

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**  
**2010 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification**

**Table of Contents - Appendix**

---

<b>Coordination with Other Federal Agencies.....</b>	<b>814</b>
Environmental Programs.....	814
Enabling Support Programs.....	844
<b>Major Management Challenges.....</b>	<b>850</b>
<b>EPA User Fee Program.....</b>	<b>869</b>
<b>Working Capital Fund.....</b>	<b>871</b>
<b>Acronyms.....</b>	<b>872</b>
<b>STAG Categorical Program Grants.....</b>	<b>877</b>
Statutory Authority and Eligible Uses.....	877
<b>Program Projects by Appropriation.....</b>	<b>887</b>
<b>Program Projects by Program Area.....</b>	<b>902</b>
<b>Discontinued Programs.....</b>	<b>915</b>
Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training.....	916
Categorical Grant: Target Watershed.....	917
Categorical Grant: Water Quality Cooperative Agreements.....	918
Regional Geographic Initiatives.....	919
<b>Expected Benefits of the President’s E-Government Initiatives.....</b>	<b>920</b>

## COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

### Environmental Programs

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

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

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

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

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

Agriculture on the greenhouse gas transportation rules. EPA is working with DOE and DOT and other agencies, as needed, on the requirements of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

To develop air pollutant emission factors and emission estimation algorithms for aircraft, ground equipment and military vehicles, EPA has partnered with the DoD. This partnership will provide for the joint undertaking of air-monitoring/emission factor research and the successful regulatory implementation of results nationwide.

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

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

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

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

EPA is working with DOE and USTR under the CEC to promote renewable energy markets in North America.

***Objective: Healthier Indoor Air***

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

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

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

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

EPA leads a task force with the Department of Justice (DOJ), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Department of Treasury, and other agencies to curb the illegal importation of ozone-depleting substances (ODS). Illegal import of ODS has the potential to prevent the United States from meeting the goals of the Montreal Protocol to restore the ozone layer.

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

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

EPA consults with the USDA on the potential for domestic methyl bromide needs.

EPA also coordinates closely with FDA to ensure that sufficient supplies of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are available for the production of life-saving metered-dose inhalers for the treatment of

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

EPA works with the CDC and the National Weather Service (NWS) to coordinate the UV Index and the health messages that accompany UV Index reports.

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

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

***Objective: Radiation***

EPA works primarily with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), Department of Energy (DOE), and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) on multiple radiation protection issues, such as the prevention of radioactive contaminated metals and products from entering the U.S. EPA also works with NRC and DOE on the development of state-of-the-art tracking systems for radioactive sources in U.S. commerce. EPA has ongoing planning and guidance discussions with DHS on Protective Action Guidance and general emergency response activities, including exercises responding to nuclear related incidents. As the regulator of DOE's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) facility, EPA has to continually coordinate oversight activities with DOE to keep the facility operating in compliance with our regulations. EPA also works with the Department of Transportation (DOT) on initiatives to promote use of non-nuclear density gauges for highway paving.

For emergency preparedness purposes, EPA coordinates closely with other Federal agencies, through the Federal Radiological Preparedness Coordinating Committee, and other coordinating bodies. EPA participates in planning and implementing table-top and field exercises including radiological anti-terrorism activities, with the NRC, DOE, Department of Defense (DOD), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), and DHS.

With regard to international assistance, EPA serves as an expert member of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on its Environmental Modeling for Radiation Safety, Naturally Occurring Radioactive Materials Working Group. Additionally, EPA remains an active contributor to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA). EPA serves on both the NEA Radioactive Waste Management Committee (RWMC) and the Committee on Radiation Protection and Public Health (CRPPH). Through the RWMC, EPA is able to exchange information with other NEA Member Countries on the management and disposal of high-level and transuranic waste. Through participation on the CRPPH and its working groups, EPA has been successful in bringing a U.S. perspective to international radiation protection policy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

EPA coordinates its air quality research with other Federal agencies through the Subcommittee on Air Quality Research<sup>1</sup> of the NSTC Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR). The Agency and NIEHS co-chaired the subcommittee's Particulate Matter Research Coordination Working Group, which produced a strategic plan<sup>2</sup> for Federal research on the health and environmental effects, exposures, atmospheric processes, source characterization and control of fine airborne particulate matter. The Agency also is a charter member of NARSTO,<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information, see <<http://www.al.noaa.gov/AQRS/>>.

<sup>2</sup> For more information, see <<http://www.al.noaa.gov/AQRS/reports/srppm.html>>.

<sup>3</sup> For more information, see <<http://www.narsto.org/>>.

an international public-private partnership, established in 1995, to improve management of air quality across North America. EPA coordinates specific research projects with other Federal agencies (one notable example at the present time is the near road air toxics program coordinated with Federal Highways) where appropriate. In addition, the research program supports, in collaboration with other federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health, air-related research at universities and nonprofit organizations through its Science to Achieve Results (STAR) research grants program.

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

The 1996 Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) amendments mandate joint EPA/CDC study of waterborne diseases in public water supplies. Through an Interagency Agreement (IA), EPA and CDC have collaborated on the completion of these studies and on improving identification and investigation of waterborne diseases from drinking water. EPA and CDC are building state capacity by directly assisting state health departments develop skills and tools to improve waterborne disease investigation and prevention. The two agencies are also investigating the health risks associated with contaminant problems in the drinking water distribution system. Additionally, EPA and CDC also share expertise and information exchange on drinking water related health effects, risk factors, and research needs on a regular basis.

### *Source Water Preservation and Protection for Public Water Systems (PWS)*

In implementing its source water preservation and protection efforts, the Agency coordinates with other Federal agencies that own or operate public water systems (e.g., USDA, USFS, DOD, DOE, DOI/NPS).. EPA's coordination focuses on ensuring that they cooperate with the states in which their systems are located, and that they are accounted for in the states' source water assessment programs as mandated in the 1996 amendments to the SDWA.

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

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

### *Tribal Access Coordination*

In 2003 EPA and its Federal partners in USDA, HUD, HHS, and BOI set a very ambitious goal to reduce the number of homes without access to safe drinking water by 50% by 2015. EPA leads the Tribal Access Subgroup, which developed a strategy document that identified the goal's challenges and recommended approaches to overcome them. This goal remains ambitious due to the logistical challenges and capital and operation and maintenance costs involved in providing access. EPA is working with its Federal partners to coordinate spending and address some of the challenges to access on Tribal lands, and we are hopeful that we can make measureable progress on the access issue. Specific actions currently underway by the Tribal Access Subgroup are developing a map of homes without access to safe drinking water on the Navajo Nation and a strategy to coordinate technical assistance services to tribes.

### *Collaboration with USGS*

EPA and USGS have established an IA to coordinate activities and information exchange in the areas of unregulated contaminants occurrence, the environmental relationships affecting contaminant occurrence, protection area delineation methodology, and analytical methods. This collaborative effort has improved the quality of information to support risk management decision-making at all levels of government, generated valuable new data, and eliminated potential redundancies.

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

EPA coordinates with other Federal agencies, primarily DHS, CDC, FDA and DoD on biological, chemical, and radiological contaminants of high concern, and how to detect and respond to their presence in drinking water and wastewater systems. A close linkage with the FBI and the Intelligence Analysis Directorate in DHS, particularly with respect to ensuring the timely dissemination of threat information through existing communication networks, will be continued. The Agency is strengthening its working relationships with the Water Research Foundation, the Water Environment Research Federation and other research institutions to increase our knowledge on technologies to detect contaminants, monitoring protocols and techniques, and treatment effectiveness.

### *Collaboration with FDA*

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

### *Beach Monitoring and Public Notification*

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



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

### *Watersheds*

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

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

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

### *Joint Strategy for Animal Feeding Operations*

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

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

Representatives from EPA's SRF program, HUD's Community Development Block Grant program, and USDA's Rural Utility Service have signed a MOU committing to assisting state or Federal implementers in: (1) coordination of the funding cycles of the three Federal agencies; (2) consolidation of plans of action (operating plans, intended use plans, strategic plans, etc.); and (3) preparation of one environmental review document, when possible, to satisfy the

requirements of all participating Federal agencies. A coordination group at the Federal level has been formed to further these efforts and maintain lines of communication. In many states, coordination committees have been established with representatives from the three programs.

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

#### *Federal Agency Partnerships on Impaired Waters Restoration Planning*

The Federal government owns about 671.8 million acres, which is about 29.6% of the 2.27 billion acres of land in the United States. Four agencies administer about 93.5% of these federal lands, including the Forest Service (28.7% of federal total), Fish and Wildlife Service (14.2%), National Park Service (11.8%), and Bureau of Land Management (38.9%). EPA has increased its coordination with these Federal land management agencies at the national level to enhance watershed protection and assess restoration needs on federal lands. Increased collaboration will mutually aid each agency's statutory programs, strategic plans, and shared mission to protect aquatic resources. As part of these coordination efforts, EPA is initially working with Federal land management agencies to determine the extent and type of impaired waters on federal lands.

#### *Nonpoint Sources*

EPA will continue to work closely with its Federal partners to achieve our goals for reducing pollutant discharges from nonpoint sources, including reduction targets for sediments, nitrogen and phosphorous. Most significantly, EPA will continue to work with the USDA, which has a key role in reducing sediment loadings through its continued implementation of the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, Conservation Reserve Program, and other conservation programs. USDA also plays a major role in reducing nutrient discharges through these same programs and through activities related to the AFO Strategy. EPA will also continue to work closely with the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management especially on the vast public lands that comprise 29 percent of all land in the United States. EPA will work with these agencies, USGS, and the states to document improvements in land management and water quality.

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

#### **Vessel Discharges**

Regarding vessel discharges, EPA will continue working closely with the U.S. Coast Guard on addressing ballast water discharges domestically, and with the interagency work group and U.S.

delegation to Marine Environmental Protection Committee (MEPC) on international controls. EPA will continue to work closely with the U.S. Coast Guard, Alaska and other states, and the International Council of Cruise Lines regarding regulatory and non-regulatory approaches to managing wastewater discharges from cruise ships. Also, EPA will continue to work with the U.S. Coast Guard in the development of Best Management Practices and discharge standards under the Clean Boating Act. Additionally, EPA will work with the U.S. Coast Guard on vessel sewage standards. Regarding dredged material management, EPA will continue to work closely with the COE on standards for permit review, as well as site selection/designation and monitoring.

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

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

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

EPA chairs the intergovernmental Mississippi River/Gulf of Mexico Watershed Nutrient Task Force (Gulf Hypoxia Task Force) and is responsible for overseeing implementation of the 2008 Gulf Hypoxia Hypoxia Action Plan. Also, EPA is a member of the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR) which coordinates the research activities among Federal agencies to assess the impacts of nutrients and hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico.

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

EPA's Clean Water Research Programs are in accordance with the Administration's policy of scientific integrity.<sup>4</sup> While EPA is the Federal agency mandated to ensure safe drinking water, other Federal and non-Federal entities are conducting research that complements EPA's drinking water research program. For example, the CDC and NIEHS conduct health effects and exposure research, the USGS is actively involved in monitoring sources of drinking water for chemicals and emerging contaminants. FDA also performs research on children's health risks. The DOE and USGS are actively involved in research that relates to underground sources of drinking water, with increasing efforts focused on geologic sequestration of carbon dioxide. The Bureau of Reclamation is also involved in research on water resources and water purification with an emphasis on recovering water from saline or impaired sources.

The private sector, particularly water utilities and industries that develop and support treatment and monitoring technologies, is actively involved in research activities on analytical methods, treatment technologies, water infrastructure rehabilitation, repair, and replacement, and water resources protection. Recently there has been increasing interest in research to support water

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.whitehouse.gov/the\\_press\\_office/Memorandum-for-the-Heads-of-Executive-Departments-and-Agencies-3-9-09/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Memorandum-for-the-Heads-of-Executive-Departments-and-Agencies-3-9-09/)

efficiency, reduce the energy dependencies of water systems, and implementation of alternative “green” technologies for treatment and distribution of water. There has also been increasing interest in linking the quality of water with its intended use to preserve high quality water for potable purposes and substitute alternative sources for nonpotable applications (e.g. toilet flushing, irrigation, etc.). Cooperative research efforts have been ongoing with the Water Research Foundation and other stakeholders to coordinate drinking water research on emerging contaminants water infrastructure, and other topics. In 2009 EPA and the Water Research Foundation formed the Distribution System Research and Information Collection Partnership (RICP) to coordinate and collaborate on decision-relevant distribution system research.

