

APPENDIX B:

Proposed Future Program Evaluations



APPENDIX B—PROPOSED FUTURE PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Program evaluation is a formal assessment, through objective measurement and systematic analysis, of the manner and extent to which government programs achieve intended objectives. A focused program evaluation will examine specifically identified factors of a program in a more comprehensive way than day-to-day experience provides. Evaluating environmental programs enables

EPA to continuously streamline and modernize our operations while managing our programs, promoting continuous improvement, and supporting innovation. We can also incorporate the lessons we learn into other programs. This appendix lists proposed program evaluations that support EPA's five strategic goals by goal and objective.

GOAL 1			
Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Measuring Effectiveness of the Air Toxics Monitoring Program in the EPA Region 9 office	Goal 1, Objective 1	EPA is planning to conduct a systematic analysis of the effectiveness of its San Francisco regional office's Air Toxics Monitoring Program in meeting program objectives. The evaluation will include analysis of data from several sources, which will be used to develop a logic model based on outcomes, resources, customers, and federal, state, local, and tribal activities. As a result of the evaluation, quantitative measures will more clearly link the region's contributions to the national Air Toxics Program's GPRA goals, and the assessment will be relevant to national program design developments.	FY 2007

GOAL 2			
Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Assessment of Public Water Supply Logic Model	Goal 2, Objective 1	The proposed project is an assessment of the FY 2006 piloting of the Public Water System Supervision logic model as a tool for oversight, program assessment, and program management. Discussion will center on lessons learned, recommendations from pilot regions and states on possible changes to the oversight process, and ideas for new indicators or revisions to existing indicators. Based on the assessment, EPA also will consider which logic model indicators should be included in the next <i>EPA Strategic Plan</i> (2009-2014).	FY 2007

GOAL 2 (continued)			
Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Assessment of Public Water Supply Logic Model (Continued)	Goal 2, Objective 1	Information will be collected through interviews and facilitated discussion with EPA regional offices and state managers and staff.	FY 2007
Measuring Effectiveness of the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health (BEACH) Act Grants	Goal 2, Objective 2	<p>EPA's Office of Water administers the BEACH Act by making available almost \$10 million in grants each year to 35 eligible coastal states/territories to protect public health at the nation's beaches. States/territories use these grants to monitor water quality at their beaches and to notify the public when water quality problems exist. The ultimate goal is to protect millions of Americans from exposure to unhealthy levels of pathogens at coastal beaches by giving them the information to make informed choices on where to swim.</p> <p>The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of state and territory BEACH monitoring/notification programs by reviewing relevant beach monitoring and notification data and studies completed by the local beach authorities. EPA will also visit nine state officials who administer monitoring and public notification data to obtain their perspectives on the utility of monitoring and the effectiveness of their programs.</p>	FY 2008
Review of State On-Site/Decentralized Programs	Goal 2, Objective 2	<p>This review will look at the elements of state on-site/decentralized programs to evaluate whether they are adequate to protect public health and the environment. The elements to be reviewed include planning, performance, site evaluation, design, construction, operations and maintenance, compliance inspections and monitoring, residuals management, record keeping, inventory and reporting, public education, and funding/financial assistance.</p> <p>Data will be collected through document reviews and meetings with regional and state staff.</p>	FY 2008
Program Evaluation of Tribal 106 Grant Guidance	Goal 2, Objective 2	With the FY 2007 grant cycle, EPA's Office of Water is beginning to use the new Tribal 106 Grant Guidance to lead tribes in a more structured direction for managing their water quality protection programs. The new guidance guides tribes through various alternatives for designing their water quality programs and tiers of improvement. The guidance also lays the foundation for a new era of monitoring and collecting data on tribal waters.	FY 2008

