

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN COMPONENTS

Introduction

The Agency's approach to annual planning under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) is based on a full integration of strategic planning, annual planning, budgeting, and accountability. The Agency's Annual Plan and Budget submission to OMB reflects this integration; all of the components of the Annual Plan are contained within the Budget. In addition, to fully explain the Agency's resource needs, the Budget contains a set of annual performance goals and performance measures broader than what will be included in the Annual Plan submission to Congress under GPRA. The Agency will submit a stand-alone Annual Plan to Congress to meet the legislative concern expressed in GPRA that "annual plans not be voluminous presentations describing performance...for every activity. The annual plan and reports are to inform, not overwhelm the reader."

Annual Plan Organization

The Annual Plan submission to Congress contains the following elements of the Agency's Annual Plan and Congressional Justification:

I. Goals

- Goal Statement
- Background and Context
- Means and Strategy
- External Factors
- Goal Resources

II. Objectives

- Objective Statement
- Key Program Resources
- Annual Performance Goals and Performance Measures:
(The set of APGs included in the Annual Plan are those reported in the Budget Goal Overview. The APGs and PMs in the Annual Plan represent the most significant accomplishments planned for FY2001, and are intended to be used to evaluate the Agency's performance under GPRA.)
- Verification and Validation of Performance Measures

III. Appendix

- Customer Service Program
- Costs and Benefits of Economically Significant Rules
- Major Management Issues
- Use of Non-Federal Parties in Preparing this Annual Plan
- Relationship Between the Annual Plan and the Strategic Plan

CHARGING ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT COSTS TO ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS

In response to Government Performance and Results Act and Managerial Cost Accounting requirements, the Agency has initiated an effort to accurately reflect all costs associated with implementing environmental goals where there is a reasonably clear benefit to that goal. Specifically, beginning in 1999 the Agency has charged management and administrative costs to environmental goals to more accurately capture the costs of supporting environmental programs. The Agency believes that this will result in more reliable information for internal and external reporting.

In the FY 2003 Annual Plan/OMB Submission, FY 2003 OMB Request, FY 2002 President's Budget and FY 2001 Enacted levels reflect a realignment of resources from Agency Management to the agency's other strategic goals where there is a readily identifiable cost that clearly contributes to the achievement of those goals.

The costs allocated across the agency's strategic goals include the entire budget for rent, utilities and security, and portions of total agency costs in the following areas: Administrative Services (human resource operations, contracts management, grants management, financial management, facility operations and information resources management); management, support and oversight; and legal services. The total amounts allocated in 2003, 2002 and 2001 are:

Dollars in Thousands	FY 2003	FY 2002	FY 2001
Rent, Utilities and Security	\$201,932	\$196,468	\$184,176
Management Services and Stewardship	\$111,554	\$122,278	\$110,675
Legal Services	\$43,223	\$42,114	\$39,526

EPA USER FEE PROGRAM

In FY 2003, EPA will have four (4) user fee programs in operation. These user fee programs are as follows:

Motor Vehicle and Engine Compliance Program Fee

This fee is authorized by the Clean Air Act of 1990 and is managed by the Office of Air and Radiation. Fee collections began in August 1992. This fee is imposed on manufacturers of light-duty vehicles, light and heavy trucks, and motorcycles. It covers the cost of certifying new engines and vehicles and monitoring compliance of in-use engines and vehicles. In FY 2003, EPA expects to collect \$11,000,000 from this fee.

Pesticide 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. These fees supplement annual appropriated funds for EPA's Tolerance Program and are also deposited into the FIFRA Fund. Annually, the fees are adjusted by the percentage change in the Federal employee General Schedule (GS) pay scale. In FY 2003, EPA expects to replace this fee with a more comprehensive cost-recovery fee. The FFDCA, as amended by FQPA, mandates that EPA must require the payment of such fees as will, in the aggregate, be sufficient to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate service for establishing tolerances. A proposed Tolerance Fee Rule was published in FY 1999.

This request is based on the issuance of a final tolerance fee rule on October 1, 2002 with an effective date of March 31, 2003. EPA anticipates collecting \$58,000,000 in fees in FY 2003, which would provide funding for the tolerance program at current services levels. The remaining collections would be used at some future time.

Pre-manufacturing Notification Fee

Since 1989, this fee has been collected for the review and processing of new chemical Pre-Manufacturing Notifications (PMN) submitted to EPA by the chemical industry. They are paid at the time of submission of the PMN for review by EPA's Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances. 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 expects to collect \$1,800,000 in PMN fees in FY 2003 under the existing fee structure. The removal of the statutory fee cap is discussed below under User Fee Proposals.

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 less than \$500,000 will be deposited in FY 2002 and FY 2003. Deposits should increase to up to \$800,000 in FY 2004 because many individuals will need to recertify and many training program providers will be applying for new or additional accreditation.

User Fee Proposals

Removal of the Statutory Cap on the Pre-manufacturing Notification Fee

The Agency is proposing authorizing and appropriations language to remove the statutory cap on the existing Pre-Manufacturing Notification (PMN) fees to allow EPA to cover the full cost of the PMN program. The authorizing language would remove the current statutory cap in the Toxic Substances Control Act on the total fee that EPA is allowed to charge. The fee change would be subject to an appropriations language trigger that would allow the fees to be counted as discretionary. Under the current fee structure, the Agency will collect \$1,800,000 in FY 2003. The increase in PMN fees will be deposited into a special fund in the U.S. Treasury, available to the Agency, subject to appropriation. In FY 2003, after the anticipated rulemaking, the Agency estimates collections of an additional \$4,000,000.

EPA's CUSTOMER SERVICE PROGRAM

Background

EPA's Customer Service Program (CSP) has been actively promoting the provision of citizen centered services and products to all our external and internal customers since 1993. The Agency is committed to providing the highest quality service possible to the American people and to achieving the Bush Administration's goal of making all aspects of the Executive Branch's management practices and operations equal to or better than the best service in the private sector.

The CSP staff, who coordinate and support all aspects of the Program, are located in the Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation within the Office of the Administrator. Directly, or through contractors, the staff supports EPA's Customer Service Steering Committee (CSSC), the group that sets CSP policy, its 11 work and process groups, and customer service coordinators across the Agency; coordinates an annual national customer service conference in partnership with a regional host and/or Federal partners; develops and disseminates training and measurement support tools and techniques; and gathers and shares best practices and success stories to speed adoption of customer service innovations. By involving approximately 400 individuals from staff and management through CSSC workgroups and office/region/laboratory Customer Service Councils, the CSP leverages its three-person staff to implement the Agency's Customer Service Strategy.

EPA considers the American people to be its number one customer. As we enforce laws and administer our many non-regulatory programs, we must understand and be responsive to their legitimate expectations. Being prompt and predictable, knowledgeable and responsive to customers' needs, flexible where appropriate, and unfailingly considerate and courteous, enables EPA to work as a better partner and to produce better environmental results. Customer service does not take the place of intelligent program strategies; rather, it is an integral part of every strategy.

What Improved Customer Service Will Achieve

Agency Strategy and Plans:

Late in 1998, the CSSC adopted a Customer Service Program Strategy that focuses on:

1. helping all EPA employees understand the importance and substantial mission-related benefits of improving service to the public and each other;
2. providing employees with goals (standards) and guidelines for improvement and involving them in identifying and attempting to eliminate barriers to achieving customer service excellence;
3. providing training to build staff capacity to achieve the standards and effectively apply customer service skills, and building a culture that encourages learning;
4. developing tools and building capacity to gather formal and informal feedback and measure customer satisfaction (service, product and process improvement) over time;

5. learning what we need to do to increase satisfaction with our services and our treatment of customers; and,
6. recognizing and rewarding customer service excellence.

Since October 2000, twenty-two offices and regions have been implementing their plans for building world class customer service across the Agency. CSP staff is tracking progress and providing assistance to program offices. The main elements of the plans follow.

- Vision/Leadership - Establish a clear vision of how providing outstanding customer service fits into the Agency's mission and a method to communicate this picture of the future throughout the organization.
7. Feedback/Measurement - Formally assess and document the satisfaction of key external and/or internal customers, make appropriate changes as a result, and develop objective measures to track progress.
8. Sharing/Benchmarking - Investigate, discover and implement practices from the best public and private sector service leaders.
9. Accountability/Recognition - Hold everyone responsible for providing service excellence and recognize outstanding efforts.
10. Personal Development - Provide opportunities for as many people as possible to attend at least one customer service workshop.

Standards:

Implementing the plans will enable the Agency to better achieve EPA's Six Principles of Customer Service and enhance implementation of the Agency's overall Customer Service Strategy. The Six Principles are:

11. Be helpful! Listen to your customers!
12. Respond to all phone calls by the end of the next business day.
13. Respond to all correspondence within 10 business days.
14. Make clear, timely, accurate information accessible.
15. Work collaboratively with partners to improve all products and services.
16. Seek and use customers' ideas and input!

In addition to the Six Principles, EPA has specific service standards for its core processes of permitting; rule making, state, local and tribal grants; pesticides regulation; public access (correspondence, telephone, and electronic); research grants, and partnerships. All standards are posted on the CSP web site [<http://www.epa.gov/customerservice/standards.htm>] along with a section on what to expect from EPA when they are customers of these processes [<http://www.epa.gov/customerservice/principles.htm>].

The Permits Core Process group developed a document, the “Customer Service in Permitting Tool Kit” [<http://www.epa.gov/customerservice/permits/>] to assist EPA and its partners in permitting, and began distribution in 2000. With regional sponsors and participation from the states, the CSP launched full day workshops using the Tool Kit to focus on key attributes of permitting services and practical ways to obtain and use customer feedback to improve permitting.

Feedback and Measurement:

Because customer satisfaction measurement is central to the CSP, staff developed “Hearing the Voice of the Customer - Customer Feedback and Customer Satisfaction Measurement Guidelines” [<http://www.epa.gov/customerservice//feedback/voice.htm>] in 1998. The CSP sponsors workshops to train advisors/consultants to assist people across the Agency to use the Guidelines to obtain and use customer input. CSP staff and these advisors assist other staff to prepare surveys that they can endorse and send to EPA’s liaison to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

All feedback instruments are cleared through OMB under the CSP generic Information Collection Request (ICR) for customer satisfaction surveys. A renewal of that clearance will be prepared during FY 2003 to extend the ICR beyond the current March 2003 expiration date. During 2001, with CSP staff assistance, the Office of Environmental Information launched an OMB-approved standardized web site survey and began encouraging web site managers to use that survey instrument to learn from their users what and how to improve their Internet web pages. The CSP also encourages organizations to establish systems to document complaints and comments, track responses, and make improvements.

EPA offices annually sponsor many surveys and focus group sessions with outside customers. Most survey instruments are developed independently by staff, managers and contractors for different programs. Some of these feedback activities are accomplished quickly and efficiently, but many are not. The CSP initiated a project in 2001 to gather and consolidate survey information from across the Agency on an intranet site. This will enable programs that are inexperienced in effective feedback to learn from more experienced programs. It will also give offices that have not performed surveys information that may help them focus their activities more effectively.

The CSP staff coordinated EPA’s participation in the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ASCI) Survey. To examine the customer service aspects of the information provision part of its mission, EPA chose to focus on Internet users because web pages are representative of all EPA programs, the Internet is becoming increasingly more accessible to the general public (in 1999, 50% of the public; five years prior, only 30%), and increasing public access to environmental information is a strategic goal of the Agency. Using the results of the ASCI and the many follow-up surveys, focus groups, and usability testing performed to clarify findings, the Agency continually makes changes to improve its websites.

Training/Conferences:

Over 200 EPA staff are certified to facilitate training across the Agency. Many have delivered “Forging the Links” (an EPA-specific workshop that ties service improvement to better mission performance) and customer skills courses [<http://www.epa/customer-service/training.htm>]. Through sharing benchmarking and best practices information and by convening the only government sponsored annual customer service conference, the CSP supplements training opportunities. Optional training workshops follow each annual conference. The conferences showcase outstanding speakers, excellent trainers and best-in-class service deliverers. They bring together EPA, Federal, state and local government employees and managers to share information that speeds adoption of best practices. [<http://www.epa.gov/customer-service/conference.htm>]

Each year, the conference has served to advance customer service innovation within EPA. As it expanded to include additional Federal, state and local agencies and their service contractors, the conference has served to speed innovation far beyond EPA. Conference themes have included: delivering citizen centered government, measuring customer satisfaction and acting on customer feedback, being accountable to customers, recognizing excellence, partnering for better service delivery, and using technology (e-gov) to improve access and services. Staff members from EPA and its co-sponsors record all sessions and gather all presentations. The CSP staff develop conference proceedings and post the compiled notes and papers on the customer service website to further extend the effectiveness of the conferences. [<http://www.epa.gov/customer-service/conference.htm>]

Recognition:

Through recognizing outstanding service, the Agency highlights, encourages, and reinforces service excellence. Many offices and regions in EPA have created specific cash awards for customer service. In addition, many non-monetary awards are in place to encourage improvements in correspondence and telephone service to the public. Administrator Whitman presented the first Honor Awards for excellence in customer service in 2001.