EPA has active collaborations with several federal agencies through a variety of efforts. EPA actively participates in the interagency Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR) Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality (SWAQ). The CENR is also coordinating the research efforts among Federal agencies to assess the impacts of nutrients and hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico. In addition, EPA is working directly with CDC in coordinating research on waterborne disease outbreaks, pathogens, algal toxins, and water distribution systems, EPA is also working with USGS on monitoring pharmaceuticals, personal care products, and other emerging contaminants, evaluating newly developed methods for microbial monitoring, and interpreting water data from the Ambient Water Quality Assessment (NAWQA) program. This effort has helped demonstrate that pesticide levels in urban watersheds can exceed levels in agricultural dominated streams and follow-on collaborations will be integrated into the Geographic Information System (GIS) database system. EPA has also developed joint research initiatives with NOAA and USGS for linking monitoring data and field study information with available toxicity data and assessment models for developing sediment criteria.

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

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

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

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

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

recycled contents, in promoting electronic stewardship and achieving waste reduction and recycling goals.

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

***Objective: Restore Land***

*Superfund Remedial Program*

The Superfund Remedial program coordinates with several other Federal agencies, such as ATSDR or NIEHS, in providing numerous Superfund related services in order to accomplish the program's mission. In FY 2010, EPA will have active interagency agreements with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Department of the Interior (DOI).

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

*Superfund Federal Facilities Program*

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

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

### *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act*

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

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

### *Leaking Underground Storage Tanks*

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

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

### *Emergency Preparedness and Response*

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

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

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

### *Superfund Enforcement*

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

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

### *Superfund Federal Facilities Enforcement Program*

The Superfund Federal Facilities Enforcement program ensures that 1) all Federal facility sites on the National Priority List have interagency agreements (IAGs), which provide enforceable schedules for the progression of the entire cleanup; 2) these IAGs are monitored for compliance; and 3) Federal sites that are transferred to new owners are transferred in an environmentally responsible manner. After years of service and operation, some Federal facilities contain environmental contamination, such as hazardous wastes, unexploded ordnance, radioactive wastes or other toxic substances. To enable the cleanup and reuse of such sites, the Federal Facilities Enforcement program coordinates creative solutions that protect both human health and the environment. These enforcement solutions help restore facilities so they can once again serve an important role in the economy and welfare of local communities and our country.

### *Oil Spills*

Under the Oil Spill Program, EPA works with other Federal agencies such as U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), NOAA, FEMA, DOI, DOT, DOE, and other Federal agencies and states, as well as with local government authorities to develop Area Contingency Plans. The Department of Justice also provides assistance to agencies with judicial referrals when enforcement of violations becomes necessary. In FY 2010, EPA will have an active interagency agreement with the USCG. EPA and the USCG work in coordination with other Federal authorities to implement the National Preparedness for Response Program.

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

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

The Agency is also working with NIEHS, which manages a large basic research program focusing on Superfund issues, to advance fundamental Superfund research. The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) also provides critical health-based information to assist EPA in making effective cleanup decisions. EPA works with these agencies on collaborative projects, information exchange, and identification of research issues and has a MOU with each agency. EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, and Navy recently signed a MOU to increase collaboration and coordination in contaminated sediments research. Additionally, the Interstate Technology Regulatory Council (ITRC) has proved an effective forum for coordinating Federal and state activities and for defining continuing research needs through its teams on topics including permeable reactive barriers, radionuclides, and Brownfields EPA has developed an MOU<sup>5</sup> with several other agencies [DOE, DoD, NRC, USGS, NOAA, and USDA] for multimedia modeling research and development.

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>5</sup> For more information please go to: Interagency Steering Committee on Multimedia Environmental Models MOU, <http://www.iscmem.org/Memorandum.htm>



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

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

FQPA requires EPA to consult with other government agencies on major decisions. EPA, USDA and FDA work closely together using both a MOU and working committees to deal with a variety of issues that affect the involved agencies' missions. For example, agencies work together on residue testing programs and on enforcement actions that involve pesticide residues on food, and we coordinate our review of antimicrobial pesticides. The Agency coordinates with USDA/ARS in promotion and communication of resistance management strategies. Additionally, we participate actively in the Federal Interagency Committee on Invasive Animals and Pathogens (ITAP) which includes members from USDA, DOL, DoD, DHS and CDC to coordinate planning and technical advice among Federal entities involved in invasive species research, control and management.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EPA's chemical testing data provides information for the OSHA worker protection programs, NIOSH for research, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) for informing consumers about products through labeling. EPA frequently consults with these Agencies on project design, progress and the results of chemical testing projects.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

and the CODEX Alimentarius Commission. NAFTA and cooperation with Canada and Mexico play an integral part in the harmonization of data requirements.

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

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

### ***Objective: Communities***

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

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

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

### ***Brownfields***

EPA continues to lead the Brownfields Federal Partnership. The Partnership includes more than 20 federal agencies dedicated to the cleanup and redevelopment of brownfields properties. Partner agencies work together to prevent, assess, safely clean up, and redevelop brownfields. The Brownfields Federal Partnership's on-going efforts include promoting the Portfields and

Mine-Scarred Lands projects and looking for additional opportunities to jointly promote community revitalization by participating in multi-agency collaborative projects, holding regular meetings with federal partners, and supporting regional efforts to coordinate federal revitalization support to state and local agencies.

### *Environmental Justice*

Through the Federal Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice (IWG), EPA is working in partnership with ten other federal agencies to address the environmental and public health issues facing communities with environmental justice concerns. In 2009, the IWG will continue its efforts to work collaboratively and constructively with all levels of government, and throughout the public and private sectors. The issues range from lead exposure, asthma, safe drinking water and sanitation systems to hazardous waste clean-up, renewable energy/wind power development, and sustainable environmentally-sound economies. The IWG is utilizing EPA's collaborative problem-solving model, based on the experiences of federal collaborative partnerships, to improve the federal government's effectiveness in addressing the environmental and public health concerns facing communities. As the lead agency, EPA shares its knowledge, experience and offers assistance to other federal agencies as they enhance their strategies to integrate environmental justice into their programs, policies and activities.

### ***Objective: Ecosystems***

#### *National Estuary Program*

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

#### *Wetlands*

Several Federal agencies share the goal of increasing wetland acreage in the U.S. as well as better understanding and protecting wetland functions and values. EPA, USFWS, COE, NOAA, USGS, USDA, and FHWA currently coordinate on a range of wetlands activities. These activities include: studying and reporting on wetlands trends in the U.S., diagnosing causes of coastal wetland loss, updating and standardizing the digital map of the nation's wetlands, statistically surveying the condition of the Nation's wetlands, and developing methods for better protecting wetland function. In addition to that, EPA and the ACOE work very closely together in implementing the wetlands regulatory program under Clean Water Act Section 404. Under the regulatory program the agencies coordinate closely on overall implementation of the permitting decisions made annually under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, through the headquarters offices as well as the ten EPA Regional Offices and 38 ACOE District Offices. The agencies also coordinate closely on policy development and litigation. EPA and ACOE are committed to achieving the goal of no net loss of wetlands under the Section 404 program.

## *Coastal America*

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

## *Great Lakes*

EPA is leading the member Federal agencies of the Interagency Task Force<sup>6</sup> in the development and implementation of a new Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. As the Initiative progresses, EPA will work with its partners to develop the management and coordinative structures required for this effort, including Interagency Agreements with all appropriate Federal agency participants. Participating agencies will focus their activities to support outcome-oriented performance goals and measures to direct their Great Lakes protection and restoration activities. This effort builds upon previous coordination and collaboration by the Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) pursuant to the mandate in Section 118 of the Clean Water Act to “coordinate action of the Agency with the actions of other Federal agencies and state and local authorities...” pursuant to which GLNPO was already engaged in extensive coordination efforts with state, Tribal, and other Federal agencies, as well as with our counterparts in Canada pursuant to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA). The Federal Interagency Task Force, created by EO 13340, is charged with increasing and improving collaboration and integration among Federal programs involved in Great Lakes environmental activities. The Great Lakes task force brings together eleven Cabinet department and Federal agency heads to coordinate restoration of the Great Lakes, focusing on outcomes, such as cleaner water and sustainable fisheries, and targeting measurable results. In December 2005, the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration issued a Great Lakes Regional Collaboration Strategy. The Interagency Task Force has been able to use that work to guide development of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. Coordination by GLNPO supports the GLWQA and other efforts to improve the Great Lakes and will now lead to implementation of priority actions for Great Lakes restoration by the Federal agencies and their partners. Coordinative activities that will continue as part of the implementation of the Initiative are expected to include: extensive coordination among state, Federal, and provincial partners, both in terms of implementing the monitoring program, and in utilizing results from the monitoring to manage environmental programs: sediments program work with the states and the Corps regarding dredging issues; implementation of the Binational Toxics Strategy via extensive coordination with Great Lakes States; habitat protection and restoration with states, tribes, FWS, and NRCS; and coordination with these partners regarding development and implementation of Lakewide Management Plans for each of the Great Lakes and for Remedial Action Plans for the 30 remaining U.S./binational Areas of Concern.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Interagency Task Force includes eleven agency and cabinet organizations: EPA, State, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Transportation, Homeland Security, Army, Council on Environmental Quality, and Health and Human Services.

### *Chesapeake Bay*

The Chesapeake Bay Program's former Federal Agencies Committee has been replaced by a higher level group of the nine principal Federal agencies involved in Chesapeake Bay restoration and protection work. This group of Federal Office Directors (FOD), chaired by EPA, meets monthly, and includes:

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- Natural Resources Conservation Service
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Geological Survey
- U.S. Forest Service
- National Park Service
- U.S. Navy (representing Department of Defense)

The new group has been meeting regularly and provides a forum for Federal agencies to coordinate and to devise unified Federal positions on various policy options. EPA is the lead Federal agency which represents the Federal government on the Chesapeake Executive Council, and the FOD provides the opportunity for EPA to coordinate Federal positions. In addition to the Administrator of EPA, the Chesapeake Executive Council consists of the governors of the Bay states, the mayor of the District of Columbia, the chair of the Chesapeake Bay Commission, and for the past few years, the Secretary of Agriculture.

Through the FODs and the Chesapeake Executive Council, several Federal agencies have become "champions" of specific issues:

- EPA – Funding to promote innovation and implementation; No Runoff Challenge; promoting the use of "green infrastructure", such as through the DC stormwater permit
- NRCS – Promoting and encouraging use of best conservation practices on watershed farms
- U.S. Forest Service – Working to ensure that the 2012 forest protection goals are met in the Bay watershed
- U.S. Navy – Promoting and incorporating low impact and no impact development on Navy properties throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

### *Gulf of Mexico*

Key to the continued progress of the Gulf of Mexico Program is a broad multi-organizational Gulf states-led partnership comprised of regional; business and industry; agriculture; state and local government; citizens; environmental and fishery interests; and, numerous Federal departments and agencies. This Gulf partnership is comprised of members of the Gulf Program's Policy Review Board, subcommittees, and workgroups. Established in 1988, the Gulf of Mexico Program is designed to assist the Gulf States and stakeholders in developing a regional, ecosystem-based framework for restoring and protecting the Gulf of Mexico through coordinated Gulf-wide as well as priority area-specific efforts. The Gulf States strategically

identify the key environmental issues and work at the regional, state, and local level to define, recommend, and voluntarily implement the supporting solutions. To achieve the Program's environmental objectives, the partnership must target specific Federal, state, local, and private programs, processes, and financial authorities in order to leverage the resources needed to support state and community actions.