GOAL 2 (continued)			
Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Program Evaluation of Tribal 106 Grant Guidance (Continued)	Goal 2, Objective 2	The evaluation will focus on a core subset of tribes (most likely those tribes committed to meeting Program Activity Measure WQ-9 and implementing monitoring strategies in FY 2007) to assess the effectiveness of the guidance in meeting new tribal water quality requirements, such as development of tribal monitoring strategies, data collection, and submission to EPA. It will include a narrative assessment of tribal water quality, and will monitor EPA's ability to define, as per the guidance, a baseline for tracking and assessing the quality of waters in Indian country. ¹	FY 2008
Evaluation of the Clean Water Act Section 319 Non-Point Source Program	Goal 2, Objective 2	The Clean Water Act establishes a “national policy” to develop and implement non-point source (NPS) programs expeditiously to achieve the goals of the Act. The Section 319 program addresses NPS pollution, which is the largest remaining cause of water quality impairments. Section 319 is the only program to address all sources of NPS pollution. Section 319 can be used for monitoring and watershed planning, for which U.S. Department of Agriculture funds cannot be used. Evaluation methodology will include analysis of project documents and monitoring results, site visits, and discussion sessions and interviews with state managers and staff and regional project officers.	FY 2008
Measuring the Success of Water Quality Trading to Meet NPDES Permit Limits	Goal 2, Objective 2	One of EPA's key priorities is to foster innovative, market-based solutions to environmental problems. Trading pollutant credits among point and non-point sources is a flexible way to meet NPDES permit limits and obtain substantial cost savings. This evaluation will identify lessons learned from successful voluntary water quality trading programs; potential barriers to trading; and opportunities for improving Agency policies, guidance, and outreach/education efforts to foster water quality trading. The evaluation will collect information through interviews with federal employees, state NPDES permit writers, and local champions/developers of water quality trading programs.	FY 2007
Program Evaluation of the Targeted Watersheds Grants (TWG)	Goal 2, Objective 2	The TWG focus on identifying watersheds for which community-based collaborative partnerships are ready to implement watershed plans that, when funded, will lead to accelerated and measurable environmental results.	FY 2007

GOAL 2 (continued)

Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Program Evaluation of the Targeted Watersheds Grants (TWG) (Continued)	Goal 2, Objective 2	EPA plans to evaluate the extent to which environmental results are being achieved as a result of TWG Implementation grants. The evaluation will also assess factors that contribute to implementing projects successfully and achieving quantifiable environmental results, including expanding grant recipients' technical and organizational capacity. Evaluation methodology will include analysis of project documents and monitoring results, site visits, and discussions and interviews with selected grantees and their regional project officers	FY 2007

GOAL 3

Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Measuring the Effectiveness of the CORE Emergency Response (ER) Program Review Process	Goal 3, Objective 2	EPA's Office of Emergency Management (OEM) CORE ER review process appears to have improved response preparedness in all the regions. The program has reached certain goals, expressed as CORE ER scores, that are taken to be a measure of each region's preparedness. OEM will test whether reaching those goals makes a difference in the real response world. In addition, OEM needs to improve the CORE ER instrument (checklist) to address lessons learned from recent responses. This project will evaluate whether perceived improvement in preparedness is providing more efficient and effective response to real incidents. CORE ER involves all 10 EPA regions.	FY 2007
Superfund Program Reviews	Goal 3, Objective 2	The Superfund program review is a 24-month process where each region will undergo a review on selected program elements. The review elements are selected based on their relative importance in meeting program targets such as construction completions, human exposures under control, contaminated groundwater under control, and deletions. This process involves conducting in-depth regional interviews and discussion sessions on the selected program elements, using carefully designed governing questions.	Complete first Superfund program review cycle in second quarter of FY 2008. Initiate second Superfund program review cycle in third quarter FY 2008 and complete this cycle in FY 2010.

GOAL 3 (continued)			
Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Joint Project with EPA's Conflict Prevention and Resolution Center on Impacts and Effectiveness of the Collaborative Decision-Making Process at Superfund Sites	Goal 3, Objective 2	This project will assess the effects of the collaborative process compared with an alternative, such as litigation. It will evaluate whether or not the collaborative process leads to a Record of Decision stage at Superfund sites and provides a better environmental result than the alternative process. Evaluation results will inform the collaborative decision-making process.	Estimated completion date FY 2007
Superfund Workload Assessment Project	Goal 3, Objective 2	This project will develop a sound analytical basis for ensuring that human resources are used effectively and efficiently to achieve program goals. A Working Group, composed of representatives of all major EPA Superfund stakeholders, will use a bottom-up approach to determine work years required to implement and support the program.	Estimated completion date FY 2008
Re-evaluation of Site-Specific Payroll Charging	Goal 3, Objective 2	This evaluation will focus on whether improvement has occurred based on the site-specific payroll benchmarking effort completed in second quarter of FY 2006.	This is a follow-up project to work completed in second quarter FY 2006.
Broaden Core Emergency Response (ER) Program and Evaluate Annually	Goal 3, Objective 2	We will extend the Core ER program to include all aspects of emergency management activities (i.e., emergency response, emergency preparedness, and accident prevention.) We will use the baseline already developed under Core ER, to adapt and broaden the Core ER process, and then annually evaluate all aspects of the emergency management program.	Implement changes and begin evaluations during FY 2007.