Expected Results

In FY 2003, the Agency will continue to implement its customer service strategy. The expected results follow:

17. policy and guidance will better integrate customer service excellence with achieving EPA’s mission;
18. communications and liaison with senior managers and other Federal and state partners will assure consistent and rapid follow-up;
19. best practices research and benchmarking assistance will lead to continued improvements in processes, products and services;
20. direct CSP staff assistance and contractual support to workgroups, program and regional offices will speed implementation of customer service plans;

21. customer service and related training opportunities will increase the customer focus of the Agency;
22. continuous support for feedback and measurement activities will prevent duplicative surveys and speed survey clearances;
23. a sixth National Customer Service Conference will enable EPA and its partners to meet, share, and learn from top performing agencies and companies how to apply their knowledge to improve customer service;
24. increased access to CSP information via the Intra- and Internet and a gateway to other customer service information will enable more people to understand the benefits of world class customer service; and
25. service excellence will be a core value at EPA.

FTE: 3.0

Funding: \$300,000 (salaries/benefits) \$150,000 (contract request)

FY 2002 REVISED FINAL ANNUAL PLAN

As in the case of the past three Annual Plans, EPA has opted to prepare a Revised Final Annual Plan for FY 2002. The primary purpose of the revised plan is to update annual performance goals and targets using FY 2001 performance data and reflecting Congressional action on EPA's portion of the FY 2002 President's Budget. The FY 2002 Final Annual Plan was included in the Agency's FY 2002 budget request which was released in April of 2001, approximately six months prior to the beginning of FY 2002.

The FY 2002 Annual Plan included well over 500 annual performance goals (APGs) and annual performance measures (PMs). The Agency has been criticized for its large number of APGs/PMs. As part of the development of the FY 2003 Annual Plan, EPA undertook a concerted effort to improve the quality and reduce the number of externally-reported APGs and PMs. As a result of this effort to create a smaller, more meaningful set of goals and measures EPA has determined that there are important performance results that should be captured in the narrative section of this document but do not necessarily warrant a separate APG or PM. In most cases, EPA will continue to use these goals and measures for internal management purposes. EPA has also determined that some of these changes should also be made for the corresponding FY 2002 APGs and PMs. As such, a number of the changes reflected in the FY 2002 Revised Final Annual Plan are not included in the main body of this document.

Listed below are the FY 2002 APGs and PMs that were not in ten strategic goal chapters of the FY 2003 Annual Plan/Congressional Justification but were included in the Agency's FY 2002 Annual Plan. These APGs/PMs will also be referenced in the Agency's FY 2002 Annual Report:

Notes:

- The goals and measures listed as "Former Goals" represent those goals and measures as they existed in the FY 2002 Annual Plan.
- The goals and measures listed as "Revised Goals" represent those goals and measures as they currently exist.
- The strikeouts (indicated by a line through the text) listed in the "Former Goals" section indicate that language was deleted from the goal or measure.
- The bold (indicated by darkened text) listed in the "Former Goals" section indicate that revised language was added to the goal or measure.

GOAL 5: Safe Waste Management

OBJ 1. (OECA)

Former Goal: Maximize all aspects of potentially responsible party (PRP) participation including having PRPs initiate work at 70% of the new construction starts at non-Federal Facility Superfund sites, and emphasize fairness in the settlement process.

Performance Measure: Ensure fairness by making orphan share offers at 100% of all eligible settlement negotiations for response work.

Target: 100%

Performance Measure: Provide finality for small contributors by entering into *de minimis* settlements and report the number of settlers.

Target: 18%

Revised Goal: Reclassify performance measures as reporting (internal).

Explanation: This APG no longer needs to be highlighted with these PMs. The need to emphasize fairness in the Superfund enforcement is now routine. Orphan share offers are routinely made at all eligible sites, and *de minimis* settlements are entered into with small contributors as appropriate. These measures are no longer necessary to highlight routine activities.

OBJ 1. (OECA)

Former Goal: Continue to make formerly contaminated parcels of land available for residential, commercial, and industrial reuse by addressing liability concerns through the issuance of comfort letters and Prospective Purchaser Agreements (PPAs).

Performance Measure: Evaluate liability concerns - 100% of PPA requests addressed up to a maximum of 40 requests.

Target: 100%

Explanation: The new Brownfields legislation, the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act, reduces the need for prospective purchaser agreements and comfort letters. It provides liability protection for prospective purchasers, contiguous property owners, and innocent landowners among other hindrances to brownfields cleanup. EPA will continue to pursue liability concerns as needed.

Goal 6: Global Change

OBJ 2. (OAR)

Former Goal: Demonstrate technology for an 85 MPG mid-size family sedan that has low emissions and is safe, practical, and affordable.

Performance Measures: Fuel Efficiency of EPA-Developed PNGV Concept Vehicle over EPA Driving Cycles Tested

Revised Goal: This goal will be permanently dropped beginning in FY 2002.

Performance Measures: This measure will be permanently dropped beginning in FY 2002.

Explanation: The Administration has eliminated the PNGV program for FY 2003. As a result, our FY 2002 work has been recharacterized to lead into what the Administration has asked us to do in FY 2003. In FY 2002, EPA will continue work under two CRADA partnerships with private industry to transfer passenger car technology to SUV and urban delivery vehicles. Given this, we have crafted a new APG for FY 2003 that describes the EPA goal relative to the CRADA partnerships.

OBJ 2. (OAR)

Former Goal: Assist 10 to 12 developing countries and countries with economies in transition in developing strategies and actions for reducing emissions of greenhouse gases and enhancing carbon sequestration.

OBJ 2. (OAR)

Former Goal: Provide analysis, assessment, and reporting support to Administration officials, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

OBJ 2. (OAR)

Former Goal: In close cooperation with USDA, identify and assess opportunities to sequester carbon in agricultural soils, forests, other vegetation and commercial products, with collateral benefits for productivity and the environment, with carbon removal potential of up to 25 MMTCE by 2010.

OBJ 3. (OAR)

Former Goal: Increase the number of children participating in the SunWise School Program by 25%, and reduce the rate of sunburns among participants by 5%.

HOMELAND SECURITY

Introduction

EPA played a critical role in responding to the September 11, 2001, attacks at the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon. At the World Trade Center, the Agency aided in debris removal from Ground Zero, combined efforts with Occupational Health and Safety Administration and the New York City Department of Health to monitor worker exposure to contaminated dust and particulate matter, and coordinated with the New York City Department of Environmental Protection to sample drinking water and ambient air quality. Similar monitoring efforts were conducted at the Pentagon crash site. At the Senate Hart Office Building in Washington, D.C., EPA worked with the Sergeant at Arms, who served as the lead, during the Anthrax decontamination process, which was successfully completed in January 2002.

EPA recognizes that establishing comprehensive homeland security does not end with the conclusion of cleanup efforts in New York and Washington, DC. In FY 2002 and FY 2003 the Agency will be investing over \$300 million for preparedness and response activities.

FY 2001/2002 Immediate Response

Immediately following the September 11, 2001 attack at the World Trade Center (WTC) in New York City, EPA entered into the first in a series of Mission Assignments with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for response work at Ground Zero. By the end of December, the Mission Assignments totaled \$42.6 million. Subsequent to December 31, FEMA transferred an additional \$52.7 million to EPA via Inter-Agency Agreements to continue the work through mid-2002, making the total amount \$95.3 million. EPA's assignments included:

- Implementation of personnel and equipment decontamination operations for thousands of on-site workers;
- Conducting continuous air and water sampling in and around the WTC site;
- Conducting asbestos sampling, radiological monitoring and waste categorization monitoring at the Staten Island Landfill;
- Vacuum cleaning of sidewalks, streets, and buildings in the WTC area.

These operations have been continually maintained since September 11, 2001, under the overall management of Region 2's Superfund response program and supported by the East Coast Environmental Response Team, as well as staff and management from EPA's other nine Regional offices.

EPA criminal investigators also assisted the FBI and other local and Federal law enforcement organizations at the WTC site. Agency staff aided in the collection of crime scene evidence, photographic documentation, and related investigative duties.

At the Pentagon crash site, EPA emergency responders worked with the FBI and the Department of Defense from September 11 through September 29, 2001 to collect air, water, and

debris samples to ensure the safety of response personnel, Pentagon employees, and nearby residents. The Agency's air monitoring did not detect any pollutants from the fires and building debris. EPA sampling also indicated that there was no threat of drinking water contamination. EPA criminal investigator staff provided the FBI with crime scene investigative support in the areas of body recovery, evidence collection, and assistance at the morgue.

EPA's homeland security emergency response efforts entered a new phase in October 2001, beginning with the discovery of Anthrax in Florida. The Agency responded to private sites, the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) and, other government agency sites, and the Capitol Hill complex. The Superfund emergency response program has provided the personnel, equipment and contractors to provide assessment, technical assistance and remediation services according to the needs of each site. Through the end of January 2002, EPA has obligated over \$20 million for Anthrax cleanup at the Capitol Hill complex.

EPA's criminal investigations program provided direct investigative and forensic assistance to the FBI, Capitol Police, Sergeant at Arms, Senate Director of Security, and the Senate Select Intelligence Committee. Activities included documenting and gathering crime scene evidence, removing suspected contaminated mail from several Capitol Hill facilities, examining mail to obtain additional evidence, and environmental sampling of hot zones on the 5th and 6th floors of the Hart Building and several other location. EPA's criminal program is continuing to provide criminal investigative and technical support to the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Forces and the Attorney General's Anti-Terrorism Task Forces across the country.

FY 2002 Emergency Supplemental Appropriation

The 2002 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act provided \$175.6 million to EPA. The Agency allocated these resources to address the most important priorities, described below.

In the President's request to Congress, following the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the security of Federal facilities was highlighted as an imperative issue. A total of \$30 million was provided to assess the security needs at EPA buildings and laboratories and mitigate those to the extent possible. Investments include, but are not limited to: additional contract guards, cameras, X-ray machines, blast resistant glass, closed circuit TVs, locks, and motorized gates.

The nation's water supply is one of our most vital natural resources. Potential threats to this resource include contamination with biological, chemical, or radiological agents; destruction of physical infrastructure; and disruption of electrical and computer systems. EPA will invest \$88.8 million to support enhancement of security at the nation's drinking water systems. \$79.8 million will be used to direct grants to the largest drinking water systems to carry out vulnerability systems and enhance emergency response plans, to provide technical assistance on vulnerability assessments and emergency response plans to small and medium drinking water systems, and to further refine security-related detection, monitoring, and treatment tools. In FY 2002 EPA will invest \$4 million in accelerating the development and testing of counter terrorism tools, supporting training for the development of vulnerability assessments, providing technical

assistance, and conducting research on redesign and detection of collection and treatment systems, and testing and implementation of this research. In addition, the Agency will provide \$5 million to the states to support homeland security coordination work in conjunction with EPA and drinking water utilities to implement homeland security activities. EPA will also develop tools and training for medium and small drinking water utilities to assess vulnerabilities and develop appropriate emergency response plans.

Any major terrorist incident, whether involving explosives, conventional hazardous materials or radiological, chemical or biological agents necessitates an EPA response. This includes first assessing the risks to public health, the environment, and response workers; second, managing and mitigating the hazards of residual contamination; and third, conducting assessments of the adequacy of the response sufficient to allay the concerns of the public who will re-occupy the affected area. The ability to effectively execute these tasks is crucial in providing homeland security. Creating a West Coast Environmental Response Team (ERT) will enable the Agency to respond more rapidly to an event beyond the immediate reach of EPA's current dedicated response team based in New Jersey. The Agency will also use Supplemental resources to enhance preparedness and response effectiveness within each EPA Regional office, fortify the East Coast ERT, and increase Headquarters support. Specific investments include equipment (breathing apparatus, chemical agent monitors, field analytical and communications equipment, etc.); training and exercises for EPA responders and On-Scene Coordinators; participation in inter-agency events with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), FEMA, and others; pre-deployment of security at national events, such as the 2002 Winter Olympics and IMF/World Bank meetings; and coordination with states and local communities to include homeland security preparedness in their emergency planning programs.