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

Research in human health is coordinated with several Federal agencies that also sponsor research on variability and susceptibility in health risks from exposure to environmental contaminants. EPA collaborates with a number of the Institutes within the NIH and CDC. For example, the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) conducts multi-disciplinary biomedical research programs, prevention and intervention efforts, and communication strategies. The NIEHS program includes an effort to study the effects of chemicals, including pesticides and other toxics, on children's health. EPA collaborates with NIEHS in supporting the Centers for Children's Environmental Health and Disease Prevention, which study whether and how environmental factors play a role in children's health.<sup>7</sup> EPA coordinates research on identification and management of health risks of mold with the Federal Interagency Committee on Indoor Air Quality. EPA coordinates with ATSDR through a memo of understanding on the development of toxicological reviews and toxicology profiles, respectively. EPA also has strong working collaborations with CDC including 1) an MOU and projects directed at linking the CDC Public Health Tracking Network Program with EPA's environmental monitoring data and the indicators efforts tied to EPA's Report on the Environment; 2) an MOU and projects linking EPA's Community Action for Renewed Environments with CDC's community-based environmental health programs, a collaboration that already has addressed environmental public health issues along the U.S.-Mexico border under the Binational Border 2012 Program.. EPA and CDC are also collaborating in the areas of asthma, biomonitoring, and global health. EPA also works collaboratively with CDC on the development of indicators of exposure and health effects generating data included in EPA's Report on the Environment and assisting CDC in its Public health Surveillance efforts.

**Goal 5-Compliance and Environmental Stewardship**

***Objective: Improve Compliance***

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

The Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) coordinates with the Chemical Safety and Accident Investigation Board, OSHA, and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry in preventing and responding to accidental releases and endangerment situations, with the BIA on Tribal issues relative to compliance with environmental laws on Tribal Lands, and with the SBA on the implementation of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA). OECA also shares information with the IRS on cases which require defendants to pay civil penalties, thereby assisting the IRS in assuring compliance with tax laws. In addition, it coordinates with the SBA and a number of other Federal agencies in implementing

---

<sup>7</sup> For more information, see <<http://es.epa.gov/ncer/childrenscnters/>>



the Business Gateway initiative, an “E-Government” project in support of the President’s Regulatory Management Agenda. OECA also works with a variety of Federal agencies including the DOL and the IRS to organize a Federal Compliance Assistance Roundtable to address cross cutting compliance assistance issues. Coordination also occurs with the COE on wetlands.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EPA works directly with Canada and Mexico bilaterally and in the trilateral Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC). EPA's border activities require close coordination with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of

Justice, and the States of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. EPA is the lead agency and coordinates U.S. participation in the CEC. EPA works with NOAA, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Geological Survey on CEC projects to promote biodiversity cooperation, and with the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative to reduce potential trade and environmental impacts such as invasive species.

***Objective: Improve Environmental Performance through Pollution Prevention and Innovation***

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

This effort includes a number of demonstration projects with other federal Departments and agencies, such as the National Park Service (NPS) (to use Green Purchasing as a tool to achieve the sustainability goals of the parks), the Department of Defense (DoD) (use of environmentally preferable construction materials), and Defense Logistics Agency (identification of environmental attributes for products in its purchasing system). The program is also working within EPA to “green” its own operations. The program also works with the Department of Commerce’s National Institute of Science and Technology (NIST) to develop a life-cycle based decision support tool for purchasers.

Under the Suppliers’ Partnership for the Environment program and its umbrella program, the Green Suppliers’ Network (GSN), EPA’s P2 Program is working closely with NIST and its Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program to provide technical assistance to the process of “greening” industry supply chains. The EPA is also working with the Department of Energy’s (DOE) Industrial Technologies Program to provide energy audits and technical assistance to these supply chains.

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

EPA and DOI are coordinating an Interagency Tribal Information Steering Committee that includes the Bureau of Reclamation, DOE, Housing and Urban Department, U.S. Geological Service, Federal Geographic Data Committee, Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Justice. This Interagency effort is aimed to coordinate the exchange of selected sets of environmental, resource, and programmatic information pertaining to Indian Country, among federal agencies in a “dynamic” information

management system that is continuously and automatically updated and refreshed, and to be shared equally among partners and other constituents.

Under a two-party interagency agreement, EPA works extensively with the Indian Health Service to cooperatively address the drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of Indian Tribes. EPA is developing protocols with the Indian Health Service Sanitation Facilities Construction Program for integration of databases of the two agencies, within the framework of the Tribal Enterprise Architecture.

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

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

The Sector Strategies Program promotes optimal environmental protection, energy efficiency, and resource management in high-impact industries and fuel production sectors. The program engages with many diverse stakeholder groups, including other Federal programs, for policy dialogue and strategic planning. Engagement tends to be informal and issue-specific, as opposed to formal inter-agency partnerships. At the program-wide level, Sector Strategies works on various issues with the Council on Environmental Quality; with industry-oriented programs in the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; with manufacturing programs at the Department of Commerce; and with the North American Commission on Environmental Cooperation on trade issues related to climate policy. Examples of sector-specific interactions include Agribusiness Sector work with USDA programs; Oil & Gas Sector work with the Bureau of Land Management at the Department of the Interior; work on Port Sector issues with the Coast Guard and the Committee on the Marine Transportation System at the Department of Transportation; work on industrial material recycling issues with the DOT's Federal Highway Administration; and work with the Department of the Navy on Shipbuilding Sector initiatives.

The Smart Growth program has a number of key Federal partnerships. Under an MOU with NOAA the program is - developing a joint publication on smart growth guidelines for coastal communities, offering introductory smart growth training through NOAA's Coastal Services Center, and providing technical support to state Sea Grant programs. Along with the Federal Highway Administration, the program is co-sponsoring a publication on Designing Walkable Urban Streets and participating in an Interagency Working Group on Land Use, Vehicle Travel and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Through an interagency agreement with FEMA, EPA is providing recovery and redevelopment assistance to five Iowa communities impacted by recent flooding. Also through an interagency agreement, the program is working with the Centers for Disease Control to develop Active Community Design indicators for regional Metropolitan Listing Services (MLS) that will provide home buyers with information on neighborhood

walkability. Finally, the program has continued to work with the Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry and Cooperative Forestry program to promote smart growth in both urban and rural areas.

EPA is a member of the Interagency Network of Enterprise Assistance Providers (INEAP), an interagency collaboration that also includes the departments of Commerce, Transportation working to leverage program effectiveness through partnership. The collaboration is focusing specifically on ways to promote competitiveness and work toward sustainability.

EPA is also a member and plays a leadership role in the federal Program Evaluators Network which is a cross-agency collaboration working on improving program evaluation tools and improving capacity for more effective performance management.

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

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

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

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

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

As a participant on the following interagency workgroups, EPA remains informed of related efforts across the government and provides coordination assistance as necessary: The Interagency Committee on Education (Chair: Department of Education); Partners in Resource Education (Chair: National Environmental Education and Training Foundation); the Federal

Interagency Committee on Interpretation (Chair: National Park Service); Ocean Education Task Force (workgroup of the U.S. Ocean Commission); and the Afterschool.gov (Chair: General Services Administration).

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

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

***Objective: Improve Human Health and the Environment in Indian Country***

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

The first, or umbrella MOU, promotes coordination between federal Tribal infrastructure programs, including financial services, while allowing federal programs to retain their unique advantages. It is fully expected that the efficiencies and partnerships resulting from this collaboration will directly assist tribes with their infrastructure needs. Under the umbrella MOU, for the first time, five Federal departments joined together and agreed to work across traditional program boundaries on Tribal infrastructure issues. The second MOU, addressing a specific infrastructure issue was created under the umbrella authority and addresses the issue of access to safe drinking water and wastewater facilities on Tribal lands. Currently, the five Federal agencies are working together to develop solutions for specific geographic areas of concern (Alaska, Southwest), engaging in coordination of ARAR funding, and promoting cross-agency efficiency. These activities are completed in coordination with federally recognized tribes.

For more information, please see the web link: <http://www.epa.gov/tribalportal/mous.htm>.

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

EPA is coordinating with DoD's Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) in an ongoing partnership, especially in the areas of sustainability research and of incorporating materials lifecycle analysis into the manufacturing process for weapons and military equipment. EPA is continuing its partnerships with NSF, NIEHS, and NIOSH on jointly issued grant solicitations for nanotechnology, and its coordination through the NSET with all agencies that are part of the NNI. In addition, in response to a Congressional request to collaborate internationally, EPA is partnering with sister agencies in the United Kingdom and will jointly fund consortia between U.S. and United Kingdom research institutions.

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

Georgia, Kentucky, and Michigan (storm water treatment); and Colorado and New York (waste-to-energy technologies).

The statutorily mandated Biomass Research and Development Board (chaired by DOE and USDA) provides overall federal coordination of biofuel research activities. EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD) represents the Agency on this Board and co-chairs two of its seven working groups. The two working groups chaired by EPA's ORD are the Sustainability and Environment, Health and Safety workgroups. ORD works to ensure that all relevant EPA offices are aware of and involved in EPA-related Board activities.

## COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

### Enabling Support Programs

#### Office of the Administrator (OA)

The Office of the Administrator (OA) supports the leadership of the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) programs and activities to protect human health and safeguard the air, water, and land upon which life depends. Several program responsibilities include policy, economics, and innovation; children's health protection and environmental education; homeland security; Congressional and intergovernmental relations, the Science Advisory Board, and the small business program.

EPA collaborates with other Federal agencies in the collection of economic data used in the conduct of economic benefit-cost analyses of environmental regulations and policies. The Agency collaborates with the Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census on the Pollution Abatement Costs and Expenditure (PACE) survey in order to obtain information on pollution abatement expenditures by industry. In our effort to measure the beneficial outcomes of Agency programs, EPA co-sponsors with several other agencies the U.S. Forest Service's National Survey on Recreation and the Environment (NSRE), which measures national recreation participation and recreation trends. EPA also collaborates with other natural resource agencies (e.g., United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Department of Interior, and National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)) to foster improved interdisciplinary research and reporting of economic information by collaboratively supporting workshops and symposiums on environmental economics topics (e.g., economic valuation of ecosystem services, adoption of market mechanisms to achieve environmental goals); and measuring health and welfare benefits (e.g., represent EPA issues in cross-agency group charged with informing USDA efforts to establish markets for ecosystem services). EPA also collaborates with the State Department and Treasury on the Strategic Economic Dialogue (SED) Joint Economic Study (JES), which includes examining the environmental, economic, and human health costs of pollution and enhancing further cooperation between the U.S. and China to analyze and address these issues.

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

EPA's Office of Homeland Security (OHS) continues to focus on broad Agency and government-wide homeland security policy issues that cannot be adequately addressed by a



single program office, as well as ensuring implementation of EPA's Homeland Security Strategy. A significant amount of the responsibilities require close coordination with Federal partners, through Interagency Planning Committees (IPCs), briefings, and discussions with individual senior Federal officials. The Associate Administrator for Homeland Security (OHS) and staff represent the Administrator, Deputy Administrator, and other senior Agency officials at meetings with personnel from the White House and Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and other high-level stakeholders. OHS coordinates the development of responses to inquiries from the White House, DHS, the Congress, and others with oversight responsibilities for homeland security efforts. EPA's ability to effectively implement its broad range of homeland security responsibilities is significantly enhanced through these efforts. OHS ensures consistent development and implementation of the Agency's homeland security policies and procedures, while building an external network of partners so that EPA's efforts can be integrated into, and build upon, the efforts of other Federal agencies.