GOAL 4			
Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Evaluation of the National Estuary Program	Goal 4, Objective 3	The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the progress the 28 estuaries have made in meeting their goals since the inception of the National Estuary Program in 1987. Effort will be made to characterize and assess best practices that can be transferred to other geographic-based programs.	2007-2008

GOAL 4 (continued)

Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Program Evaluation of EPA's Wetlands Program Development Grants	Goal 4, Objective 3	<p>EPA is authorized to manage a Wetland Program Development Grant program to empower partners in developing comprehensive state and tribal wetlands programs. EPA's Wetlands Division would like to evaluate the effectiveness of the grants in achieving program outcomes.</p> <p>EPA will use a retrospective data mine of its databases supplemented by information from sources such as interviews with regional staff and data from organizations such as the Association of State Wetland Managers and the Environmental Law Institute. Statistical analysis will answer some questions, while others will be best answered with descriptive narratives.</p>	<p>Scoping and refinement of questions to be answered during the evaluation and methodology to be conducted in 2007. Evaluation to be conducted in 2008.</p>

GOAL 5

Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Evaluating EPA's Petroleum Refinery National Priority Performance-Based Strategy Implementation	Goal 5, Objective 1	<p>As part of EPA's strategic planning process, our Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) develops a national program priority component that focuses attention on specific environmental problems and patterns of non-compliance. This evaluation will help identify components of a successful priority work process for addressing significant national environmental problems. OECA is currently midway in implementing 9 priority strategies under its FY 2005-2007 work planning cycle, and seeks to learn more about the specific aspects of the petroleum refinery process that worked well, and can be applied to other industry sectors and media programs and replicated at the regional and state levels. Knowledge gained from an effective exit strategy for the Petroleum Refinery process will help to inform the process for the nine current priorities and future efforts. Evaluation methodology includes interviews with EPA staff, partners, and stakeholders. In addition, the evaluation will require a review of strategy documents and supporting data.</p>	FY 2007

GOAL 5 (continued)			
Evaluation Topic	Strategic Goal and Objective	Proposed General Scope and Issues To Be Addressed	Timeframe
Evaluation of the full implementation of the State Review Framework	Goal 5, Objective 1	This evaluation will address the effectiveness of implementing the State Review Framework (SRF) in all 50 states and 5 territories. The SRF is a tool to assess performance in core enforcement and compliance assurance for state air, water, and hazardous waste programs. The SRF was piloted in 10 states in FY 2006. By the end of FY 2007, the remaining states and territories will be reviewed. The evaluation methodology will include surveys of state environmental agencies that were reviewed under the SRF and surveys of state media association members.	The evaluation will be conducted in FY 2008 when the implementation phase is complete.
EPA New England Marina Initiative	Goal 5, Objective 2	Under the EPA New England marina initiative, which ran from 2001 to 2005, a variety of marina environmental assistance projects were implemented and the results were measured. The primary goal of this effort was to help marinas meet required and desired practices managing stormwater, oil and fuel, and hazardous waste. Under the measurement component, environmental indicators were established and measured using statistically valid methods, including on-site assessment visits to monitor progress. The evaluation will determine the extent to which the program achieved its intended objectives. Evaluation methodology includes a review of the results of 140 on-site marina visits, as well as a review of regulatory records.	FY 2007
Evaluation of the National Environmental Performance Track (NEPT) program	Goal 5, Objective 2	This third party evaluation will review the effectiveness of the NEPT program in meeting its stated goals. The project will evaluate whether the program is likely to achieve the intended results, and will make appropriate recommendations on program design and implementation.	FY 2008: Initiate evaluation. FY 2009: Complete evaluation and develop recommendations to implement findings.

NOTES

1. Use of the terms “Indian country,” “Indian lands,” “tribal lands,” “tribal waters,” and “tribal areas” within this *Strategic Plan* is not intended to provide any legal guidance on the scope of any program being described, nor is their use intended to expand or restrict the scope of any such programs.