EPA worked to clean up the Hart Senate Office Building from anthrax contamination, while also assisting at the Brentwood facility in Washington, DC and the AMI building in Florida. Staff provided direct investigative and forensic assistance to the FBI and Capitol Police, bringing the Agency's subject matter expertise to bear on the gathering of potential crime scene evidence; removal and examination of suspected contaminated mail from several Capitol Hill facilities; and environmental sampling of hot zones in the Hart Building. The 2002 Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act provided resources for EPA's cleanup efforts, as well as funds to hire and train additional criminal investigators.

The 2002 Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act also provides funds to initiate research and development activities in support of homeland security needs. With these resources EPA will develop a unique pathological suite at its Cincinnati lab capable of sampling and evaluating Anthrax and other biological agents. In addition, EPA will use these resources to evaluate the performance of drinking water treatment systems for their ability to cost effectively remove inactivate biological and chemical warfare agents. Finally, these increased resources will provide scientifically based data to assist in selecting effective technologies to destroy chemical and biological contaminants on surfaces and in buildings.

At present, there are no registered pesticide products for killing anthrax. Accordingly, EPA expects an upsurge in requests to market new antimicrobial products many of which much

be tested on an expedited basis for homeland defense. To prepare for such reviews, EPA will be focusing on chemicals that can combat other microbes, both professional decontamination products and some

clinical/household disinfectants that may be effective against multiple biological terrorism threats. The Agency will be reviewing requests to market new anthrax and other microbe-killing pesticides.

EPA will deal with potential homeland security problems from misuse of industrial chemicals, by accelerating work in detecting and analyzing the impact of potential threats from exposure to toxic industrial chemicals. Additional information needed to determine the risks to human health from short-term exposures to acutely toxic chemicals will be developed, and subsequently disseminated through the 50 State Emergency Response Commissions (SERCs) to more than 3,500 Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs).

Preserving and protecting the quality of air is a critical aspect of ensuring homeland security. EPA's monitoring efforts at the World Trade Center site illustrate the importance of monitoring ambient air and indoor air. Resources will be used to: purchase field equipment that enables the Agency to screen for contamination, collect samples, ensure protection of response personnel, and inform the public. In addition, EPA will invest in mobile assets, such as sample preparation trailers, mobile radioanalytical labs, and liquid scintillation counters. The Agency will provide training to new laboratory and headquarters support personnel and facilitate coordination efforts with other agencies.

The attacks of September 11, 2001, directly affected EPA personnel in the New York area. Information technology and communication equipment in the Agency's downtown Manhattan office was destroyed or damaged; the building was closed for several weeks; and staff were relocated to an EPA facility in Edison, New Jersey. A portion of the Supplemental Appropriation will be used to reimburse costs of replacing and maintaining equipment at this location. With regards to public access and environmental information, EPA will use resources to provide environmental updates on environmental data to the Agency's web-site regarding cleanup efforts at the World Trade Center.

FY 2003 President's Request

The President's FY 2003 request includes \$19 million to continue security upgrades of EPA facilities and maintain the increased contract guards that were initiated with funds from the 2002 Emergency Supplemental Appropriation. This investment sustains the Administration's commitment in preserving a safe and healthy work environment for all Federal employees.

Building on its 2002 investments, the Agency's requests \$16.9 million to conduct additional drinking water vulnerability assessments for small and medium-sized systems, and \$5 million in grants to states to support homeland security coordination.

EPA will continue to operate the West Coast ERT in FY 2003. The President's request includes \$5.5 million for the maintenance of this program. An additional \$7.7 million is also being requested to upgrade EPA response capabilities.

In FY 2003, EPA is investing \$3.8 million for special agents who will provide environmental crimes expertise to the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Forces and the Department of Justice's Anti-Terrorism Task Forces. Personnel will also form five National Counter Terrorism Response Teams to coordinate with FBI field offices, perform protection duty services for the Administrator's Office, and provide on-site investigative support for designated National Security Special Events. Additionally, experts at the National Enforcement Investigations Center will respond with technical support in the event of a hazardous chemical release intended to threaten homeland security.

One of EPA's ten goals is to provide the public with quality environmental information. In FY 2003, the Agency will invest \$0.5 million to enhance outreach and ensure that the American people are kept informed on the issues of homeland security and the environment.

The FY 2003 President's Budget requests an additional \$75 million to conduct research on better technologies and assessments to cleanup buildings contaminated by biological and chemical agents. These efforts will include the transfer of technologies and guidance on decontamination processes, evaluation of existing and new cleanup and detection technologies, development of risk assessment methodologies, and production of rapid decontamination techniques and technologies. The incidents in Florida, New York, and Washington, DC illustrate the potential use of biological and chemical agents as deadly weapons. Through these research efforts, EPA will work to achieve a higher degree of preparedness which will strengthen Federal response efforts.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FY 2002/2003 HOMELAND SECURITY SUMMARY
(Dollars in thousands)

Goal	FY 2002	FY 2002	FY 2002	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2003	FY 2003
Objective	Base	FTE	Supplemental	Supplemental	Base	President's	Budget
Appropriation	Resource		Resources	FTE	Resource	Budget	
	Declarations				Request	Investments	FTE
Clean Air	\$874.0	9.2	\$600.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Attain NAAQS	\$520.5	6.9	\$600.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
EPM	\$0.0	0.0	\$600.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
S&T	\$520.5	6.9	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Reduce Air Toxics Risk	\$353.5	2.3	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
S&T	\$353.5	2.3	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Clean and Safe Water	\$3,764.1	12.0	\$88,794.0	10.0	\$1,946.5	\$20,000.0	0.0
Safe Drinking Water	\$3,264.1	12.0	\$87,794.0	10.0	\$1,946.5	\$20,000.0	0.0
S&T	\$3,264.1	12.0	\$82,794.0	10.0	\$1,946.5	\$15,000.0	0.0
STAG	\$0.0	0.0	\$5,000.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$5,000.0	0.0
Reduce Loadings	\$500.0	0.0	\$1,000.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
EPM	\$500.0	0.0	\$1,000.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Safe Food	\$14.0	0.2	\$1,465.4	2.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Reduce Risk	\$0.0	0.0	\$602.6	1.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0

EPM	\$0.0	0.0	\$602.6	1.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Eliminate Use on Food	\$14.0	0.2	\$862.8	1.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
EPM	\$0.0	0.0	\$862.8	1.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
S&T	\$14.0	0.2	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Preventing Pollution	\$0.0	0.0	\$1,734.6	3.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Reduce Public and	\$0.0	0.0	\$482.4	2.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
EPM	\$0.0	0.0	\$482.4	2.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Reduce Risks from Lead	\$0.0	0.0	\$150.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
EPM	\$0.0	0.0	\$150.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Manage New Chemical	\$0.0	0.0	\$1,102.2	1.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
EPM	\$0.0	0.0	\$1,102.2	1.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Better Waste Management	\$3,192.4	12.1	\$42,300.0	80.0	\$3,185.4	\$83,125.0	32.0
Control Risks	\$3,185.4	12.0	\$42,300.0	80.0	\$3,185.4	\$83,125.0	32.0
EPM	\$0.0	0.0	\$3,300.0	5.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Superfund	\$3,185.4	12.0	\$39,000.0	75.0	\$3,185.4	\$83,125.0	32.0
Regulate Facilities	\$7.0	0.1	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
S&T	\$7.0	0.1	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Quality Environmental Info	\$607.8	5.0	\$2,181.5	6.0	\$473.3	\$0.0	4.9
Increase Availability	\$600.8	4.9	\$0.0	0.0	\$473.3	\$0.0	4.9
EPM	\$600.8	4.9	\$0.0	0.0	\$473.3	\$0.0	4.9
Provide Access	\$7.0	0.1	\$253.1	3.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
EPM	\$0.0	0.0	\$253.1	3.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
S&T	\$7.0	0.1	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0

Improve Agency Info	\$0.0	0.0	\$1,928.4	3.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
EPM	\$0.0	0.0	\$1,028.4	3.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Superfund	\$0.0	0.0	\$900.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Sound Science	\$579.6	5.0	\$1,474.0	2.0	\$0.0	\$1,875.0	0.0
Conduct Research	\$65.5	0.9	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
S&T	\$65.5	0.9	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Improve Scientific Basis	\$360.1	1.9	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
S&T	\$360.1	1.9	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Enhance Capabilities	\$147.0	2.1	\$1,440.6	2.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
S&T	\$147.0	2.1	\$1,440.6	2.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Improve Environmental	\$7.0	0.1	\$33.4	0.0	\$0.0	\$1,875.0	0.0
S&T	\$7.0	0.1	\$33.4	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Superfund	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$1,875.0	0.0
Credible Deterrent	\$3,457.3	30.0	\$7,010.5	50.0	\$3,807.0	\$0.0	30.0
Increase Compliance	\$2,715.5	24.0	\$7,010.5	50.0	\$3,807.0	\$0.0	30.0
EPM	\$2,715.5	24.0	\$5,618.5	40.0	\$3,036.3	\$0.0	24.0
Superfund	\$0.0	0.0	\$1,392.0	10.0	\$770.7	\$0.0	6.0
Promote Compliance	\$741.8	6.0	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Superfund	\$741.8	6.0	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.0
Effective Management	\$0.0	0.0	\$30,040.0	3.0	\$0.0	\$19,000.0	0.0
Provide Quality Work Env.	\$0.0	0.0	\$30,040.0	3.0	\$0.0	\$19,000.0	0.0
EPM	\$0.0	0.0	\$24,000.0	3.0	\$0.0	\$6,000.0	0.0
S&T	\$0.0	0.0	\$6,040.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$1,500.0	0.0

B&F	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	0.0	\$0.0	\$11,500.0	0.0
<hr/>							
	\$12,489.2	73.5	\$175,600.0	157.0	\$9,412.2	\$124,000.0	66.9

Note: Table does not include FEMA reimbursable resources

Environmental Protection Agency

FY 2003 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification

Key Programs (Dollars in Thousands)

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
ATSDR Superfund Support	EPM	\$0.0	\$654.3	\$0.0
Acid Rain –CASTNet	S&T	\$3,991.2	\$3,991.2	\$3,991.2
Acid Rain -Program Implementation	EPM	\$12,248.7	\$12,500.2	\$12,790.4
Administrative Law	EPM	\$2,567.3	\$2,684.0	\$2,869.8
Administrative Services	EPM	\$15,520.3	\$0.0	\$0.0
Administrative Services	SUPERFUND	\$14,211.8	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Administrative Services</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$29,732.1</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Air Toxics Research	S&T	\$19,077.0	\$18,923.4	\$19,883.7
Air, State, Local and Tribal Assistance Grants: Other Air Grants	STAG	\$227,724.5	\$240,724.5	\$240,724.5
American Indian Environmental Office	EPM	\$10,014.8	\$9,911.6	\$10,219.7
Assessments	SUPERFUND	\$79,417.5	\$76,472.9	\$76,236.3
Assistance Agreement Audits	IG	\$1,631.7	\$1,500.0	\$0.0
Assistance Agreement Audits	IG SFUND XFER	\$1,855.9	\$0.0	\$0.0
Assistance Agreement Audits	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$500.0	\$0.0
<i>Assistance Agreement Audits</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$3,487.6</i>	<i>\$2,000.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Assistance Agreement Investigations	IG	\$793.6	\$1,885.0	\$0.0
Assistance Agreement Investigations	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$1,015.0	\$0.0
<i>Assistance Agreement Investigations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$793.6</i>	<i>\$2,900.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Beach Grants	STAG	\$0.0	\$10,000.0	\$10,000.0
Brownfields	EPM	\$2,634.9	\$2,819.2	\$29,500.0
Brownfields	STAG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$170,500.0
Brownfields	SUPERFUND	\$89,905.4	\$94,813.5	\$0.0
<i>Brownfields</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$92,540.3</i>	<i>\$97,632.7</i>	<i>\$200,000.0</i>
Capacity Building	EPM	\$9,917.1	\$9,511.1	\$10,543.4
Capacity Building	S&T	\$162.5	\$169.6	\$175.9
Capacity Building	SUPERFUND	\$1,611.1	\$1,075.5	\$1,368.5
<i>Capacity Building</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$11,690.7</i>	<i>\$10,756.2</i>	<i>\$12,087.8</i>
Carbon Monoxide	EPM	\$3,879.8	\$3,964.3	\$3,834.3
Carbon Monoxide	S&T	\$182.5	\$294.1	\$190.8
<i>Carbon Monoxide</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$4,062.3</i>	<i>\$4,258.4</i>	<i>\$4,025.1</i>
Chesapeake Bay	EPM	\$20,728.0	\$20,551.8	\$20,650.8
Children's Indoor Environments	EPM	\$14,714.1	\$13,287.9	\$13,918.4