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

EPA's Office of Small Business Programs (OSBP) works with the Small Business Administration (SBA) and other Federal agencies to increase the participation of small and disadvantaged businesses in EPA's procurements. OSBP works with the SBA to develop EPA's goals for contracting with small and disadvantaged businesses; address bonding issues that pose a roadblock for small businesses in specific industries, such as environmental clean-up and construction; and address data-collection issues that are of concern to Offices of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (OSDBU) throughout the Federal government. EPA's OSBP works closely with the Center for Veterans Enterprise and EPA's Regional and program offices to increase the amount of EPA procurement dollars awarded to Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSB). OSBP, through its Minority Academic Institutions (MAI) Program, also works with the Department of Education and the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities to increase the institutional capacity of HBCUs, and to create opportunities for them to work with Federal agencies, especially in the area of scientific research and development. Also, through its MAI Program, OSBP works collaboratively with the Department of Energy to provide summer internship opportunities for students attending MAIs. OSBP coordinates with the Minority Business Development Agency, the Department of Veteran's Affairs, the Department of Defense, and many other federal agencies to provide outreach to small disadvantaged businesses and Minority-Serving Institutions throughout the United States and the trust territories. OSBP's Director is an active participant in the Federal OSDBU Directors' Council ([www.osdbu.gov](http://www.osdbu.gov)). The OSDBU Directors' Council collaborates to support major outreach efforts to small and disadvantaged businesses, SDVOSB, and minority academic institutions via conferences, business fairs, and speaking engagements. The OSBP's

Asbestos and Small Business Ombudsman partners with SBA and other federal agencies to ensure small business concerns are considered in regulatory development and compliance efforts, and to provide networks, resources, tools, and forums for education and advocacy on behalf of small businesses across the country.

### **Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)**

EPA makes active contributions to standing interagency management committees, including the Chief Financial Officers Council and the Federal Financial Managers' Council. These groups are focused on improving resources management and accountability throughout the Federal government. EPA actively participates on the Performance Improvement Council which coordinates and develops strategic plans, performance plans, and performance reports as required by law for the Agency. EPA also coordinates appropriately with Congress and other Federal agencies, such as Department of Treasury, Office of Management of Budget (OMB), and the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

### **Office of Administration and Resources Management (OARM)**

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

- Chief Human Capital Officers, a group of senior leaders that discuss human capital initiatives across the Federal government; and
- Legislative and Policy Committee, a committee comprised of other Federal agency representatives who assist Office of Personnel and Management in developing plans and policies for training and development across the government.
- The Chief Acquisition Officers Council, the principal interagency forum for monitoring and improving the Federal acquisition system. The Council also is focused on promoting the President's specific initiatives and policies in all aspects of the acquisition system.

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

EPA is working with the OMB, General Services Administration (GSA), and Department of Commerce's National Institute of Standards and Technology to implement the Policy for a Common Identification Standard for Federal Employees and Contractors.

## **Office of Environmental Information (OEI)**

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

**The Chief Information Officer's (CIO) Council:** The CIO Council is the principal interagency forum for improving practices in the design, modernization, use, sharing, and performance of Federal information resources. The Council develops recommendations for IT management policies, procedures, and standards; identifies opportunities to share information resources; and assesses and addresses the needs of the Federal IT workforce.

**E-Rulemaking:** EPA is the managing partner agency of the e-Rulemaking Program. E-Rulemaking's mission addresses two areas: to improve public access to, understanding of, and participation in regulation development, and to streamline government's management of, and efficiency in, promulgating regulations. In January 2003, e-Rulemaking Program launched the award-winning *Regulations.gov* web site – a single web site where citizens can access and comment on all proposed Federal regulations. Since its launch, tens of millions of individuals have used the site to find, view, and comment on proposed regulations. In September 2005, the e-Rulemaking Program launched the award-winning Federal Docket Management System (FDMS - publicly accessible at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov)). FDMS is an electronic document repository where agencies post rulemaking and non-rulemaking documents for public access and comment. As a result, the public can now access Federal Register documents, supporting technical/legal/economic analyses, and public comments, most of which were previously available only by physically visiting a Federal docket center. The e-Rulemaking Program is partnering with more than 29 Departments and Independent Agencies, comprised of 161 bureaus, boards, agencies and administrations, representing more than 90 percent of the Federal rules promulgated annually.

**The National Environmental Exchange Network (EN):** The EN is a partnership among states, tribes, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. It is revolutionizing the exchange of environmental information by allowing these Partners to share data efficiently and securely over the Internet. This approach is providing real-time access to higher quality data while saving time, resources, and money for all of the Partners. Leadership for the EN is provided by the Exchange Network Leadership Council (ENLC), which is co-chaired by OEI and a State partner. The ENLC works with representatives from the EPA, state environmental agencies, and tribal organizations to manage the Exchange Network..

**Automated Commercial Environment/International Trade Data System (ACE/ITDS):** ACE is the system being built by Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to ensure that its customs agents have the information they need to decide how to handle goods and merchandise being shipped into, or out of, the US. ITDS is the organizational framework by which all government agencies with import/export responsibilities participate in the development of the ACE system. ACE will be a single, electronic point of entry for importers and exporters to

report required information to the appropriate agencies. It will also be the way those Agencies provide CBP with information about potential imports/exports. ACE eliminates the need, burden, and cost of paper reporting. It also allows importers and exporters to report the same information to multiple federal agencies with a single submission.

EPA has the responsibility and legal authority to make sure pesticides, toxic chemicals, vehicles and engines, ozone-depleting substances, and other commodities entering the country meet our environmental, human health, and safety standards. EPA's ongoing collaboration with CBP on the ACE/ITDS project will greatly improve information exchange between EPA and CBP. As a result, Customs officers at our nation's borders will have the information they need to admit products that meet our environmental regulations, and to interdict goods or products that are hazardous or illegal. EPA's work on ACE/ITDS builds on the technical leadership developed by the Central Data Exchange and Exchange Network (CDX/EN). Applying the CDX/EN technology offers all Agencies participating in ACE the opportunity to improve the quality, timeliness and accessibility of their data at lower cost. Five Agencies have expressed interest in the CDX/EN technology as a way to exchange data.

**Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) Support:** EPA's Automated Security Self-Evaluation and Reporting Tool (ASSERT) provides Federal managers with the information they need, from an enterprise perspective, to make timely and informed decisions regarding the level of security implemented on their information resources. It provides the reports and information those managers need to protect their critical cyber infrastructure and their privacy information. It helps agencies understand and assess their security risks, monitor corrective actions and provide standardized and automated FISMA reports. Federal agencies using EPA's FISMA Reporting Solution, and ASSERT, include: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Export-Import Bank (EXIM), General Services Administration (GSA), Housing and Urban Development (HUD), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC), and the Social Security Administration (SSA)

**Geospatial Information:** OEI works extensively with the Department of Interior, NOAA, USGS, NASA, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Homeland Security and many other Federal agencies through the activities of the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) and the OMB Geospatial Line of Business (GeoLoB). OEI leads several key initiatives within the FGDC and GeoLoB, and is one of only two agencies (the other being the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency) that participate in the Coordinating Committee, Steering Committee, and Executive Steering Committee of the FGDC, and the Federal Geospatial Advisory Committee. A key component of this work is developing and implementing the infrastructure to support a comprehensive array of national spatial data – data that can be attached to and portrayed on maps. This work has several key applications, including ensuring that human health and environmental conditions are represented in the appropriate contexts, supporting the assessment of environmental conditions, and supporting first responders and other homeland security situations. Through programs like the EPA National Information Exchange Network, EPA also works closely with its State and Tribal partners to ensure consistent implementation of standards and technologies supporting the efficient and cost effective sharing of geographically based data and services.

**Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS):** OEI works with the Office of Research and Development (ORD) to lead EPA's involvement in the GEOSS initiative. Other partners in this initiative are: The U.S. Group on Earth Observations (USGEO), and a significant number of other Federal agencies, including NASA, NOAA, USGS, HHS/CDC, DoE, DoD, USDA, Smithsonian, NSF, State, and DOT. Under a ten-year strategic plan published by the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) in 2005, OEI and ORD are leading EPA's development of the environmental component of the Integrated Earth Observation System (IEOS), which will be the U.S. Federal contribution to the international GEOSS effort. Earth observation data, models, and decision-support systems will play an increasingly important role in finding solutions for complex problems, including adaptation to climate change.

### **Office of the Inspector General (OIG)**

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

## MAJOR MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

### Introduction

The Reports Consolidation Act of 2000 requires the Inspector General to identify the most serious management challenges facing EPA, briefly assess the Agency's progress in addressing them, and report annually. In FY 2008, EPA's Office of Inspector General revised its definition of a management challenge to distinguish it from an internal control weakness. A weakness is a deficiency in the design or operation of a program, function, or activity, which the Agency can correct. In contrast, a management challenge is a lack of capability derived from internal self-imposed or externally imposed constraints that prevent an organization from reacting effectively to a changing environment. Addressing a management challenge may require assistance from outside of EPA and take years to fully resolve. The discussion that follows summarizes each of the management challenges that EPA's Office of Inspector General (OIG) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) have identified and presents the Agency's response.

EPA has established a mechanism for identifying and addressing its key management challenges. As part of its Federal Management Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) process, EPA senior managers meet with representatives from EPA's OIG, GAO, and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to hear their views on EPA's key management challenges. EPA managers also use audits, reviews, and program evaluations conducted internally and by GAO, OMB, and OIG to assess program effectiveness and identify potential management issues. EPA recognizes that management challenges, if not addressed adequately, may prevent the Agency from effectively meeting its mission. EPA remains committed to addressing all management issues in a timely manner and will address them to the fullest extent of our authority.

### 1. Performance Measurement\*

***Summary of Challenge:** EPA must focus on the logic and design of its measures for success and efficiency, along with data standards and consistent definitions, to ensure that usable, accurate, timely, and meaningful information is used to evaluate and manage EPA programs, operations, processes, and results.*

**Agency Response:** While measuring environmental performance is inherently challenging, EPA has made performance measurement improvement and performance management a priority and is pursuing many actions to meet this challenge. The Agency has undertaken significant work to strengthen its performance management framework and has made significant progress. EPA's on-going work to strengthen performance management contributed to the Agency's winning the President's Quality Award for Management Excellence for the second consecutive year.

EPA's Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) completed an annual performance measures review for each of the last two years and is currently conducting a third annual review. This effort has included better aligning EPA's operational measures with its annual budget measures and strategic plan measures. EPA established an Agency-wide Deputy Regional Administrator and Deputy Assistant Administrator Performance Management Council to discuss and improve EPA's performance management practices. Additionally, EPA has begun to execute the

Agency's Implementation Plan for Executive Order 13450 on Improving Government Program Performance. OMB lauded EPA's plan as a model for other agencies. The Agency's Performance Management Workgroup, comprising EPA senior staff, continues to improve performance measures and address key issues at the staff level on an ongoing basis. EPA continued implementing and improving its quarterly management report and "measures central"—a centralized database of the Agency's key performance measures. Regional priorities are included in the system; the Agency has characterized the relationships among key sets of measures; and staff have further streamlined and aligned measures.

Other EPA offices have also led significant efforts to improve performance management practices. The Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation (OPEI) leads regular progress meetings between regional offices, Headquarters offices, and the Deputy Administrator on key measures. OPEI's National Center for Environmental Innovation (NCEI) runs regular trainings for EPA staff and managers on the logic of program design, including specific training in logic modeling and program evaluation. NCEI offers detailed courses for staff and a primer for managers.

In 2007, the Office of Research and Development initiated a study with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to assist EPA and other agencies in addressing the common challenge of evaluating efficiency in research. The NAS study provided precedent-setting information that will allow research programs throughout the government to reassess how they measure efficiency.

EPA's plans to continue addressing the performance measurement challenge include:

- Finalizing the annual review of FY 2010 measures, focused on further improving the links between EPA's operational measures, senior management priorities, and long-term environmental and health goals.
- Strengthening efforts to govern/oversee the overall quality of the measures and data in the measures central system.
- Implementing systems improvements to measures central to improve data quality and consistency.
- Developing an Agency-wide "Quality Standard" for performance information
- Implementing a comprehensive strategy to address barriers to program evaluation (National Center for Environmental Innovation).
- Continuing to improve the performance measures used for state grants to increase transparency and accountability of state contributions to achieving EPA's mission.

## 2. Meeting Homeland Security Requirements\*\*

*Summary of Challenge:* EPA needs to implement a strategy to effectively coordinate and address threats, including developing a scenario to identify resource needs, internal and external coordination points, and responsible and accountable entities.

**Agency Response:** In FY 2006, EPA acknowledged homeland security as an Agency weakness in response to concerns raised by the OIG. Over the years, EPA has taken action to strengthen its responsibility for homeland security by expanding its homeland security planning and coordination efforts with other federal, state, and local agencies; recognizing a more complete range of issues and information that must be considered in the development of response plans for large-scale catastrophic incidents; developing a crisis communication plan and identifying responsible parties and roles for crisis communications; and fulfilling basic homeland security requirements.

