) at Level 3. CDX-Web provides E-Authentication and other services for back-end EPA systems, and our current plan is to offer production Level 3 E-Authentication for the end-users of the one system that currently is on track to implement PKI-

based digital signatures. This implementation will achieve production Level 3 E-Authentication by upgrading PKI certificate management practices and validation technologies already available within the CDX-Web environment so that they meet the requirements for E-Authentication participation. As currently planned, the implementation will provide E-Authentication services for 1,000 to 2,000 end-users.

The initiative benefits EPA by providing expertise, guidance, and documentation, including project planning and reporting templates, to enable EPA to achieve production implementation of E-Authentication for its CDX-Web by the end of Q2 FY08. EPA is taking advantage of the availability of PKI certificates provided through the EPA Authentication Federation to offer production level 3 E-Authentication service.

EPA benefits from E-Authentication in FY09 are anticipated to be similar to those described for FY08.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-16-03-0250-24	$104.1
2009	020-00-01-16-03-0250-24	$201.9

Business Gateway

By creating a single portal for business information, such as the e-Forms catalog, Business Gateway directly benefits EPA's regulated communities, many of whom are subject to complex regulatory requirements across multiple agencies. The Business Gateway initiative benefits EPA by supporting the Agency's emphasis on the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002. EPA has over 100 initiatives, activities, and services directed at small business needs. Business.gov continues to provide a one-stop compliance tool enabling small and emerging businesses access to compliance information, forms and tools across the Federal Government. Business Gateway supports EPA's small business activities function by providing the following benefits:

- Providing a single point of access for electronic regulatory forms;
- Providing "plain English" compliance guidance, fact sheets and links to checklists for small businesses; and
- Maintaining an extensive Web site with numerous links to other internal and external assistance sources.

EPA anticipates similar benefits from Business Gateway in 2009 as stated for 2008.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-16-04-0100-24	$120.0
2009	020-00-01-16-04-0100-24	$209.3

E-Travel

E-Travel is designed to provide EPA more efficient and effective travel management services, with cost savings from cross-government purchasing agreements and improved functionality through streamlined travel policies and processes, strict security and privacy controls, and enhanced agency oversight and audit capabilities. EPA employees also will benefit from the integrated travel planning provided through E-Travel. EPA and GSA have agreed to a September 2008 GovTrip implementation date.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-01-03-0221-24	$1,088.7
2009	020-00-01-01-03-0221-24	$1,327.9

IT LoB

The initiative benefits EPA through improved IT performance, greater efficiencies in IT infrastructure investments, and consistency and standardization of infrastructure platforms. The IT LoB will provide EPA with best practice data and industry-wide performance metrics to validate existing performance.

EPA stands to benefit from all three IT Infrastructure areas of concentration (End User Systems and Support, Mainframes and Servers Systems and Support, and Telecommunications Systems and Support). In addition, EPA should benefit from information and, potentially, pricing previously available to only larger agencies.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2008	020-00-02-00-04-3300-24	$20.0
2009	020-00-02-00-04-3300-24	$0.0

Financial Management Line of Business

EPA will complete the planning and acquisition phase of its Financial System Modernization Project (FSMP) and will begin migration to a shared service provider. This work will benefit from the migration guidance developed in FY06, including the use of performance metrics developed for service level agreements and the use of standard business processes developed for four core financial management sub-functions: Payments, Receipts, Funds and Reporting. The Agency expects to achieve operational savings in future years because of the use of the shared service provider for operations and maintenance of the new system.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2008	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	$45.0
2009	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	$44.4

Budget Formulation and Execution (BFE) LoB

The Budget Formulation and Execution Lines of Business (BFE LoB) allows EPA and other agencies to access budget-related benefits and services and optionally implement LoB sponsored tools and services.

EPA has benefited from the BFE LoB in the following ways:

- Through on-going agency presentations, the LoB shares valuable information on what has/hasn't worked (best/worst practices) on the use of different budget systems and software.
- Through the use of a collaboration effort, a government-wide/government only capability for electronic collaboration *(Wiki)* has been established where a Budget Community website allows EPA to share budget information with OMB (and other federal agencies) in a more efficient and effective manner.
- The LoB is working on giving EPA and other agencies the capability to have secure, virtual on-line meetings where participants can not only hear what's been said by conference calling into the meeting, but also view budget-related presentations directly from their workspace.
- The LoB has provided EPA and other agencies with Budget Execution and Financial Management Integration tools, such as fundamental budget documents, that provide agencies a better understanding of the relationship and tie-in between the budget process and the financial management process.
- The LoB has provided budget-related training to EPA budget employees on OMB's MAX budget system, and on Treasury's FACTS II statements and how it ties to the budget process.
- EPA will also benefit from the LoB's on-going effort to develop a government-wide "core competencies" budget training and certification program where employees entering the field of budget will be required to complete essential basic federal budgeting training; thus providing EPA with a better qualified budget analysts.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2008	-------	$110.0 of in-kind services
2009	-------	$95.0 of in-kind services