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
Childrens Health, Program Development and Coordination	EPM	\$6,036.9	\$6,099.0	\$6,670.9
Civil Enforcement	EPM	\$95,752.3	\$95,090.8	\$93,182.4
Civil Enforcement	Oil Spill	\$1,264.7	\$1,512.0	\$1,538.6
Civil Enforcement	S&T	\$2,979.4	\$2,669.1	\$2,739.0
Civil Enforcement	SUPERFUND	\$4,085.3	\$4,289.5	\$4,379.5
<i>Civil Enforcement</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$104,081.7</i>	<i>\$103,561.4</i>	<i>\$101,839.5</i>
Civil Rights/Title VI Compliance	EPM	\$9,140.1	\$11,143.6	\$11,770.7
Climate Change Research	S&T	\$22,550.4	\$21,350.5	\$21,729.3
Climate Protection Program: Buildings	EPM	\$52,535.0	\$48,571.3	\$49,820.5
Climate Protection Program: Carbon Removal	EPM	\$997.8	\$1,549.7	\$1,576.3
Climate Protection Program: Industry	EPM	\$31,929.6	\$25,368.6	\$25,673.1
Climate Protection Program: International Capacity Building	EPM	\$5,501.7	\$6,982.8	\$7,086.5
Climate Protection Program: State and Local Climate Change Program	EPM	\$2,494.5	\$2,245.6	\$2,275.2
Climate Protection Program: Transportation	EPM	\$2,494.5	\$4,404.8	\$4,447.9
Climate Protection Program: Transportation	S&T	\$26,940.6	\$26,425.9	\$17,119.3
<i>Climate Protection Program: Transportation</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$29,435.1</i>	<i>\$30,830.7</i>	<i>\$21,567.2</i>
Coastal Environmental Monitoring	S&T	\$7,467.5	\$7,325.3	\$7,671.2
Commission for Environmental Cooperation - CEC	EPM	\$3,269.0	\$3,396.4	\$3,535.3
Common Sense Initiative	EPM	\$1,781.1	\$1,838.7	\$0.0
Communicating Research Information	ORD SFUND XFER	\$138.3	\$160.7	\$0.0
Communicating Research Information	S&T	\$5,817.3	\$5,383.0	\$5,408.9
Communicating Research Information	SFUND RESEAR	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$160.7
<i>Communicating Research Information</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$5,955.6</i>	<i>\$5,543.7</i>	<i>\$5,569.6</i>
Community Assistance	EPM	\$4,174.5	\$1,124.6	\$1,428.9
Community Right to Know (Title III)	EPM	\$4,861.1	\$4,968.4	\$4,953.1
Compliance Assistance and Centers	EPM	\$25,097.8	\$25,735.4	\$25,106.7
Compliance Assistance and Centers	LUST	\$656.4	\$670.0	\$689.8
Compliance Assistance and Centers	Oil Spill	\$267.9	\$264.8	\$271.4
<i>Compliance Assistance and Centers</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$26,022.1</i>	<i>\$26,670.2</i>	<i>\$26,067.9</i>
Compliance Incentives	EPM	\$10,093.3	\$9,512.0	\$9,344.6
Compliance Incentives	SUPERFUND	\$394.4	\$583.3	\$345.3
<i>Compliance Incentives</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$10,487.7</i>	<i>\$10,095.3</i>	<i>\$9,689.9</i>
Compliance Monitoring	EPM	\$54,166.5	\$50,572.2	\$48,487.0
Compliance Monitoring	S&T	\$2,614.7	\$2,644.1	\$2,711.4
<i>Compliance Monitoring</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$56,781.2</i>	<i>\$53,216.3</i>	<i>\$51,198.4</i>

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
Congressional Projects	EPM	\$1,979.2	\$2,078.6	\$1,991.3
Congressional/Legislative Analysis	EPM	\$4,357.6	\$4,852.2	\$4,857.8
Congressionally Mandated Projects	EPM	\$102,581.9	\$85,223.6	\$0.0
Congressionally Mandated Projects	S&T	\$49,785.1	\$58,977.0	\$0.0
Congressionally Mandated Projects	STAG	\$353,650.4	\$343,900.0	\$0.0
<i>Congressionally Mandated Projects</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$506,017.4</i>	<i>\$488,100.6</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Contract Audits	IG	\$4,165.3	\$3,900.0	\$0.0
Contract Audits	IG SFUND XFER	\$860.1	\$0.0	\$0.0
Contract Audits	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$1,300.0	\$0.0
<i>Contract Audits</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$5,025.4</i>	<i>\$5,200.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Contract and Procurement Investigations	IG	\$510.1	\$2,325.0	\$0.0
Contract and Procurement Investigations	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$775.0	\$0.0
<i>Contract and Procurement Investigations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$510.1</i>	<i>\$3,100.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Correspondence Coordination	EPM	\$2,658.6	\$1,200.7	\$1,096.3
Criminal Enforcement	EPM	\$25,669.0	\$26,321.3	\$26,855.3
Criminal Enforcement	S&T	\$5,095.8	\$5,465.8	\$5,643.2
Criminal Enforcement	SUPERFUND	\$10,075.3	\$9,768.6	\$10,039.6
<i>Criminal Enforcement</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$40,840.1</i>	<i>\$41,555.7</i>	<i>\$42,538.1</i>
Data Collection	EPM	\$6,451.4	\$103.1	\$125.9
Data Collection	SUPERFUND	\$393.4	\$22.8	\$0.0
<i>Data Collection</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$6,844.8</i>	<i>\$125.9</i>	<i>\$125.9</i>
Data Management	EPM	\$16,680.7	\$17,247.6	\$17,768.6
Data Management	SUPERFUND	\$1,262.7	\$1,223.0	\$1,234.2
<i>Data Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$17,943.4</i>	<i>\$18,470.6</i>	<i>\$19,002.8</i>
Data Standards	EPM	\$3,165.6	\$1,512.9	\$2,510.3
Data Standards	S&T	\$3,032.9	\$3,563.2	\$3,633.8
Data Standards	SUPERFUND	\$647.8	\$263.8	\$336.5
<i>Data Standards</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$6,846.3</i>	<i>\$5,339.9</i>	<i>\$6,480.6</i>
Design for the Environment	EPM	\$4,965.6	\$4,707.6	\$4,810.7
Direct Public Information and Assistance	EPM	\$10,431.0	\$8,612.7	\$8,998.4
Disadvantaged Communities	EPM	\$4,309.6	\$4,350.8	\$4,481.3
Drinking Water Implementation	EPM	\$35,058.0	\$38,332.9	\$38,935.0
Drinking Water Regulations	EPM	\$33,585.6	\$25,908.9	\$27,241.4
Drinking Water Regulations	S&T	\$2,595.5	\$2,688.5	\$2,792.6
<i>Drinking Water Regulations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$36,181.1</i>	<i>\$28,597.4</i>	<i>\$30,034.0</i>
EMPACT	EPM	\$7,782.8	\$0.0	\$0.0
EMPACT	S&T	\$5,986.8	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>EMPACT</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$13,769.6</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Ecosystems Condition, Protection and	S&T	\$101,267.3	\$104,492.9	\$105,795.0

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
Restoration Research				
Effluent Guidelines	EPM	\$23,354.1	\$22,773.4	\$23,010.3
Employee Integrity Investigations	IG	\$325.8	\$750.0	\$0.0
Employee Integrity Investigations	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$250.0	\$0.0
<i>Employee Integrity Investigations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$325.8</i>	<i>\$1,000.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Endocrine Disruptor Research	S&T	\$12,849.4	\$10,722.4	\$12,178.7
Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program	EPM	\$10,128.5	\$8,952.4	\$9,063.5
Enforcement Training	EPM	\$4,236.7	\$3,230.3	\$3,145.4
Enforcement Training	SUPERFUND	\$1,041.0	\$717.0	\$735.0
<i>Enforcement Training</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$5,277.7</i>	<i>\$3,947.3</i>	<i>\$3,880.4</i>
Environment and Trade	EPM	\$1,700.0	\$1,672.6	\$1,844.3
Environmental Appeals Boards	EPM	\$1,553.1	\$1,667.3	\$1,737.7
Environmental Education Division	EPM	\$9,003.4	\$9,160.2	\$0.0
Environmental Finance Center Grants (EFC)	EPM	\$1,249.0	\$2,000.0	\$2,000.0
Environmental Justice	EPM	\$4,148.5	\$4,164.4	\$4,078.8
Environmental Justice	SUPERFUND	\$997.8	\$900.0	\$900.0
<i>Environmental Justice</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$5,146.3</i>	<i>\$5,064.4</i>	<i>\$4,978.8</i>
Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program, EMAP	S&T	\$29,613.7	\$32,426.0	\$38,259.6
Environmental Technology Verification (ETV)	S&T	\$6,294.0	\$3,607.7	\$3,617.6
Executive Support	EPM	\$2,835.7	\$3,113.0	\$3,121.2
Existing Chemical Data, Screening, Testing and Management	EPM	\$24,522.4	\$28,286.4	\$28,331.9
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	B & F	\$23,878.4	\$25,318.0	\$31,418.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	EPM	\$270,069.3	\$280,850.7	\$279,773.2
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	LUST	\$847.3	\$841.5	\$824.7
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	Oil Spill	\$517.6	\$454.1	\$451.9
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	S&T	\$21,405.7	\$17,409.9	\$8,539.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	SUPERFUND	\$55,444.3	\$57,507.1	\$55,357.0
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$372,162.6</i>	<i>\$382,381.3</i>	<i>\$376,363.8</i>
Federal Facilities	SUPERFUND	\$30,622.0	\$31,206.5	\$31,915.5
Federal Facility IAGs	SUPERFUND	\$8,455.1	\$8,784.7	\$9,091.7
Federal Preparedness	SUPERFUND	\$9,728.2	\$9,849.3	\$9,883.0
Financial Statement Audits	IG	\$3,250.3	\$3,000.0	\$0.0
Financial Statement Audits	IG SFUND XFER	\$749.7	\$0.0	\$0.0
Financial Statement Audits	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$1,000.0	\$0.0
<i>Financial Statement Audits</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$4,000.0</i>	<i>\$4,000.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Fish Contamination/Consumption	EPM	\$3,188.4	\$2,764.8	\$2,788.4
GLOBE	EPM	\$997.8	\$0.0	\$0.0
Geospatial	EPM	\$522.3	\$983.2	\$743.4