EPA established the Homeland Security Collaborative Network to coordinate and directly address high-priority, cross-Agency technical and policy issues related to day-to-day homeland security policies and activities.

To improve its processes for identifying, obtaining, maintaining, and tracking response equipment necessary for large-scale catastrophic incidents, EPA created and convened the Homeland Security Interagency Planning Committee (IPC). This executive committee, activated after a homeland-security-related attack, brings together the Agency's senior political leadership to provide policy direction to responders.

In FY 2008, EPA revised the Homeland Security Priority Work Plan (FYs 2008–2010), the Agency's overarching planning framework for identifying and aligning cross-Agency homeland security programs with EPA's highest homeland security priorities. The Plan identifies EPA's continuing efforts to advance the Agency to the next level of preparedness.

EPA has been called on to respond to five major disasters and nationally significant incidents in the past seven years: the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the anthrax terrorist incidents, the Columbia Shuttle disaster and recovery efforts, the ricin incident on Capitol Hill, and the Gulf Coast hurricanes. These responses have reinforced the importance of a continued focus on improving the Agency's environmental homeland security focal areas: detection, prevention, and mitigation and field preparedness and response. Within these areas, EPA identified and continues to focus on four homeland security priorities: water security, decontamination, emergency response, and internal preparedness. These priority areas have been identified as the result of external entities assigning EPA specific responsibilities or through homeland security requirements and assignments.

Additionally, EPA developed three tiers of information to be responsive to its homeland security mandates. This information forms the basis for understanding EPA's highest homeland security priorities and serves as a way to assess short-, medium-, and long-term goals and results. The three tiers are:



- **Desired end states.** These describe the final outcomes of homeland security projects or efforts once EPA believes it has met its various homeland security responsibilities.
- **Desired results.** These reflect specific programmatic areas through which EPA seeks to make progress toward the desired end state.
- **Action items.** EPA's FY 2008–2010 action items reflect specific program and regional office plans (e.g., projects or efforts) to progress toward desired results and ultimately reach EPA's desired end state.

EPA will continue to use its Homeland Security Priority Work Plan as a systematic method to assess homeland security priorities and projects annually. Additionally, the Agency will rely on audits and evaluations conducted by the OIG to help ensure that it achieves its homeland security objectives and that its appropriations supporting homeland security are spent efficiently and effectively. EPA has completed all corrective actions associated with this Agency weakness.

### **3. Threat and Risk Assessment**

***Summary of Challenge:** The Agency does not comprehensively assess threats to human health and the environment across media to ensure EPA's actions are planned, coordinated, designed and budgeted to most efficiently and effectively address environment risks. The fragmentary nature of EPA's approach continues as environmental laws often focus on single media or threats.*

**Agency Response:** EPA appreciates the OIG's concerns and recommendation that the Agency enhance its efforts to periodically assess and prioritize threats to human health and the environment across media and use this information to inform its strategic planning and budgeting processes. As the OIG points out, nearly 20 years ago EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) recommended that EPA target its efforts based on opportunities for the greatest risk reduction. The Board's 1990 report, *Reducing Risk: Setting Priorities and Strategies for Environmental Protection*, described the "fragmentary nature of EPA's approach" to addressing environmental problems due to a number of underlying conditions, including environmental laws that are focused on a single medium or threat, the Agency's responsibilities for addressing separate legislative mandates, and technologies that are targeted to address specific pollutant sources.

Given these conditions and EPA programs' disparate and individual interests and responsibilities, forging a cross-media, cross-Agency approach to assessing risk and using the information to establish risk-based priorities for planning and resource allocation represents a significant challenge. In principle, however, EPA concurs with the OIG's view that, given the diminishing resources available for environmental protection, there is a critical need for EPA to focus on high-priority environmental threats to human health and the environment across media to ensure that the Agency's actions are designed to reduce total risk in the most efficient manner. Over the coming months, EPA will conduct further discussions with senior leadership and policy-makers from across the Agency to initiate the development of an integrated risk-based strategy and appropriate metrics to measure the aggregate impacts of risk reduction to human health and ecosystems. EPA will consult with the SAB as necessary in developing this integrated

risk-based approach. The Agency also will continue to consult with the OIG and to provide information on its progress.

#### **4. EPA's Organization and Infrastructure\*\*\***

***Summary of Challenge:** EPA maintains 204 offices and laboratories in 144 locations with over 18,000 staff members. With diminishing resources, the autonomous nature of regional and local offices, and the growing pressure to expand its role globally, EPA will be challenged to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of its current structure to identify opportunities for consolidating and reducing costs.*

**Agency Response:** EPA acknowledges the OIG's concerns and agrees that the Agency could benefit from a comprehensive review of its organizational structure as it relates to the number and location of employees needed to effectively accomplish its mission. While EPA does not have the resources or the authority to conduct such a broad review, it has conducted periodic nationwide assessments to identify cost-saving opportunities as a result of mission and personnel changes.

EPA maintains an inventory of buildings—owned and leased—that support its current mission. While some employees are located in “special use spaces,” the vast majority of employees are located in Headquarters buildings, regional offices, and laboratories. The “special use spaces” are rent-free in many instances and generally used by enforcement personnel who must work in concert with and proximate to state and local enforcement offices. The Agency requires all program and regional senior management officials to provide, in writing, space requirements and any requests for additional space, facility construction, repair, and alterations.

Under the Space Consolidation and Rent Avoidance Project, the Agency has released approximately 195,000 square feet of space, resulting in an annual rent avoidance of more than \$6.5 million. The Agency plans to release approximately 86,000 square feet of additional space in regional facilities for an estimated annual rent avoidance of nearly \$2 million. Through its master space planning process, the Agency will continue to identify and fulfill its long-term facility requirements.

#### **5. Water and Wastewater Infrastructure**

***Summary of Challenge:** Drinking water and wastewater treatment systems are wearing out and it will take huge investments to replace, repair, and construct facilities.*

**Agency Response:** EPA is working to change the way the country views, values, manages, and uses its drinking water and wastewater infrastructure. The Sustainable Infrastructure initiative continues to be a top priority and has been extremely active in the past year. While ultimately long-term sustainability will occur at the local level, EPA has provided and continues to provide national leadership. For example, the Agency has partnered with six of the major water and wastewater professional associations to reach national consensus on the 10 “Attributes of an Effectively Managed Utility.” This first-of-a-kind national collaboration will enable utilities to operate under a common management framework that will help the sector move toward

sustainability in a unified manner. Recently, this collaboration has resulted in a primer to help utilities assess their operations based on the “Attributes,” focus on their most critical challenges, and set measurable performance goals. The primer is accompanied by an online tool kit that identifies other sources that can help utilities manage in a sustainable manner.

Recognizing that water efficiency has significant implications for infrastructure and how the Agency values water, EPA has been actively expanding the WaterSense Program, launched in 2006. The WaterSense label will help consumers find products and services that save water while ensuring performance, thereby reducing the burden on infrastructure and mitigating water availability challenges. It also helps to build a national consciousness of the value of water and water services, which will be essential to the national awareness and commitment that will be required to pay for infrastructure needs.

Additionally, EPA has reached out to other federal agencies and departments to work together on infrastructure sustainability. EPA is working with the Department of Transportation (DOT) on a set of case studies on asset management, an area of common interest for water and highway infrastructure. DOT and EPA have agreed to establish a full-time liaison position to facilitate further collaboration. Last year, EPA partnered with the Department of Agriculture on the National Paying for Sustainable Water Infrastructure conference and continues to collaborate with the Department and its funding programs. EPA has discussed water infrastructure with the Army Corps of Engineers and recently shared with them its Special Appropriations Act Project guidance, which includes a section on how to incorporate sustainable practices in earmark projects.

EPA believes it has taken and will continue to take effective steps to define and pursue its role in ensuring that the nation’s drinking water and wastewater infrastructure is sustainable in the future and in increasing public awareness and appreciation of the need for sustainable water infrastructure. Expanding EPA’s role will require increased authority and resources.

## **6. Oversight of Delegations to States\***

***Summary of Challenge:** Implementing EPA’s programs, enforcement of laws and regulations, and reporting on program performance has to a large extent been delegated to States and tribes, with EPA retaining oversight responsibility. However, inconsistent capacity and interpretation of responsibility among State, local, and tribal entities limits accountability for and compliance with environmental programs and laws.*

**Agency Response:** EPA agrees with the OIG that the Agency has made progress in its oversight of delegated programs, and it intends to continue this progress through a variety of ongoing initiatives. As the OIG notes, state oversight is a very complex and changeable arena. Through federal statute, implementing regulations, and program design, states are allowed flexibility in how they manage and implement environmental programs. This flexibility is critical for individual states to meet the broad range of environmental challenges and set priorities to deal with them.

EPA is devoting significant attention to improving its performance management and accountability systems for Agency programs, including those delegated to the states. Several of these efforts are aimed at improving data and performance measures to better assess program progress nationally. Through the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS), state environmental commissioners, who are responsible for implementing delegated programs, annually participate in developing EPA's strategic plan and national program guidance. For the last three budget cycles, council officers have participated in the Agency's budget hearings with the Deputy Administrator and Chief Financial Officer. For the budget hearings, states provide information about state priorities, respond to Agency questions about program priorities and funding needs, and submit state budget proposals for the state and tribal categorical grant programs.

National program consistency and accountability depend on the work that EPA regions do with states to ensure that national program goals are met through negotiated EPA/state agreements and grants. National program managers and EPA's OCFO work closely with the states in planning, budgeting, and accountability processes to ensure better alignment of program goals, objectives, and measures of effectiveness at the state level. Each year, states, regions, and national program managers review existing program progress measures and make recommendations for improving individual measures, aligning their measures, and where appropriate, reducing/eliminating unnecessary measures. The focus is on ensuring that the measures are meaningful ways to measure program progress.

EPA program offices are responsible for state oversight of individual programs; however, the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations participates in joint workgroups, such as the State Review Framework Workgroup, to remove barriers to collaborative problem solving. The Office supports outreach and consultation with the states through national associations, particularly the Environmental Council of the States. EPA works with the Council to ensure that consultation with the states occurs early in the development of regulations, policy, and guidance, and that the consultation that takes place is timely, meaningful, appropriate, and facilitates the goal of protection of human health and the environment.

Currently, the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations (OCIR) is participating in a number of areas to improve the EPA-state relationships. Many of these areas involve improving data, performance measurement, and accountability.

- EPA is working on a uniform state grant workplan in response to OMB concerns and has developed a common set of environmental measures that it requires be included in all state grant workplans.
- EPA will continue to utilize performance measurement and accountability analyses, using information from completed Agency Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) reviews and OMB program assessments.
- The Office of Environmental Information is working with states to have them adopt data standards for national program databases and to develop new applications for the National Environmental Information Exchange Network.

- EPA is making expanded use of business process improvement techniques and burden reduction projects to eliminate waste and duplication in EPA and state work to enable “doing the right things, the right way,” reducing reporting burden for state programs, and allowing the redirection and redeployment of scarce resources to maximize program accountability.
- The Agency is enhancing its consultation with the states in developing regulations to ensure that final rules can be implemented effectively. OCIR is also participating in a special project to revise EPA's guidance governing economic analyses for the cost of rules to include better estimates of the costs to the states for implementation.

The Agency is committed to pursuing these improvements.