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
Geospatial	SUPERFUND	\$0.0	\$32.1	\$0.0
<i>Geospatial</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$522.3</i>	<i>\$1,015.3</i>	<i>\$743.4</i>
Global Toxics	EPM	\$1,579.3	\$1,522.8	\$1,415.1
Global Trade Issues for Pesticides and Chemicals	EPM	\$2,703.7	\$3,091.2	\$3,125.4
Grants to States for Lead Risk Reduction	STAG	\$13,682.0	\$13,682.0	\$13,682.0
Great Lakes	EPM	\$3,114.4	\$3,208.6	\$2,684.7
Great Lakes National Program Office	EPM	\$15,266.3	\$14,929.7	\$15,128.2
Gulf of Mexico	EPM	\$4,341.2	\$4,261.6	\$4,327.4
Hazardous Air Pollutants	EPM	\$49,407.8	\$48,130.9	\$48,687.2
Hazardous Air Pollutants	S&T	\$3,882.4	\$4,094.4	\$3,935.2
<i>Hazardous Air Pollutants</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$53,290.2</i>	<i>\$52,225.3</i>	<i>\$52,622.4</i>
Hazardous Substance Research:Hazardous Substance Research Centers	ORD SFUND XFER	\$2,282.6	\$2,331.7	\$0.0
Hazardous Substance Research:Hazardous Substance Research Centers	SFUND RESEAR	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$2,354.1
Hazardous Substance Research:Hazardous Substance Research Centers	SUPERFUND	\$2,245.1	\$2,245.1	\$2,245.1
<i>Hazardous Substance Research:Hazardous Substance Research Centers</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$4,527.7</i>	<i>\$4,576.8</i>	<i>\$4,599.2</i>
Hazardous Substance Research:Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE)	ORD SFUND XFER	\$6,554.0	\$6,501.0	\$0.0
Hazardous Substance Research:Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE)	SFUND RESEAR	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$6,545.0
<i>Hazardous Substance Research:Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE)</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$6,554.0</i>	<i>\$6,501.0</i>	<i>\$6,545.0</i>
Hazardous Waste Research	S&T	\$6,990.0	\$9,088.3	\$9,548.7
Homeland Security	B & F	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$11,500.0
Homeland Security	EPM	\$0.0	\$3,816.3	\$9,509.6
Homeland Security	HOMELAND SECURITY	\$0.0	\$170,600.0	\$0.0
Homeland Security	S&T	\$1,963.2	\$4,745.7	\$18,446.5
Homeland Security	SFUND RESEAR	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$75,000.0
Homeland Security	SUPERFUND	\$3,194.0	\$3,927.2	\$13,956.1
<i>Homeland Security</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$5,157.2</i>	<i>\$183,089.2</i>	<i>\$128,412.2</i>
Homestake Mine	STAG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$8,000.0
Human Health Research	S&T	\$49,825.7	\$47,225.6	\$51,824.5
Immediate Office of the Administrator	EPM	\$3,994.1	\$3,175.9	\$4,343.7
Indoor Environments	EPM	\$8,579.3	\$9,036.7	\$8,978.1
Indoor Environments	S&T	\$662.6	\$329.5	\$329.5
<i>Indoor Environments</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$9,241.9</i>	<i>\$9,366.2</i>	<i>\$9,307.6</i>
Information Exchange Network	STAG	\$0.0	\$25,000.0	\$25,000.0
Information Integration	EPM	\$5,860.2	\$5,783.6	\$17,057.0

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
Information Integration	SUPERFUND	\$0.0	\$332.5	\$3,100.0
<i>Information Integration</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$5,860.2</i>	<i>\$6,116.1</i>	<i>\$20,157.0</i>
Information Technology Management	EPM	\$27,394.4	\$25,291.0	\$25,544.4
Information Technology Management	S&T	\$187.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Information Technology Management	SUPERFUND	\$3,212.4	\$3,230.4	\$2,537.9
<i>Information Technology Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$30,793.8</i>	<i>\$28,521.4</i>	<i>\$28,082.3</i>
Intergovernmental Relations - OA	EPM	\$3,111.2	\$3,687.2	\$4,128.1
International Safe Drinking Water	EPM	\$384.4	\$0.0	\$0.0
Investigations	IG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$6,959.4
Investigations	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$2,510.2
<i>Investigations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$9,469.6</i>
LUST Cleanup Programs	LUST	\$10,055.4	\$10,067.4	\$10,285.4
Lake Champlain	EPM	\$1,995.6	\$2,500.0	\$954.8
Lead	EPM	\$329.5	\$342.2	\$339.6
Lead Risk Reduction Program	EPM	\$14,214.3	\$13,092.6	\$13,166.3
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST)Cooperative Agreements	LUST	\$58,341.3	\$59,331.9	\$58,341.2
Legal Services	EPM	\$38,594.5	\$41,783.6	\$45,458.2
Legal Services	SUPERFUND	\$810.9	\$819.5	\$844.5
<i>Legal Services</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$39,405.4</i>	<i>\$42,603.1</i>	<i>\$46,302.7</i>
Long Island Sound	EPM	\$4,989.0	\$2,500.0	\$477.4
Management Services and Stewardship	EPM	\$87,515.4	\$96,334.8	\$107,290.8
Management Services and Stewardship	LUST	\$368.2	\$486.1	\$518.3
Management Services and Stewardship	Oil Spill	\$6.2	\$44.7	\$53.2
Management Services and Stewardship	S&T	\$129.5	\$176.8	\$198.7
Management Services and Stewardship	SUPERFUND	\$27,142.3	\$40,115.1	\$41,245.0
<i>Management Services and Stewardship</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$115,161.6</i>	<i>\$137,157.5</i>	<i>\$149,306.0</i>
Marine Pollution	EPM	\$8,198.5	\$7,994.8	\$8,170.7
Multi_Media Communications	EPM	\$0.0	\$821.3	\$870.3
Multilateral Fund	EPM	\$10,975.8	\$9,575.8	\$9,575.8
NACEPT Support	EPM	\$1,560.6	\$1,803.1	\$1,670.1
NAFTA Implementation	EPM	\$403.3	\$514.3	\$747.9
NEPA Implementation	EPM	\$11,081.4	\$11,507.5	\$11,785.8
NPDES Program	EPM	\$40,961.5	\$40,991.0	\$41,720.8
National Association Liaison	EPM	\$235.5	\$346.0	\$262.5
National Estuaries Program/Coastal Watersheds	EPM	\$20,151.9	\$24,521.3	\$19,246.2
National Nonpoint Source Program Implementation	EPM	\$16,644.6	\$16,488.6	\$16,908.6
National Program chemicals: PCBs, Asbestos, Fibers,and Dioxin	EPM	\$6,103.8	\$6,775.5	\$6,994.5
New Chemical Review	EPM	\$14,224.5	\$14,088.8	\$14,730.2

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
Nitrogen Oxides	EPM	\$1,379.4	\$1,325.5	\$1,399.0
Oil Spills Preparedness, Prevention and Response	Oil Spill	\$11,948.9	\$11,795.4	\$12,332.2
Other Federal Agency Superfund Support	SUPERFUND	\$10,676.5	\$10,676.0	\$10,676.0
Ozone	EPM	\$32,322.5	\$32,783.9	\$34,763.6
Ozone	S&T	\$35,783.8	\$35,671.2	\$42,735.2
<i>Ozone</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$68,106.3</i>	<i>\$68,455.1</i>	<i>\$77,498.8</i>
PBTI	EPM	\$2,455.1	\$2,572.5	\$2,580.5
POPs Implementation	EPM	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$680.3
PWSS - Homeland Security	STAG	\$0.0	\$5,000.0	\$5,000.0
Pacific Northwest	EPM	\$1,078.6	\$1,003.8	\$1,028.5
Particulate Matter	EPM	\$32,466.9	\$29,561.0	\$32,118.5
Particulate Matter	S&T	\$23,150.4	\$22,741.7	\$30,505.8
<i>Particulate Matter</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$55,617.3</i>	<i>\$52,302.7</i>	<i>\$62,624.3</i>
Particulate Matter Research	S&T	\$65,457.3	\$65,468.2	\$66,662.0
Partnerships to Reduce High Risk Pesticide Use	EPM	\$11,851.9	\$10,407.0	\$12,279.8
Performance Track	EPM	\$1,995.6	\$1,834.6	\$1,834.6
Pesticide Registration	EPM	\$39,813.2	\$41,005.9	\$39,981.5
Pesticide Registration	S&T	\$2,069.2	\$2,006.8	\$2,138.7
<i>Pesticide Registration</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$41,882.4</i>	<i>\$43,012.7</i>	<i>\$42,120.2</i>
Pesticide Reregistration	EPM	\$33,844.6	\$35,218.6	\$45,993.2
Pesticide Reregistration	S&T	\$2,110.0	\$2,364.7	\$2,377.9
<i>Pesticide Reregistration</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$35,954.6</i>	<i>\$37,583.3</i>	<i>\$48,371.1</i>
Pesticide Residue Tolerance Reassessments	EPM	\$14,656.3	\$14,671.8	\$5,267.9
Pesticide Residue Tolerance Reassessments	S&T	\$137.2	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Pesticide Residue Tolerance Reassessments</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$14,793.5</i>	<i>\$14,671.8</i>	<i>\$5,267.9</i>
Pesticides Program Implementation Grant	STAG	\$13,085.5	\$13,085.5	\$13,085.5
Planning and Resource Management	EPM	\$34,630.0	\$38,560.2	\$43,857.8
Planning and Resource Management	LUST	\$907.0	\$772.3	\$813.9
Planning and Resource Management	SUPERFUND	\$12,056.5	\$16,962.8	\$18,119.4
<i>Planning and Resource Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$47,593.5</i>	<i>\$56,295.3</i>	<i>\$62,791.1</i>
Planning, Analysis, and Results - IG	IG	\$7,916.1	\$4,609.0	\$0.0
	IG SFUND			
Planning, Analysis, and Results - IG	XFER	\$1,547.2	\$0.0	\$0.0
Planning, Analysis, and Results - IG	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$1,677.0	\$0.0
<i>Planning, Analysis, and Results - IG</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$9,463.3</i>	<i>\$6,286.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Pollution Prevention Incentive Grants to States	STAG	\$5,986.3	\$5,986.3	\$5,986.3
Pollution Prevention Program	EPM	\$10,066.4	\$9,597.8	\$9,902.8
Preventing Contamination of Drinking Water Sources	EPM	\$22,424.7	\$23,470.2	\$22,096.8
Program Audits	IG	\$4,148.9	\$3,675.0	\$0.0

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
Program Audits	IG SFUND XFER	\$2,030.1	\$0.0	\$0.0
Program Audits	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$1,225.0	\$0.0
<i>Program Audits</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$6,179.0</i>	<i>\$4,900.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Program Evaluation - IG	IG	\$10,877.2	\$11,250.0	\$0.0
Program Evaluation - IG	IG SFUND XFER	\$4,431.7	\$0.0	\$0.0
Program Evaluation - IG	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$3,750.0	\$0.0
<i>Program Evaluation - IG</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$15,308.9</i>	<i>\$15,000.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Program Evaluations/Audit	IG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$28,365.6
Program Evaluations/Audit	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$10,231.8
<i>Program Evaluations/Audit</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$38,597.4</i>
Program Integrity Investigations	IG	\$400.0	\$1,125.0	\$0.0
Program Integrity Investigations	Superfund-IG	\$0.0	\$375.0	\$0.0
<i>Program Integrity Investigations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$400.0</i>	<i>\$1,500.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Project XL	EPM	\$3,075.3	\$0.0	\$0.0
Public Access	EPM	\$10,265.4	\$12,931.2	\$14,068.3
Public Access	S&T	\$577.9	\$279.3	\$324.8
Public Access	SUPERFUND	\$691.6	\$703.8	\$1,176.3
<i>Public Access</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$11,534.9</i>	<i>\$13,914.3</i>	<i>\$15,569.4</i>
RCRA Corrective Action	EPM	\$41,150.9	\$38,262.3	\$38,965.2
RCRA Enforcement State Grants	STAG	\$43,127.6	\$42,904.7	\$42,904.7
RCRA Improved Waste Management	EPM	\$62,477.7	\$61,174.6	\$61,860.0
RCRA State Grants	STAG	\$63,236.0	\$63,458.9	\$63,458.9
RCRA Waste Reduction	EPM	\$11,689.0	\$14,633.7	\$13,740.7
Radiation	EPM	\$14,124.1	\$13,897.5	\$14,253.5
Radiation	S&T	\$5,200.1	\$5,546.2	\$5,931.3
Radiation	SUPERFUND	\$2,064.1	\$2,180.3	\$2,234.3
<i>Radiation</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$21,388.3</i>	<i>\$21,624.0</i>	<i>\$22,419.1</i>
Radon	EPM	\$4,945.7	\$5,095.7	\$5,095.7
Radon	S&T	\$1,277.0	\$1,357.3	\$1,398.2
<i>Radon</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$6,222.7</i>	<i>\$6,453.0</i>	<i>\$6,493.9</i>
Recreational Water and Wet Weather Flows Research	S&T	\$5,926.4	\$5,635.8	\$5,496.6
Regional Geographic Program	EPM	\$8,192.3	\$7,609.2	\$8,651.1
Regional Haze	EPM	\$2,305.9	\$2,535.9	\$2,408.1
<i>Regional Haze</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$2,305.9</i>	<i>\$2,535.9</i>	<i>\$2,408.1</i>
Regional Management	EPM	\$33,146.5	\$32,104.4	\$32,476.8
Regional Management	LUST	\$104.3	\$143.7	\$143.7
Regional Management	Oil Spill	\$24.9	\$23.8	\$23.8
Regional Management	SUPERFUND	\$8,617.6	\$8,485.0	\$8,577.2

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
<i>Regional Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	\$41,893.3	\$40,756.9	\$41,221.5
Regional Operations and Liaison	EPM	\$428.3	\$547.5	\$477.6
Regional Program Infrastructure	EPM	\$4,712.1	\$4,604.6	\$4,604.6
Regional Program Infrastructure	LUST	\$40.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Regional Program Infrastructure	SUPERFUND	\$1,425.0	\$1,527.6	\$1,427.5
<i>Regional Program Infrastructure</i>	<i>Total</i>	\$6,177.1	\$6,132.2	\$6,032.1
Regional Science and Technology	EPM	\$3,850.3	\$3,574.9	\$3,601.8
Regional and Global Environmental Policy Development				
	EPM	\$2,697.8	\$2,362.7	\$2,046.8
Regulatory Development	EPM	\$23,418.4	\$27,412.1	\$36,381.5
Reinventing Environmental Information (REI)	EPM	\$0.0	\$7,812.1	\$7,542.8
Reinventing Environmental Information (REI)	S&T	\$0.0	\$33.5	\$0.0
Reinventing Environmental Information (REI)	SUPERFUND	\$0.0	\$778.2	\$357.2
<i>Reinventing Environmental Information (REI)</i>	<i>Total</i>	\$0.0	\$8,623.8	\$7,900.0
Research to Support Contaminated Sites	LUST	\$617.5	\$687.1	\$696.0
Research to Support Contaminated Sites	ORD SFUND XFER	\$26,464.6	\$27,304.6	\$0.0
Research to Support Contaminated Sites	Oil Spill	\$936.8	\$905.2	\$909.9
Research to Support Contaminated Sites	S&T	\$2,647.6	\$1,000.0	\$0.0
Research to Support Contaminated Sites	SFUND RESEAR	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$26,515.2
<i>Research to Support Contaminated Sites</i>	<i>Total</i>	\$30,666.5	\$29,896.9	\$28,121.1
Research to Support Emerging Issues	S&T	\$23,365.6	\$28,658.5	\$29,150.8
Research to Support FQPA	S&T	\$12,120.0	\$12,594.4	\$12,042.3
Research to Support Pollution Prevention	ORD SFUND XFER	\$980.2	\$593.0	\$0.0
Research to Support Pollution Prevention	S&T	\$38,176.3	\$37,079.9	\$43,482.4
Research to Support Pollution Prevention	SFUND RESEAR	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$593.0
<i>Research to Support Pollution Prevention</i>	<i>Total</i>	\$39,156.5	\$37,672.9	\$44,075.4
Research to Support Safe Communities	S&T	\$20,093.7	\$21,593.6	\$25,149.6
Risk Management Plans	EPM	\$8,005.5	\$7,202.9	\$7,446.0
SBREFA	EPM	\$571.9	\$686.2	\$608.8
STAR Fellowships Program	S&T	\$9,704.3	\$9,748.7	\$0.0
Safe Drinking Water Research	S&T	\$47,784.7	\$45,579.5	\$49,491.0
Safe Pesticide Applications	EPM	\$10,135.4	\$11,157.2	\$10,193.9
Safe Pesticide Applications	S&T	\$0.0	\$25.0	\$0.0
<i>Safe Pesticide Applications</i>	<i>Total</i>	\$10,135.4	\$11,182.2	\$10,193.9
Safe Recreational Waters	EPM	\$917.9	\$834.4	\$842.7
Science Advisory Board	EPM	\$2,775.1	\$2,887.8	\$3,352.5

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
Science Coordination and Policy	EPM	\$275.8	\$492.2	\$950.1
Sector Grants	STAG	\$2,209.3	\$2,209.3	\$2,209.3
Small Business Ombudsman	EPM	\$3,000.9	\$3,049.1	\$3,124.0
Small, Minority, Women-Owned Business Assistance	EPM	\$2,048.2	\$2,295.5	\$3,305.0
South Florida/Everglades	EPM	\$2,942.0	\$2,648.3	\$2,665.5
State Multimedia Enforcement Grants	STAG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$15,000.0
State Nonpoint Source Grants	STAG	\$237,476.8	\$237,476.8	\$238,476.8
State PWSS Grants	STAG	\$93,100.2	\$93,100.2	\$93,100.2
State Pesticides Enforcement Grants	STAG	\$19,867.8	\$19,867.8	\$19,867.8
State Pollution Control Grants (Section 106)	STAG	\$171,883.3	\$192,476.9	\$180,376.9
State Toxics Enforcement Grants	STAG	\$5,138.9	\$5,138.9	\$5,138.9
State Underground Injection Control Grants	STAG	\$10,950.9	\$10,950.9	\$10,950.9
State Water Quality Cooperative Agreements	STAG	\$18,958.2	\$18,958.2	\$38,958.2
State Wetlands Program Grants	STAG	\$14,967.0	\$14,967.0	\$14,967.0
Stratospheric Ozone Protection	EPM	\$5,771.9	\$5,602.7	\$5,642.2
Sulfur Dioxide	EPM	\$12,158.1	\$12,318.5	\$13,624.7
Superfund - Cost Recovery	SUPERFUND	\$29,495.5	\$29,477.5	\$30,375.9
Superfund - Justice Support	SUPERFUND	\$28,437.3	\$28,150.0	\$28,150.0
Superfund - Maximize PRP Involvement (including reforms)	SUPERFUND	\$82,193.9	\$81,701.1	\$84,396.9
Superfund Remedial Actions	SUPERFUND	\$498,286.4	\$488,951.3	\$493,646.5
Superfund Removal Actions	SUPERFUND	\$198,973.0	\$202,654.0	\$202,610.3
System Modernization	EPM	\$12,163.6	\$12,875.0	\$12,210.0
System Modernization	SUPERFUND	\$1,496.4	\$815.0	\$1,480.0
<i>System Modernization</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$13,660.0</i>	<i>\$13,690.0</i>	<i>\$13,690.0</i>
TMDLs	EPM	\$20,594.5	\$21,232.1	\$21,433.2
Technical Cooperation with Industrial and Developing Countries	EPM	\$4,162.2	\$4,478.4	\$4,330.1
Toxic Release Inventory / Right-to-Know (RtK)	EPM	\$14,105.6	\$14,155.6	\$15,293.2
Tribal General Assistance Grants	STAG	\$52,469.7	\$52,469.7	\$57,469.7
Tropospheric Ozone Research	S&T	\$6,551.0	\$6,514.8	\$6,758.1
U.S. - Mexico Border	EPM	\$4,384.2	\$4,149.5	\$5,364.6
UST State Grants	STAG	\$11,918.4	\$11,918.4	\$11,918.4
Underground Storage Tanks (UST)	EPM	\$7,045.8	\$6,795.7	\$7,026.4
Wastewater Management/Tech Innovations	EPM	\$9,055.0	\$8,840.1	\$9,073.7
Water Infrastructure: Alaska Native Villages	STAG	\$34,923.0	\$40,000.0	\$40,000.0
Water Infrastructure:Bristol County	STAG	\$1,935.7	\$0.0	\$0.0
Water Infrastructure:Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CW-SRF)	STAG	\$1,347,030.0	\$1,350,000.0	\$1,212,000.0
Water Infrastructure:Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DW-SRF)	STAG	\$823,185.0	\$850,000.0	\$850,000.0

Key Program	Approp.	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request
Water Infrastructure:Mexico Border	STAG	\$74,835.0	\$75,000.0	\$75,000.0
Water Quality Criteria and Standards	EPM	\$19,515.2	\$18,782.4	\$19,127.2
Water Quality Infrastructure Protection	EPM	\$16,704.3	\$16,783.7	\$17,239.3
Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment	EPM	\$11,811.0	\$11,665.1	\$11,967.7
Watershed Assistance	EPM	\$8,467.8	\$7,821.6	\$9,479.1
Web Products Quality Control	EPM	\$0.0	\$879.5	\$767.0
Wetlands	EPM	\$17,651.0	\$17,829.8	\$18,381.9

MAJOR MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

Introduction

One of the most critical challenges facing federal managers today is preserving the public's trust in the integrity of government programs. EPA is strongly committed to achieving its goals and objectives in a manner that maintains this integrity. Over the past several years EPA senior managers have placed a high priority on strengthening results-based management and overall accountability and on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of environmental programs. The Agency uses a system of internal program reviews, independent reviews, and audits by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and EPA's Office of the Inspector General (OIG); program evaluations; and performance measurements to ensure that program activities are effectively carried out in accordance with applicable laws and sound management policy and to provide reasonable assurance that Agency resources are protected against fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement.

Over the next several years EPA faces a number of management challenges, including the government-wide initiatives identified in the President's Management Agenda; the government-wide high-risk areas and major management challenges identified by GAO in its January 2001 update to their Performance and Accountability Series reports to Congress, as well as issues identified by EPA's OIG. Information is provided below on efforts underway to address these issues and other critical management challenges facing the Agency.

Protecting Infrastructure from Nontraditional Attacks

Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 63, initiated in May 1998, assigned EPA as the designated Lead Agency and Sector Liaison for the Nation's water systems. To meet the requirements of PDD 63, EPA needs to work with private sector representatives to complete a national framework for protecting the critical infrastructure of the Nation's water systems from terrorist attack, conduct vulnerability assessments and risk mitigation, and implement a Vulnerability Awareness and Education Program for the water sector. EPA's OIG identified this issue as a management challenge in FY 2002.

The Agency is playing a significant role in protecting the public from terrorist attempts to endanger drinking water supplies and wastewater systems. Agency activities in FY 2000 and 2001 were designed to initiate development of the materials, tools, and training needed for drinking water systems to conduct vulnerability assessments and to begin development of a secure Information Sharing and Analysis Center (ISAC), which will allow drinking water utilities to share threat information with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other utilities. In response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the Agency established a Water Protection Task Force with a staff working full-time on implementing PDD 63 and other related activities. In FY 2002 the Agency will continue the development of ISAC, test and modify the vulnerability assessment tool, support the implementation of vulnerability assessments by the 360 largest public water systems nationwide, develop and disseminate guidance for emergency response plans, and train water system operators in the application of vulnerability assessments and remedial plans. These activities are being funded through \$83 million in an FY 2002 supplemental appropriation for EPA. In addition, the Agency will make grants to states to support homeland security coordination work with EPA and drinking water utilities to implement counterterrorism activities.

Linking Mission and Management

EPA's OIG believes the Agency needs to improve its planning, measuring, and accountability by involving its partners in goal and priority setting, linking output and outcome measures of results to its goals, and accounting for the costs of achieving those results. In addition, EPA needs to accumulate, report, link, and use environmental information on activities and outcomes as a basis for determining environmental return on investment, sound resource decisions, and accountability to the public. EPA's OIG declared linking mission and management as a management challenge in FY 2002, combining previous management challenges on accountability and managerial accounting.

EPA has made significant progress over the past year in linking the management of the Agency's resources to its mission and environmental and human health results. EPA involved its state partners in the annual planning and budgeting process by considering state priorities along with EPA headquarters and regional priorities, and consulting with the states at appropriate times during the budget development and appropriations process. The Agency also developed more outcome-oriented annual performance goals and measures. In August 2001 the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) awarded contractor support to program offices for projects geared specifically toward improving annual performance goals and performance measures. In addition, EPA's FY 2002 Final Annual Performance Plan, issued in August 2001, includes 6 percent more outcome-based goals than the final FY 2000 Plan. The Agency also improved its annual report to make it more relevant to Agency decision makers. EPA's *Fiscal Year 2001 Annual Report* focuses on environmental outcomes and demonstrates how Agency activities produce meaningful results and contribute to the health and well-being of the public.

In June 2001 EPA formed the Managing for Improved Results Steering Group, composed of senior leaders from across the Agency. The Steering Group will make recommendations on short- and long-term reforms to EPA's strategic planning, priority-setting, budgeting, and accountability structures and processes to identify potential improvements and to develop a change strategy that will operate on two fronts: (1) identify options for significant, far-reaching reforms to national processes and systems, and (2) pursue incremental changes and smaller-scale improvements that can be implemented immediately. In spring 2002 this group will present the Deputy Administrator with options for improving EPA's results-based management processes.