## **7. Chesapeake Bay Program**

***Summary of Challenge:** EPA’s Chesapeake Bay Program Office is responsible for overseeing the cleanup of the Chesapeake Bay, North America’s largest and most biologically diverse estuary. Despite EPA’s efforts, which include providing scientific information to its federal, state, and local partners for setting resource allocations, revising water quality standards, and establishing stricter wastewater treatment discharge limits, the Agency continues to face significant challenges in meeting water quality goals. OIG notes that the remaining challenges include: (1) managing land development, (2) increasing implementation of agricultural conservation practices, (3) monitoring and expediting the installation of nutrient removal technology at wastewater treatment plants, (4) seeking greater reduction in air emissions, and (5) identifying consistent and sustained funding sources to support tributary strategy implementation. While EPA is responsible for monitoring and assessing progress, its partners will need to implement practices to reduce loads. OIG believes EPA will need to institute management controls to ensure that the promised reductions are realistic and achievable. EPA should then use its reporting responsibilities to advise Congress and the Chesapeake Bay community on the partners’ progress in meeting these commitments and identify funding shortfalls and other impediments that will affect progress for restoring the Chesapeake Bay. GAO notes that despite the hundreds of measures to assess progress of its Chesapeake Bay Program, the Agency does not have an approach to translate the measures or a strategy to target limited resources to activities outlined in Chesapeake 2000. While EPA has developed a Web-based system to unify its planning documents, these activities do not fully address GAO’s recommendations. Additionally, EPA has made progress in guiding the development of an overall strategy for restoring environmental conditions in the Great Lakes Basin. However, it is unclear whether the strategy will be the guiding document for Great Lakes restoration. The Agency needs a clearly defined organizational structure with measurable basin-wide goals and a monitoring system as called for in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement and the Clean Water Act.*

**Agency Response:** GAO and OIG continue to raise concerns about EPA’s Chesapeake Bay and Great Lakes programs. In October 2005, GAO issued *Chesapeake Bay Program: Improved Strategies are Needed to Better Assess, Report and Manage Restoration Progress*. Between 2005 and 2008, OIG issued several evaluation reports on the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP), the majority focusing on EPA’s efforts to reduce nutrients and sediment loads from the principal

source sectors in the Chesapeake Bay. EPA believes that actions taken to date and those planned in the future adequately address the concerns GAO and OIG expressed in these reports.

In a May 2008 report to Congress, *Strengthening the Management, Coordination and Accountability of the Chesapeake Bay Program*, EPA described CBP partners' collective efforts to implement GAO recommendations. This report provides documentation and evidence demonstrating how these recommendations have been implemented and will support enhanced coordination, collaboration, and accountability among the CBP partners. In addition, it describes CBP partners' progress in developing and implementing the Chesapeake Action Plan (CAP), a critical enhancement of the CBP's management system that supports implementation of the GAO recommendations.

The CAP includes four primary components:

- A strategic framework that unifies CBP's existing planning documents and clarifies how CBP partners will pursue the restoration and protection goals for the Bay and its watershed;
- An operating plan that identifies and catalogues CBP partners' resources and actions being undertaken and planned;
- Dashboards, which are high-level summaries of key information, including clear status of progress, realistic annual targets toward certain Chesapeake 2000 goals, summaries of actions and funding, and critical analyses of the current strategy, challenges, and future emphasis; and
- An adaptive management process that begins to identify how this information and analysis will provide critical input to determine CBP partners' actions, assign emphasis, and establish future priorities.

These components enhance coordination among CBP partners; encourage them to continually review and improve their progress in protecting and restoring the Bay; increase the transparency of CBP's operations for partners and the public; and heighten the level of CBP's accountability as a whole and as individual partners for meeting their Bay health and restoration goals.

The CAP supports a management system that more closely aligns implementation responsibilities with the unique capabilities and missions of the CBP partners, thereby using the limited resources available to the CBP partners more efficiently. The CAP will significantly transform the way CBP will operate.

It is important to note that CBP partners have long been engaged in significant actions to advance the protection and restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. CBP partners are strongly committed to achieving program goals for the Bay. The CAP has placed CBP on a course to accelerate the pace at which the partners implement actions to improve the Bay.

In May 2004, President Bush signed Executive Order 13340, creating a Cabinet-level interagency task force to bring an unprecedented level of collaboration and coordination to restore and protect the Great Lakes. EPA's Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) was cited in the Order and given responsibility for providing assistance to carry out the goals of the

Order. In addition, the Order created a federal interagency task force to bring the many governmental partners together to protect and restore the Great Lakes. In December 2005, the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration (GLRC) developed a strategy to guide federal, state, tribal and other partners' action to restore the Great Lakes. Federal commitments have been identified in the federal Near-Term Action Plan and are being implemented. EPA's GLNPO is tracking performance in improving the Great Lakes and progress toward commitments in the Federal Near-Term Action Plan.

During FY 2008, EPA continued to support the Great Lakes Interagency Task Force. As of August 2008, 37 of 48 near-term actions had been completed, with most of the remaining on track toward completion. The completed projects include a standardized sanitary survey tool for beach managers to identify pollution sources at beaches and \$525,000 in grants to state and local governments to pilot the use of the tool to assess 60 beaches in the Great Lakes. In addition, Asian Silver Carp, Largescale Silver Carp, and Black Carp were listed as injurious under the Lacey Act, and operation of the electric carp barrier in Illinois continued preventing the spread of these species into the Great Lakes.

EPA has been working with other federal agencies to strengthen interagency coordination and resolve a variety of problems. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and EPA collectively provided nearly \$2 million in federal funding, and more in leveraged non-federal funds, to support 36 projects to make on-the-ground gains in protecting and restoring watersheds in the Great Lakes. Pursuant to the Great Lakes Habitat/Wetlands Initiative, EPA coordinated and leveraged resources with appropriate agencies, including the Corps of Engineers, to restore, protect, or improve approximately 65,000 acres of wetlands toward a near-term goal of 100,000 acres. Great Lakes states have committed to meet a similar 100,000 acre wetlands goal.

Since receiving its first appropriation under the Great Lakes Legacy Act in 2004, EPA has seen noteworthy success in the timely removal of contaminants from Great Lakes' Areas of Concern. For instance, EPA and its partners have remediated more than 800,000 cubic yards of contaminated sediment at five sites, and leveraged funds under the Act (utilizing federal, state, and private dollars) to remove more than 1.5 million pounds of contaminated sediments from the environment. These efforts have reduced risk to aquatic life and human health, removing more than 25,000 pounds of PCBs, more than 1 million pounds of chromium, about 400 pounds of mercury, and 171 pounds of lead.

EPA acknowledges that there is much more to be done and that many management challenges remain. The Agency will continue to work toward solving these problems in collaboration with other Great Lakes Interagency Task Force agencies, as well as its other international, state, and local level partners.

## **8. Voluntary Programs – Update\*\*\*\***

*Summary of Challenge: EPA must ensure that applying voluntary approaches and innovative or alternative practices to provide flexible, collaborative, and market-driven solutions for measurable results are managed using standards, consistent processes, and verifiable data, to*

*ensure that programs are efficiently and effectively providing intended and claimed environmental benefits.*

**Agency Response:** EPA programs support nearly 50 voluntary or partnership programs, which complement regulations, assistance, grants, and other tools to promote improved environmental performance. For example, they may function as an adjunct to regulatory programs (e.g., encouraging retrofit or replacement of older equipment where regulations apply only to new equipment) or fill in where a regulatory approach is not practicable (e.g., helping companies design products to minimize their long-term environmental impact). The wide range of these programs is attributed to their varying size, scope, environmental media, target environmental issue, and stakeholder base. These programs encompass a diverse array of activities ranging from high-profile programs such as Energy Star to smaller, more targeted programs such as Sunwise or Natural Gas STAR.

These programs are managed by of the Agency's various program offices. OPEI provides assistance and coordination to the program offices. OPEI also provides advice regarding the strategic management of the voluntary programs to EPA's senior management, through the Innovation Action Council (IAC).

In 2008, EPA took a number of significant steps to track these programs and ensure that they are well-designed, well-managed and properly evaluated. The Deputy Administrator established a Senior Leadership subgroup, under the auspices of the Innovation Action Council. The subgroup was tasked with adopting minimum program standards, creating procedures to report the establishment of new programs, and clearly defining what constitutes a "partnership program." The new minimum standards require each program to:

- Develop a "logic model" and business plan showing how the resources invested are expected to lead to environmental results;
- Establish and carry out a plan for measuring results;
- Establish and carry out a plan for periodic program evaluation; and
- Create a professional marketing plan to maximize program impact.

OPEI is also establishing a central database for a variety of program information including budgets and results data, for the benefit of the Agency's management.

Concurrent efforts are under way to achieve the greatest benefit from the resources invested in these programs. For example:

- Several regional offices are beginning to "bundle" programs for delivery to target partners, avoiding duplicative marketing efforts.
- OPEI provides technical assistance, such as the annual partnership program practitioners' workshop. The 2008 workshop attracted more participants than in the past and served as a vehicle for providing information about the new program standards.
- EPA issued a cross-agency guide to the EPA Climate Programs, which is designed to help businesses or industry sectors find the programs relevant to their needs for reducing



greenhouse gas emissions, reducing overlap and duplication in marketing efforts by programs reaching out to similar partners.

These steps constitute a significant response to the concerns identified in this management challenge, in particular, the need for Agency-wide policies on key evaluative elements, more consistent and reliable data, operational guidelines, and a systematic process to develop, test, market, and evaluate the effectiveness of voluntary programs.

## **9. Chemical Regulations**

*Summary of Challenge:* GAO reviews found that EPA does not routinely assess the risks of all existing chemicals and faces challenges in obtaining the information necessary to do so. Although EPA initiated the High-Production Volume (HPV) Challenge Program, it is not yet clear whether the program will produce sufficient information for EPA to determine chemicals' risks to human health and the environment. Additionally, EPA has established the Chemical Assessment and Management Program (ChAMP) to assess the harmfulness of chemicals; however, obtaining information from the chemical industry on toxicity and exposure has been difficult. Until EPA can determine the value of such programs, the Agency remains challenged in its ability to assess chemical risk to human health and the environment.

Agency Response: The Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA) authorizes EPA to obtain information on chemicals and regulate chemicals that pose an unreasonable risk to human health and the environment. In FY 2007, EPA initiated the chemical assessment phase, drawing on: 1) HPV Challenge Program chemical hazard and fate data; and 2) EPA's expansion of the TSCA Inventory Update Rule (IUR) provided valuable new use data for large volume chemicals that support exposure characterizations. The Agency is combining these data to produce Risk-Based Prioritizations (RBP) to guide subsequent actions for HPV chemicals. EPA will have developed and posted 330 RBPs for HPV chemicals by the end of FY 2009.

In FY 2008, EPA expanded the scope of its existing chemicals assessment and risk management program to develop Hazard-Based Prioritizations (HBPs) for the approximately 4,000 Moderate Production Volume (MPV) chemicals produced annually in quantities exceeding 25,000 pounds. HBPs differ from RBPs by focusing exclusively on chemical hazard and fate information. The expanded IUR chemical use data are only reported for large volume chemicals. Furthermore, since the HPV Challenge Program did not include MPV chemicals in its data collection efforts, EPA is drawing on existing data and sophisticated Structure/Activity Relationship (SAR) models to develop the HBPs. EPA will have developed and publically posted 155 HBPs by the end of FY 2009.

The RBPs and HBPs categorize chemicals into three priority levels (high, medium, low) for subsequent more detailed assessment or direct risk management action. Additional resources proposed by EPA for FY 2010 to support an enhanced toxics program will enable EPA to significantly accelerate its pace in developing RBPs (230 vs. 180 in FY 2009) and HBPs (350 vs. 100 in FY 2009). More importantly, a substantial portion of these proposed additional resources will be used by EPA to initiate the risk management phase of this strategy, supporting deployment of the full range of TSCA regulatory authorities and pollution prevention programs

to address high priority chemicals of concern. (More information is available at: <http://www.epa.gov/chemrtk/pubs/sumresp.htm>.)

Taken together, these efforts substantially enhance EPA's ability to not only assess but also act to reduce chemical risks to human health and the environment.

## **10. Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) Risk Assessment**

***Summary of Challenge:** GAO believes that EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) is at risk of becoming obsolete because of the Agency's inability to: (1) complete timely and credible assessments; (2) decrease its backlog of ongoing assessments; and (3) manage recent process changes. GAO is concerned that these factors may further prevent EPA from properly managing the IRIS database. GAO recommends that EPA, in order to effectively maintain IRIS assessments, streamline its assessment process and adopt transparency practices that provide assurance that the assessments are appropriately based on the best available science and not biased by policy considerations.*

**Agency Response:** In its March 2008 report, *Chemical Assessments: Low Productivity and New Interagency Review Process Limit the Usefulness and Credibility of EPA's Integrated Risk Information System*, GAO states that EPA's IRIS database is at risk of becoming obsolete. EPA has been working to revise the IRIS process to help address delays in completing IRIS assessments and to provide greater transparency, objectivity, balance, rigor, and predictability in the process to produce IRIS assessments. EPA recently redesigned its IRIS process and is considering other changes that it believes will sufficiently address GAO's recommendations.