In addition, EPA continued its outreach efforts to inform Agency managers on the benefits and uses of cost information, and worked with individual program offices to develop further cost accounting applications to enhance program management. The Agency met specific program needs in such diverse areas as user fees, Superfund cost recovery and the Working Capital Fund (WCF).

OCFO developed cost accounting reports to better manage critical activities and programs. For example, the Agency now produces Cost by Output, Superfund Site Specific, Superfund Remedial Action, and WCF Revenue and Expense reports. Many of these reports bring together financial, administrative, and program information from different systems and reports. This was made possible through the OCFO's financial data warehouse and reporting tools which integrate portions of "mixed" administrative management systems (e.g., grants and contracts data) with the core financial system. As a result of this integration, the Agency has expanded the range of cost information available to program managers and is better able to support decision-making based on costs and results. OCFO is continuing to partner with Agency offices to meet current needs and identify future applications.

The Agency recognizes that challenges remain in better linking assessments of program performance with resource decisions, and in identifying goals and measures that better reflect its state partners' goals and priorities and will allow for trends analyses over time. However, EPA made significant progress in FY 2001 and will continue to work diligently toward improving its ability to link its mission and management.

Human Capital Strategy Implementation

EPA must devote considerable attention to building a workforce with the highly specialized skills and knowledge required to accomplish the Agency's work or risk seriously weakening its ability to fulfill even the most basic of its legal, regulatory, and fiduciary responsibilities. With its Human Capital Strategic Plan in place, the Agency has a blueprint for the initial and long-term steps needed to begin addressing this impending weakness. In FY 1998-2002 OIG identified employee competencies as a management challenge, and in FY 2000-2001 GAO identified human capital as a management challenge and a government-wide high risk area. EPA implemented a corrective action strategy and declared human capital strategy implementation as an internal Agency weakness in FY 2000.

EPA developed a comprehensive approach for investing in and managing the Agency's human resources and during FY 2001 began to aggressively implement Investing in Our People: EPA's Strategy for Human Capital, 2001-2003. Specific accomplishments in FY 2001 include (1) graduating the second class of interns and hiring a fourth class; (2) launching the Senior Executive Service (SES) Candidate Development Program, with 50 candidates to be selected for the program in 2002; (3) developing and launching a new course for supervisors and managers that new supervisors will be required to take within the first 90 days of becoming a supervisor; and (4) beginning the rollout of five courses created as part of the Mid-Level Development Program. Completion of corrective actions is expected by FY 2003.

Information System Security

The availability and reliability of environmental information is dependant on the security of the technology platform on which it resides. OIG and GAO reviews and audits have determined that EPA's security program needs considerable improvement. Specifically, OIG audits identified that EPA needs to complete risk assessments on critical information systems and to develop a centralized security program with strong oversight processes to adequately address risks and ensure that valuable information technology (IT) resources and environmental data are secure. Audit tests of computer-based controls concluded that the computer operating systems and the Agency-wide computer network systems that support most of EPA's mission-related and financial operations had significant security weaknesses. At risk was the possible unauthorized access, use, modification, destruction, or denial of service of EPA information resources that could result from exploitation of vulnerabilities. OIG identified EPA's information system security as a management challenge in FY 1997-2002. GAO identified it as a major management challenge in FY 2000-2001. EPA declared information systems security plans as a material weakness in FY 1997 and revised the weakness in FY 2000 to be more comprehensive.

EPA has made substantial improvements in strengthening its information security program by instituting a comprehensive strategy that addresses all security-related deficiencies. Corrective actions include improving the Agency's risk assessment and planning process, implementing major new technical and procedural controls, issuing new policies, and beginning a regular process of testing and evaluation. During FY 2001 EPA completed risk assessments for security-critical applications and systems, conducted training and awareness activities for information security officers and senior managers, and provided general awareness training for all Agency employees. In addition, EPA installed network intrusion-detection and monitoring controls on its centrally managed environment and plans to install additional tools on its distributed systems environment. All corrective actions are expected to be completed by the end of FY 2002.

Data Management Practices

EPA needs to improve the management, comprehensiveness, consistency, reliability, and accuracy of its data to help better measure performance and achieve environmental results. In addition, the Agency needs to develop error detection processes to ensure that errors in its databases are addressed appropriately and in a timely and documented fashion. EPA broadened the scope of an existing internal Agency data management weakness, consolidating Agency efforts to address the multiplicity of issues related to information management, data accuracy, and error correction. EPA's data management practices was identified as a management challenge from FY 1998–2001 by GAO and from FY 1998-2002 by OIG. EPA declared Information Resources Management (IRM) data management as an Agency weakness in FY 1994 and expanded the scope of the weakness in FY 2000.

EPA is working internally and in partnership with the states to improve data management, comprehensiveness, consistency, reliability, and accuracy for better performance measurement and achievement of environmental results. The Agency completed promulgation of six key data standards and their rules for implementation in FY 2001. The Environmental Data Standards Council developed four additional key data standards in the areas of permitting, enforcement and compliance, water quality monitoring, and tribal identifiers and expects to implement them during FY 2002. The Agency is also working to expand implementation of its Integrated Error Correction Process, which provides an effective feedback mechanism for reporting and resolving errors identified by the public on EPA web sites. From May 2000 to September 2001, EPA received 987 alleged errors and resolved 650 of them; the remainder are still under review. EPA has completed major components of a data architecture to support cross-organizational activities and has begun to develop a formal data architecture document that it expects to complete by May 2002. The Agency expects to fully implement the Central Data Exchange to improve reporting of environmental information by the regulated community and states to EPA by March 2004. The Agency also expects to complete development of a strategic plan for addressing data gaps by December 2002. The Agency anticipates that all corrective actions will be completed by the end of FY 2004.

Results-Based Information Technology Project Management

EPA needs a comprehensive approach to information technology (IT) capital investment planning and a disciplined budget process for managing its assets to meet programmatic objectives. In addition the Agency needs to ensure that IT projects are timely, cost-effective, and results-based. In FY 2001-2002 EPA's OIG identified IT project management as a management challenge. In addition in FY 2001 the Agency declared this issue as an internal Agency weakness and is taking a comprehensive and systematic approach to develop an appropriate strategy to better manage EPA's IT investments. This strategy consists of four overall goals: (1) automate the Agency's capital planning and investment control (CPIC) process by deploying the Information

Technology Investment Portfolio System (I-TIPS), (2) develop a complete investment portfolio aligned with the Agency's technology architecture, (3) improve proposal quality and analysis, and (4) establish efficiencies with other Agency management processes. The Agency anticipates that all corrective actions will be completed by FY 2004.

Relationships with States (NEPPS)

During the past two decades environmental and human health protection programs have grown in size, scope and complexity. Many environmental problems transcend media and geographic boundaries and solutions may require innovative, flexible, cross-media approaches. EPA and the states realize that traditional arrangements for implementing environmental problems were not as efficient and effective as they need to be. Through NEPPS, EPA established a framework to build a result-based management system to focus on joint planning and priority setting and use environmental indicators and outcome measures for accountability. GAO identified EPA-state relationships as a major management challenge in its January 1999 and 2001 reports to Congress on management challenges. OIG also identified EPA's relationships with states as a management challenge in FY 2000-2002. GAO's and OIG's concerns center around fundamental disagreements between EPA and the states over their respective roles, priorities among state environmental programs, and the appropriate degree of federal oversight. EPA relies upon state partners for successful completion of eight of the ten goals in the Agency's Strategic Plan.

The EPA Administrator has placed a greater emphasis on improving the Agency's relations with states, tribes, and other federal agencies. In an August 2001 policy memorandum, the Administrator called for senior Agency leadership to advance the partnership through increasing the Agency's flexibility for states to address the highest priority environmental problems, working with the states to improve performance measures, and generally increasing the incentives for states to improve results-based management under the Performance Partnership System. The Agency is also developing tools that state and EPA regional NEPPS negotiators can use to clarify the appropriate performance expectations. In addition EPA and the Environmental Council of States (ECOS) have an active joint workgroup to address continuing implementation issues and work to identify and remove remaining barriers to effective implementation of the Performance Partnership System.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits

During the 1990s the backlog in EPA-issued major permits tripled and the backlog in state-issued permits doubled. The threat of the backlog to the environment is that expired NPDES permits might not reflect the most recent applicable effluent guidelines, water quality standards, or Total Maximum Daily Loads. Without timely issuance of high-quality permits, necessary improvements in water quality might be delayed. EPA headquarters and regional offices are working together closely to track both Agency- and state-issued permit efforts. EPA's OIG identified the backlog of

NPDES permits as a management challenge in FY 1998-2002, and the Agency declared NPDES permit as a material weakness in FY 1998.

The Agency has made substantial progress in implementing a process to effectively reduce the historical backlog in issuing NPDES permits. EPA, in consultation with state partners, developed and issued guidance—*Approaches for Reducing the NPDES Permit Backlog*—in July 1999. The guidance identifies four strategic objectives for reducing the backlog: (1) understand and better define the backlog, (2) examine permitting efficiencies and facilitate programmatic and technical streamlining opportunities, (3) provide funding and technical support for regions and states, and (4) encourage regions and states to share technical expertise and permitting tools. In May 1999 the Agency established two target dates for completion of corrective actions, one for individual permits for major facilities and one for individual permits for major and minor facilities combined. The target for the major facilities was to have no more than 10 percent of the permits backlogged by the end of the 2001 calendar year; the target for the combined major and minor facilities is 10 percent by the end of the 2004 calendar year. The Agency is also working closely with the regions to manage permit issuance efforts for both EPA- and state-issued NPDES permits. A monthly permit issuance/backlog trend report is distributed to each EPA region and the Agency's stakeholders. In addition, the Agency is examining strategies that will allow concentrating attention on eliminating the permit backlogs that have the most significant environmental impact. Corrective actions are expected to be completed by the end of FY 2005.

Laboratory Quality System Practices

Through internal reviews and OIG investigations, the Agency has found management control weaknesses and some cases of misconduct in laboratories concerning data quality that could impact environmental and enforcement decisions. EPA's OIG identified this issue as a management challenge in FY 1999-2002 and EPA declared it as an internal Agency weakness in FY 2000.

EPA completed independent technical reviews of its laboratories in FY 2001 to assess the Agency's ability to produce data of known and documented quality. The Agency is currently assessing draft review reports and proposed corrective action plans submitted by reviewed organizations. Other ongoing activities include assembling a workgroup consisting of both EPA and non-EPA members that will (1) identify weaknesses in laboratory quality systems that produce analytical data used for Agency decision making; (2) establish methods to detect and deter misconduct in labs; and (3) promote best practices in laboratory performance, documentation, and implementation. In addition each EPA organization will be responsible for establishing management controls to ensure that environmental measurement data supplied by laboratories are of known and documented quality. This effort includes monitoring and oversight of the development and implementation of Agency-approved quality systems by third parties. Completion of corrective actions is expected by December 2003.

Improved Management of Assistance Agreements

OIG audits have found that EPA needs to validate the effectiveness of its strategy for ensuring effective management of its assistance agreements. In FY 2000-2002 OIG identified the Agency's management of assistance agreements as a management challenge. During FY 2001 EPA conducted a review to validate the effectiveness of its post-award management policies. The review found that the Agency has made considerable progress in post-award management but that further improvement is needed. In FY 2002 EPA will consolidate all existing post-award management policies into a single, streamlined policy. In addition, EPA will continue to review quarterly reports and information from the Grantee Compliance Database and evaluate post-award monitoring plans. Completion of corrective actions is expected by FY 2002.

**Proposed New Legislation for Fully Accruing
Federal Employees Retirement and Health Benefits**

In order to reflect more accurate costs of government programs, legislation has been proposed requiring each government Agency to account for their accrued retirement benefits and health care costs. In the past, a portion of the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) and health care costs were centrally managed. However, this resulted in an understatement of the true cost of government programs.

The Budget proposes a shift of these costs from central accounts to the Agency. This shift will ensure all benefits are included in EPA's budget and provide more accurate cost information. The new legislation does not effect budget outlays or alter the surplus/deficit in any way. Costs incurred by the Agency due to the new legislation will be offset by receipts in the pension and health funds.