With regard to GAO concerns about the timeliness of IRIS assessments, EPA continues working to ensure that assessments are executed on a predictable schedule and in a manner that decreases the backlog of incomplete assessments. For the first time, specific timelines and major milestones are established for each step of the process. The timelines in the IRIS process must balance the need for careful consideration of science and science policy with EPA's need for timely information.

The new IRIS process enables greater public involvement. For example, the nomination process for new assessments has been expanded to include a Federal Register notice that allows the public to nominate chemicals for review. EPA is also working to improve the prioritization process to capture and document the relative priorities of EPA programs, in conjunction with various interests of the public and other stakeholders. In addition, to facilitate transparency, a public comment period and public listening session are now held for each chemical. They are announced through a Federal Register notice following the release of the external review draft of an assessment.

EPA believes that by promoting greater communication and information sharing, providing stakeholders and the public with increased access to the IRIS process in a well-defined capacity, it has ensured that IRIS assessments will be highly transparent and based on the most credible science. EPA will continue to evaluate the process over time, instituting additional improvements

as needed, to ensure that the process effectively meets the needs of EPA, the Federal government, and the American public.

## **11. Management of Leaking Underground Storage Tanks**

***Summary of Challenge:** Under the underground storage tanks program, EPA relies on states to ensure that tank owners and operators are in compliance with federal financial responsibilities. In a 2007 report, GAO found that EPA did not provide specific guidance to states as to whether or how frequently they should verify coverage. GAO believes EPA lacks assurance that states are adequately overseeing and enforcing financial responsibility provisions and that the Agency's method of monitoring whether state assurance funds provide adequate financial responsibility coverage is limited. In addition, GAO finds that EPA's distribution of LUST Trust Fund money to states depends on data that may be inaccurate, due to state reporting requirements. GAO recommends EPA develop national data on the extent to which releases remaining to be cleaned up are attributed to tanks without viable owners.*

**Agency Response:** In February 2007, GAO published its report to Congressional requestors, *Leaking Underground Storage Tanks: EPA Should Take Steps to Better Ensure the Effective Use of Public Funding for Cleanups*. GAO recommended EPA ensure that tank owners maintain adequate financial responsibility coverage and that state assurance funds provide reliable coverage. EPA believes it has taken steps to address these GAO concerns.

EPA agrees that regular verification of financial responsibility coverage is important to ensure adequate funding for future releases. EPA is now requiring state and EPA inspectors to verify compliance with the financial responsibility requirements as part of the Energy Policy Act's mandatory 3-year inspection requirement. In response to GAO's recommendation that the Agency improve its oversight of the solvency of state assurance funds to ensure that they continue to provide reliable coverage for tank owners, the Agency is developing guidance for monitoring the financial soundness of state funds and expects to complete this guidance in September 2009. The Agency is also conducting a study of backlog sites not yet cleaned up and assessing the feasibility of evaluating private UST insurance mechanisms. The backlog study will examine the pace of cleanups in 14 states and attempt to identify factors that may slow the rate of cleanup. The study is expected to be completed by the end of 2009.

To better focus on how EPA distributes program resources by states, the Agency has developed a Quality Assurance/Quality Evaluation Checklist and is working with regions and states to implement quality control measures and ensure that data is consistent with existing EPA definitions. EPA will also work with regions and states to consider other changes to improve the distribution of future LUST money, including changes that more specifically reflect the need at abandoned LUST sites.

## **12. Enforcement and Compliance**

***Summary of Challenge:** While EPA has improved its oversight of state enforcement programs by implementing the State Review Framework (SRF), GAO notes that the Agency needs now to use SRF reviews as a means to address issues identified. Specifically, the Agency needs to*

*determine the root cause of poorly performing programs, inform the public about states' progress in implementing their enforcement responsibilities, and utilize the SRF methodology to assess performance of EPA regions. EPA needs to improve its enforcement data to determine the universe of regulated entities and their characteristics and address apparent inconsistencies in program delivery among EPA's regional offices.*

**Agency Response:** In a July 2007 report entitled, *EPA-State Enforcement Partnership Has Improved, but EPA's Oversight Needs Further Enhancement*, GAO recommends that EPA improve its oversight of enforcement programs by using the State Review Framework (SRF) to develop a more consistent approach. EPA has used and will continue to use the SRF as tool to assess state compliance and enforcement programs, and regional direct-implementation programs.

EPA created the SRF in FY 2004 as a pilot (one state in each of its ten regions) to address concerns about consistency in the minimum level of enforcement activity across states and the oversight of state programs by EPA regions. Between FY 2005 and FY 2007, the SRF was implemented in the remaining states and 4 territories. Using 12 core elements, the SRF assesses enforcement activities across three key programs – the Clean Air Act Stationary Sources (Title V), the Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle C. The 12 core elements include data completeness, data accuracy, timeliness of data entry, completion of work plan commitments, inspection coverage, completeness of inspection reports, identification of alleged violations, identification of significant noncompliance, ensuring return to compliance, timely and appropriate enforcement, calculation of gravity and economic benefit penalty components, and final assessed penalties and their collection.

During FYs 2007-2008, EPA evaluated the first full round of the SRF to identify ways to streamline the time and effort of the reviews and opportunities for further improvements. Based on the reviews and the evaluation, EPA identified four areas that were recurring issues across states and programs: data entry and reporting; significant non-compliance and high priority violations (SNC/HPV) identification; timely enforcement; and calculation and documentation of penalties. In September 2008, EPA made key improvements and initiated Round 2, which included additional and enhanced training for regions and states, streamlined reporting through a standard template, clarified elements, improved metrics, more explicit guidance on incorporating local agencies into reviews, better understanding of where consistency is important, a streamlined review of reports, tracking and management of the implementation of recommendations, and additional steps for communication and coordination between regions and states.

The current SRF outlines the process for uniformly addressing significant problems identified in state programs. The process consists of a series of escalating steps. First, the region and state will precisely define the state's attributes and deficiencies, and then develop a schedule for implementing needed changes. Second, the region and state will jointly develop a plan to address improved performance, using established mechanisms such as Performance Partnership Agreements, Performance Partnership Grants, or categorical grant agreements to codify the

plans. Third, the implementation of the plan will be monitored and managed to ensure progress as planned and to identify and deal with issues as they arise.

EPA is using the SRF as a means to assess compliance and enforcement programs. In early 2009, EPA reviewed the status of state progress toward addressing the problems identified in the first round of SRF reviews. At that time, states had completed 74 percent of the recommended actions to address problems. The Agency will review the status of the recommendations annually and discuss progress with the regions at the senior management level twice per year. In addition, based on the reviews and the evaluation, the Agency identified four areas that were recurring issues across states and programs: data entry and reporting; significant non-compliance and high priority violations (SNC/HPV) identification; timely enforcement; and calculation and documentation of penalties. EPA has conducted an analysis of the nature and causes of these national issues and will work with the states to develop plans to improve performance in these areas on a nationwide basis.

EPA has made substantial progress in planning and priority setting with states and in using the SRF to enhance its ability to evaluate and oversee state enforcement activities. The Agency believes that the SRF will help to maintain a level of consistency across state programs, ensuring that states meet minimum standards and leading to fair and consistent enforcement of environmental laws and consistent protection of human health and the environment across the country. EPA plans to use the “SRF Tracker” to analyze trends in findings and track corrective actions to report on the results of the SRF reviews.

### **13. Environmental Information**

*Summary of Challenge:* While noting EPA’s progress in addressing critical data gaps in its environmental information, GAO believes the Agency still lacks the data it needs to manage for environmental results. The Agency continues to face challenges in filling critical data gaps to incorporate better scientific understanding into assessments of environmental trends and conditions and to develop better performance measures for managing programs and measuring program effectiveness. Additionally, the Agency needs to be cautious of its use of biomonitoring as a tool for detecting chemical effects on children’s health.

**Agency Response:** EPA has made progress in addressing critical data gaps in its environmental information. Under the Environmental Indicators Initiative, EPA is seeking to identify and obtain the data necessary to help the Agency manage for results and to provide a coherent picture of the Nation’s environment. Despite the progress being made, critical data gaps remain that need to be filled to provide better scientific understanding of environmental trends and conditions. EPA’s *Report on the Environment 2008* discusses indicators and data that are currently available to answer questions concerning environmental conditions and trends and describes their limitations. Additionally, the report identifies key limitations of these indicators and gaps where reliable indicators do not yet exist. EPA points out that these gaps and limitations highlight the disparity between the current state of knowledge and the goal of information about specific environmental conditions and trends that can direct future research and monitoring efforts.

To better link and integrate the *Report on the Environment* with its strategic planning and budgeting, EPA continues to implement and refine a process for identifying and prioritizing key data gaps that limit its ability to report on and manage for environmental results. EPA agrees with GAO that it needs to continue to make progress in this process. However, EPA does not agree that environmental information supporting the indicators activities remains a management challenge. The Agency is taking steps to implement a planning approach that takes into account important environmental results and follows through to identify knowledge gaps and limitations at the program level. By introducing environmental information needs as part of the Agency's planning process and continuing Office of Research and Development and the Office of Environmental Information (OEI) work on indicators and performance management, EPA believes it has addressed the challenge. In addition, OEI's National Dialogue on Access to Environmental Information, launched in FY 2008, will result in development of a strategy to enhance public access to environmental information available both within and outside EPA. Because a significant portion of available environmental information resides outside of EPA, the Agency believes this strategy will assist the Agency in making additional progress in addressing information needs.

#### **14. Financial Management Practices**

*Summary of Challenge:* GAO continues to raise concerns about the Agency's financial management practices. While EPA has made significant progress in enhancing its deobligation efforts, GAO believes the Agency needs to improve oversight of its processes for conducting and tracking deobligation of expired contracts, grants, and interagency agreements. Additionally, GAO recommends that the Agency report deobligation and recertification of expired funds in its Congressional budget justification.

**Agency Response:** EPA acknowledges GAO's concerns about its financial management practices. The Agency has already taken steps to reduce unliquidated obligations in expired contracts and grants, which have resulted in a significant decrease since FY 2006.

During FY 2006 and 2007, EPA integrated data elements between its Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) and Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS), thereby creating a relational database that supports integrated administrative and financial reporting. Using standard reporting and baseline estimates, EPA is able to measure unliquidated obligations remaining in expired grants. During FY 2006 and 2007, EPA achieved annual reductions of 12.1 percent and 10.6 percent, respectively. In FY 2008, EPA recognized a reduction of \$25.9 million (14.8 percent) for a baseline estimate of \$175 million in obligations that expired through October 3, 2007. The Agency is committed to achieving unliquidated obligations as a percentage of total obligations equal to no more than 10 percent by the end of FY 2009.

Under its Proud to Be VI initiative, EPA has noted the importance of integrated reporting of contracts and financial data. Much of the Agency's decision to undertake this data integration reflects feedback provided during roundtable discussions with end-users of contracts information. During FY 2007, EPA developed a strategy to integrate reports combining data from existing systems, including IFMS and administrative contract systems, and provided these reporting tools to the end-user community. In addition, to ensure continuity of data availability

to Agency decision makers, EPA developed a suite of reports that are accessible via its Financial Data Warehouse.

To provide timely data to program managers on the status of a deobligation, EPA developed an Agency-wide "Recertification Database." This allows program offices to de-obligate no-year funds (e.g., Superfund or STAG) and initiate reprogramming requests in a timely manner. It also serves as an incentive to monitor and deobligate trailing funds.

EPA will continue to work toward its goals for reducing unliquidated obligations in expired grants and contracts.