The chart below presents the amounts associated with shifting this cost from centrally managed accounts to EPA, starting in 2003. In addition, for purposes of comparison, the amounts for fiscal years 2001 and 2002 are provided. This change in treatment of costs is the first in a series of steps that will be taken to ensure that the full annual cost of resources used is charged properly in the budget presentation.

**Cost of Additional Agency Contributions
(Dollars in Millions)**

Appropriation Account	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
Science and Technology	\$14.1	\$14.8	\$15.3
Environmental Programs and Management	\$62.3	\$64.9	\$67.2
Office of Inspector General	\$2.5	\$2.6	\$2.6
Oil Spills Response	\$1.0	\$1.1	\$1.1
Hazardous Substance Superfund	\$18.6	\$19.4	\$20.0
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	\$0.9	\$0.9	\$0.9
FY 2003 Total	\$99.5	\$103.6	\$107.1

STATE and TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS (STAG)
Appropriation Account

	FY 2001 Enacted with Recision (0.022%)	FY 2002 Enacted Budget	FY 2003 Pres Budget Total
STATE/TRIBAL GRANT ASSISTANCE	\$1,005,782.4	\$1,079,376.0	\$1,158,276.0
INFRASTRUCTURE ASSISTANCE			
State Revolving Funds			
Clean Water State Revolving	\$1,347,030.0	\$1,350,000.0	\$1,212,000.0
Drinking Water State Revolving	\$823,185.0	\$850,000.0	\$850,000.0
Consolidated State Revolving	\$2,170,215.0	\$2,200,000.0	\$2,062,000.0
Brownfields Infrastructure Projects	----	----	\$120,500.0
Special Needs Projects			
Mexican Border	\$74,835.0	\$75,000.0	\$75,000.0
Bristol County, MA	\$1,995.6	----	----
Alaskan Native Villages	\$34,923.0	\$40,000.0	\$40,000.0
South Dakota Home Stake N	----	----	\$8,000.0
Needy Cities Projects	\$353,590.5	\$343,900.0	\$0.0
INFRASTRUCTURE ASSISTANCE	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	\$2,305,500.0
TOTAL STAG	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	\$3,463,776.0

CATEGORIAL PROGRAM GRANTS (STAG)
by National Program Manager and State Grant
Dollars in Thousands

Grant	FY 2001 Enacted with Recission (.022%)	FY 2002 Enacted Budget	FY 2003 Pres Budget Total
Air & Radiation			
State and Local Assistance	\$208,540.1	\$221,540.1	\$221,540.1
Tribal Assistance	\$11,044.5	\$11,044.5	\$11,044.5
Radon	\$8,139.9	\$8,139.9	\$8,139.9
	\$227,724.5	\$240,724.5	\$240,724.5
Water			
Pollution Control (Section 106)	\$171,883.3	\$192,476.9	\$180,376.9
Beaches Protection	\$0.0	\$10,000.0	\$10,000.0
Counter-Terrorism	\$0.0	\$5,000.0	\$5,000.0
Nonpoint Source (Section 319)	\$237,476.8	\$237,476.8	\$238,476.8
Wetlands Program Development	\$14,967.0	\$14,967.0	\$14,967.0
Water Quality Cooperative Agrmts	\$18,958.2	\$18,958.2	\$38,958.2
	\$443,285.3	\$478,878.9	\$487,778.9
Drinking Water			
Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	\$93,100.2	\$93,100.2	\$93,100.2
Underground Injection Control (UIC)	\$10,950.9	\$10,950.9	\$10,950.9
	\$104,051.1	\$104,051.1	\$104,051.1
Hazardous Waste			
H.W. Financial Assistance	\$106,363.6	\$106,363.6	\$106,363.6
Brownfields	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$50,000.0
Underground Storage Tanks	\$11,918.4	\$11,918.4	\$11,918.4
	\$118,282.0	\$118,282.0	\$168,282.0
Pesticides & Toxics			
Pesticides Program Implementation	\$13,085.5	\$13,085.5	\$13,085.5
Lead	\$13,682.0	\$13,682.0	\$13,682.0
Toxic Substances Compliance	\$5,138.8	\$5,138.8	\$5,138.8
Pesticides Enforcement	\$19,867.9	\$19,867.8	\$19,867.8
	\$51,774.2	\$51,774.1	\$51,774.1
Multimedia			
Environmental Information	\$0.0	\$25,000.0	\$25,000.0
Enforcement State Grants	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$15,000.0
Pollution Prevention	\$5,986.3	\$5,986.3	\$5,986.3
Enforcement & Compliance Assurance	\$2,209.3	\$2,209.3	\$2,209.3
Indian General Assistance Program	\$52,469.7	\$52,469.7	\$57,469.7
	\$60,665.3	\$85,665.3	\$105,665.3
TOTALS	\$1,005,782.4	\$1,079,376.0	\$1,158,276.0

FY 2003 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS

(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	FY 2003 Goal/ Objective
Air Resource Assistance	Clean Air Act, §103	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA	S/L monitoring and data collection activities in support of the establishment of a PM _{2.5} monitoring network and associated program costs.	\$42,500.0	\$42,500.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1
Air Resource Assistance	Clean Air Act, §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.	\$10,000.0	\$10,000.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	FY 2003 Goal/ Objective
Air Resource Assistance	Clean Air Act, 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 as of 2/1/99	Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program support costs; Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA; Supporting training for CAA section 302(b) air pollution control agency staff; Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to control interstate air pollution	\$169,040.1	\$169,040.1	Goal 1, Obj. All
Air Tribal Assistance	Clean Air Act, Sections 103 and 105; 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	\$11,044.5	\$11,044.5	Goal 1, Obj. 1 Goal 1, Obj. 2

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	FY 2003 Goal/ Objective
Radon	Toxic Substances Control Act, 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	\$8,139.9	\$8,139.9	Goal 4, Obj. 4
Water Pollution Control Agency Resource Supplementation	FWPCA, as amended, §106; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes and Intertribal Consortia, and Interstate Agencies	Develop and carry out surface and ground water pollution control programs, including NPDES permits, TMDL's, WQ standards, monitoring, NPS control and UWA activities.	\$192,476.9	\$180,376.9	Goal 2, Obj. 2
Nonpoint Source (NPS)	FWPCA, as amended, § 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.	\$237,476.8	\$238,476.8	Goal 2, Obj. 3
Wetlands Program Development	FWPCA, as amended, §104 (b)(3); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Interstate Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, and Non-Profit Organizations	To develop new wetland programs or enhance existing programs for the protection, management and restoration of wetland resources.	\$14,967.0	\$14,967.0	Goal 2, Obj. 2

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	FY 2003 Goal/ Objective
Water Quality Cooperative Agreements	FWPCA, as amended, §104(b)(3); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Non-Profit Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, and Interstate Organizations	Creation of unique and innovative approaches to pollution control and prevention requirements associated with wet weather activities, AFOs, TMDLs, source water protection, and targeted watersheds.	\$18,958.2	\$38,958.2	Goal 2, Obj. 2
Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	Safe Drinking Water Act, §1443(a); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, and 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.	\$93,100.2	\$93,100.2	Goal 2, Obj.1
Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) - Homeland Security	Safe Drinking Water Act, §1443(a); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, and Intertribal Consortia	Counterterrorism coordinators to work with EPA and drinking water utilities in assessing drinking water safety.	\$5,000.0	\$5,000.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1
Underground Injection Control [UIC]	Safe Drinking Water Act, § 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.	\$10,950.9	\$10,950.9	Goal 2, Obj. 1

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	FY 2003 Goal/ Objective
Beaches Grants	Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health 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.	\$10,000.0	\$10,000.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1
Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	Resource Conservation Recovery Act, § 3011; FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Development & Implementation of Hazardous Waste Programs	\$106,363.6	\$106,363.6	Goal 4, Obj. 5 Goal 5, Obj.1 & 2 Goal 9, Obj. 1
Brownfields	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, Section 128	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.	\$0.0	\$50,000.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1
Underground Storage Tanks [UST]	Resource Conservation Recovery Act Sections 8001 and 2007(f) and FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	State, Tribes and Intertribal Consortia	Demonstration Grants, Surveys and Training; Develop & implement UST program	\$11,918.4	\$11,918.4	Goal 5, Obj.2

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	FY 2003 Goal/ Objective
Pesticides Program Implementation	The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act § 20 & 23; the FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes and Intertribal Consortia	Assist states and tribes to develop and implement pesticide programs, including programs that protect workers, ground-water, and endangered species from pesticide risks , and other pesticide management programs designated by the Administrator; develop and implement programs for certification and training of pesticide applicators; develop Integrated Pesticides Management (IPM) programs; support pesticides education, outreach, and sampling efforts for tribes.	\$13,085.5	\$13,085.5	Goal 4, Obj. 1
Lead	Toxic Substances Control Act, § 404 (g); TSCA 10; FY2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	To support and assist states and tribes to develop and carry out authorized state lead abatement certification, training and accreditation programs; and to assist tribes in development of lead programs.	\$13,682.0	\$13,682.0	Goal 4, Obj. 2

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	FY 2003 Goal/ Objective
Toxic Substances Compliance Monitoring**	Toxic Substances Control Act, §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	\$5,138.8	\$5,138.8	Goal 9, Obj. 1
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	\$19,867.8	\$19,867.8	Goal 9, Obj. 1
Information Integration	As appropriate, Clean Air Act, Sec. 103; Clean Water Act, Sec. 104; Solid Waste Disposal Act, Sec. 8001; FIFRA, Sec 20; TSCA, Sec. 10 and 28; Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, Sec. 203; Safe Drinking Water Act, Sec. 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); Pollution Prevention Act, Sec. 6605; FY 2002 Appropriations Act and FY 2003 Appropriations Acts.	States, tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortium, and other agencies with related environmental information activities.	Assists states and others to better integrate environmental information systems, better enable data-sharing across programs, and improve access to information.	\$25,000.0	\$25,000.0	Goal 7 Obj. 1

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	FY 2003 Goal/ Objective
Pollution Prevention	Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, §6605; TSCA 10; FY2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	To assist state and tribal programs to promote the use of source reduction techniques by businesses and to promote other Pollution Prevention activities at the state and tribal levels.	\$5,986.3	\$5,986.3	Goal 4, Obj. 5
Enforcement & Compliance Assurance**	As appropriate, Clean Air Act, Sec. 103; Clean Water Act, Sec. 104; Solid Waste Disposal Act, Sec. 8001; FIFRA, Sec 20; TSCA, Sec. 10 and 28; Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, Sec. 203; Safe Drinking Water Act, Sec. 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	State, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Multi-jurisdictional Organizations	Assist in developing innovative sector-based, multi-media, or single-media approaches to enforcement and compliance assurance	\$2,209.3	\$2,209.3	Goal 9, Obj.2

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	FY 2003 Goal/ Objective
Multi-media Enforcement State Grants	FY 2002 Appropriations Act.	States, Tribes, and other entities to be determined.	Media-specific and multi-media funding to states and tribes for compliance assurance activities including compliance assistance and incentives, inspections, and enforcement actions.	\$0	\$15,000.0	Goal 9, Obj. 1
Indian General Assistance Program	Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribal Governments and Intertribal Consortia	Plan, develop and establish Tribal environmental protection programs.	\$52,469.7	\$57,469.7	Goal 4, Obj 7

* The Recipients listed in this column reflect assumptions in the FY 2003 Budget Request in terms of expected and/or anticipated eligible recipients.

** In prior years these grants were displayed as Toxic Enforcement Grants. They are both part of the Toxics Enforcement Key Program [Goal 9, Objectives 1 and 2.]

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

In FY 2003, the Agency begins its seventh year of operation of the Working Capital Fund (WCF). A WCF is a revolving fund authorized by law to finance a cycle of operations, where the costs of goods and services provided are charged to the 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 FY 1998 Appropriations Act.

The Chief Financial Officer and the Office of the Comptroller initiated the WCF in FY 1997 as part of their 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 Deputy CFO, is composed of sixteen permanent members from the program offices and the regional offices.

Two Agency services, begun in FY 1997 will continue into FY 2003. These are the Agency's computer center and telecommunications operations, managed by the Office of Technology Operations and Planning (OTOP), and Agency postage costs, managed by the Office of Administration. The Agency's FY 2003 budget request includes resources for these two activities in each National Program Manager's submission, totaling approximately \$132.0 million. These estimated resources may be increased to incorporate program office's additional service needs during the operating year. To the extent that these increases are subject to Congressional reprogramming notifications, the Agency will comply with all applicable requirements.