## **15. Human Capital Management**

*Summary of Challenge:* GAO finds that despite EPA's progress in improving the management of its human capital, the Agency needs to ensure its workforce is distributed in the most effective manner. GAO further notes that if EPA is to improve its resource planning process, the Agency needs to obtain reliable data on key workload indicators and design budget and cost accounting systems that can isolate resources needed and allocated to key activities.

Agency Response: As part of ongoing resource management efforts, EPA has been exploring how to maximize the productivity of its staff and other resources. During each year's budget process, EPA reviews the staffing, funding levels, and allocation to address all activities. The OIG and GAO routinely report that EPA (and other agencies) need to increase the efficiency of resource use in functional areas. In addition, EPA and many other federal agencies have begun specializing in particular functional areas and providing these services externally to other federal agencies. For example, EPA has contracted with the Department of Defense for its payroll services, and the Department of the Interior provides accounting services to nearly 20 other agencies.

In 2006, a workload assessment and benchmarking analysis was conducted for EPA which compared EPA's workload methodology with that of nine other federal agencies. Data were used from the Office Personnel Management's (OPM) FedScope system, interviews, and past studies conducted through contract support. Two major difficulties were encountered: 1) finding strong comparables for EPA as a whole, and 2) finding appropriate qualitative information sources at other agencies to help understand the workload assessment methodologies, if any, that these agencies used.

In FY 2009, EPA is exploring ways to better assess and benchmark current staff levels against similar functions in other federal agencies, in order to better understand EPA workload, how other agencies approach the issue, and identify potential efficiencies. In 2009, we will begin to collect and analyze the data and this work will continue into FY 2010. The analysis will target certain key functions that EPA shares with other federal agencies, such as: 1) Regulatory Development, 2) Scientific Research, 3) Enforcement, 4) Financial Management, 5) Environmental Monitoring, and 6) Permitting.

Examining the Agency's workforce distribution characteristics to improve its resource planning is a broad and lengthy process. Traditional methods require extensive data collection and analysis. Benchmarking may help identify where a more targeted analysis could be effective. EPA will continue to review current processes and methodologies to determine how best to improve the management of its resources.

- \* FY 2004 and 2005 Working Relationships with the States and Linking Mission to Management were consolidated into Managing for Results. FY 2006 and FY 2007 Managing for Results and Data Gaps were merged into Performance Management
- \*\* FY 2006 and 2007 titled Agency Efforts in Support of Homeland Security
- \*\*\* FY 2007 this topic was include in Workforce Planning and in FY 2005 and 2006 in Human Capital Management
- \*\*\*\* FY 2006 and 2007 Voluntary Programs included Alternative and Innovative Practices and Programs



## EPA USER FEE PROGRAM

In FY 2010, EPA will have several user fee programs in operation. These user fee programs and proposals are as follows:

### **Current Fees: Pesticides**

The FY 2010 President's Budget reflects the continued collection of Maintenance fees for review of existing pesticide registrations, and Enhanced Registration Service Fees for the accelerated review of new pesticide registration applications.

- **Pesticides Maintenance Fee Extension**

The Maintenance fee provides funding for the Registration Review program and a certain percentage supports the processing of applications involving "me-too" or inert ingredients. In FY 2010, the Agency expects to collect \$22 million in Maintenance fees under current law.

- **Enhanced Registration Services**

Entities seeking to register pesticides for use in the United States pay a fee at the time the registration action request is submitted to EPA specifically for accelerated pesticide registration decision service. This process has introduced new pesticides to the market more quickly. In FY 2010, the Agency expects to collect \$6 million in Enhanced Registration Service fees under current law.

### **Current Fees: Other**

- **Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee**

Since 1989, the Pre-Manufacturing Notifications (PMN) fee has been collected for the review and processing of new chemical pre-manufacturing notifications submitted to EPA by the chemical industry. These fees are paid at the time of submission of the PMN for review by EPA's Toxic Substances program. PMN fees are authorized by the Toxic Substances Control Act and contain a cap on the amount the Agency may charge for a PMN review. EPA is authorized to collect up to \$1.8 million in PMN fees in FY 2010 under current law.

- **Lead Accreditation and Certification Fee**

The Toxic Substances Control Act, Title IV, Section 402(a)(3), mandates the development of a schedule of fees for persons operating lead training programs accredited under the 402/404 rule and for lead-based paint contractors certified under this rule. The training programs ensure that lead paint abatement is done safely. Fees collected for this activity are deposited in the U.S. Treasury, and EPA estimates that \$1 million will be deposited in FY 2010.

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

This fee is authorized by the Clean Air Act of 1990 and is managed by the Air and Radiation program. Fee collections began in August 1992. This fee is imposed on manufacturers of light-duty vehicles, light and heavy trucks and motorcycles. The fees cover EPA's cost of certifying new engines and vehicles and monitoring compliance of in-use engines and vehicles. In 2004, EPA promulgated a rule that updated existing fees and established fees for newly-regulated vehicles and engines. The fees established for new compliance programs are also imposed on heavy-duty, in-use, and nonroad industries, including large diesel and gas equipment (earthmovers, tractors, forklifts, compressors, etc.), handheld and non-handheld utility (chainsaws, weed-whackers, leaf-blowers, lawnmowers, tillers, etc.), marine (boat motors, watercraft, jet-skis), locomotive, aircraft and recreational vehicles (off-road motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles). In 2009 EPA added fees for evaporative requirements for nonroad engines. EPA intends to apply certification fees to additional industry sectors as new programs are developed. In FY 2010, EPA expects to collect \$19.8 million from this fee.

### **Fee Proposals: Pesticides**

- **Pesticides Tolerance Fee**

A tolerance is the maximum legal limit of a pesticide residue in and on food commodities and animal feed. In 1954, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) authorized the collection of fees for the establishment of tolerances on raw agricultural commodities and in food commodities. The collection of this fee has been blocked by the Pesticides Registration Improvement Renewal Act (PRIA 2) through 2012. The Administration will submit legislative language proposing to allow for the collection of \$13 million in Pesticide Tolerance fees in FY 2010.

- **Enhanced Registration Services**

Legislative language will be submitted proposing to publish a new fee schedule to collect an additional \$12 million in FY 2010 to better align fee collections with program costs. Currently, those who directly benefit from EPA's registration services cover only a fraction of the costs to operate the program, leaving the general taxpayer to shoulder the remaining burden.

- **Pesticides Maintenance Fee Extension**

Legislative language will be submitted to allow the collection of an additional \$23 million in order to more closely align fee collections with program costs. The President's Budget proposes to relieve the burden on the general taxpayer and finance the costs of operating the Registration Review program from those who directly benefit from EPA's reregistration activities.

### **Fee Proposals: Other**

- **Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee**

Under the current fee structure, the Agency would collect \$1.8 million in FY 2010. Legislative language will be submitted to remove the statutory cap in the Toxic Substances Control Act on Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fees. In FY 2010, EPA expects to collect an additional \$4 million by removing the statutory cap.

## WORKING CAPITAL FUND

In FY 2010, the Agency begins its fourteenth year of operation of the Working Capital Fund (WCF). It is a revolving fund, authorized by law to finance a cycle of operations, where the costs of goods and services provided are charged to users on a fee-for-service basis. The funds received are available without fiscal year limitation, to continue operations and to replace capital equipment. EPA's WCF was implemented under the authority of Section 403 of the Government Management Reform Act of 1994 and EPA's FY 1997 Appropriations Act. Permanent WCF authority was contained in the Agency's FY 1998 Appropriations Act.

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

Four Agency activities, provided in FY 2009, will continue into FY 2010. These are the Agency's information technology and telecommunications operations, managed by the Office of Environmental Information, Agency postage costs, managed by the Office of Administration, and the Agency's core accounting system and relocation services, which are both managed by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

The Agency's FY 2010 budget request includes resources for these four activities in each National Program Manager's submission, totaling approximately \$200 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. In FY 2010, the Agency will continue to market its information technology and relocation services to other Federal agencies in an effort to deliver high quality services external to EPA, which will result in lower costs to EPA customers.

## ACRONYMS

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

**ADA:** Americans with Disabilities Act

**ADEA:** Age Discrimination in Employment Act

**AHERA:** Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act

**AHPA:** Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act

**ASHAA:** Asbestos in Schools Hazard Abatement Act

**APA:** Administrative Procedures Act

**ASTCA:** Antarctic Science, Tourism, and Conservation Act

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

**BRERA:** Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act

**CAA:** Clean Air Act

**CAAA:** Clean Air Act Amendments

**CCA:** Clinger Cohen Act

**CCAA:** Canadian Clean Air Act

**CEPA:** Canadian Environmental Protection Act

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

**CFOA:** Chief Financial Officers Act

**CFR:** Code of Federal Regulations

**CICA:** Competition in Contracting Act

**CRA:** Civil Rights Act

**CSA:** Computer Security Act

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

**CWA:** Clean Water Act

**CZARA:** Coastal Zone Management Act Reauthorization Amendments

**CZMA:** Coastal Zone Management Act

**DPA:** Deepwater Ports Act

**DREAA:** Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act

**ECRA:** Economic Cleanup Responsibility Act

**EFOIA:** Electronic Freedom of Information Act

**EPAA:** Environmental Programs Assistance Act

**EPAAR:** EPA Acquisition Regulations

**EPCA:** Energy Policy and Conservation Act

**EPACT:** Energy Policy Act

**EPCRA:** Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act

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

**ESA:** Endangered Species Act

**ESECA:** Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act

**FACA:** Federal Advisory Committee Act

**FAIR:** Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act

**FCMA:** Fishery Conservation and Management Act

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

**FFDCA:** Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act

**FGCAA:** Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act

**FIFRA:** Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

**FLPMA:** Federal Land Policy and Management Act

**FMFIA:** Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act

**FOIA:** Freedom of Information Act

**FPAS:** Federal Property and Administration Services Act

**FPA:** Federal Pesticide Act

**FPPA:** Federal Pollution Prevention Act

**FPR:** Federal Procurement Regulation

**FQPA:** Food Quality Protection Act

**FRA:** Federal Register Act

**FSA:** Food Security Act

**FUA:** Fuel Use Act

**FWCA:** Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

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

**GISRA:** Government Information Security Reform Act

**GMRA:** Government Management Reform Act

**GPRA:** Government Performance and Results Act

**HMTA:** Hazardous Materials Transportation Act

**HSWA:** Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments

**IGA:** Inspector General Act

**IPA:** Intergovernmental Personnel Act

**IPIA:** Improper Payments Information Act

**ISTEA:** Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act

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

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

**MPRSA:** Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act

**NAAEC:** North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation

**NAAQS:** National Ambient Air Quality Standard

**NAWCA:** North American Wetlands Conservation Act

**NEPA:** National Environmental Policy Act

**NHPA:** National Historic Preservation Act

**NIPDWR:** National Interim Primary Drinking Water Regulations

**NISA:** National Invasive Species Act of 1996

**ODA:** Ocean Dumping Act

**OPA:** The Oil Pollution Act

**OWBPA:** Older Workers Benefit Protection Act

**PBA:** Public Building Act

**PFCRA:** Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act

**PHSA:** Public Health Service Act

**PLIRRA:** Pollution Liability Insurance and Risk Retention Act

**PR:** Privacy Act

**PRA:** Paperwork Reduction Act

**QCA:** Quiet Communities Act

**RCRA:** Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

**RLBPHRA:** Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act

**RFA:** Regulatory Flexibility Act

**RICO:** Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act

**SARA:** Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986

**SBREFA:** Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

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

**SDWA:** Safe Drinking Water Act

**SICEA:** Steel Industry Compliance Extension Act

**SMCRA:** Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act

**SPA:** Shore Protection Act of 1988

**SWDA:** Solid Waste Disposal Act

**TCA:** Tribal Cooperative Agreement

**TSCA:** Toxic Substances Control Act

**UMRA:** Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

**UMTRLWA:** Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Land Withdrawal Act

**USC:** United States Code

**USTCA:** Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act

**WQA:** Water Quality Act of 1987

**WRDA:** Water Resources Development Act

**WSRA:** Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

**WWWQA:** Wet Weather Water Quality Act of 2000



## STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS

### Statutory Authority and Eligible Uses (Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2009 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2010 Goal/ Objective	FY 2010 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Section 103	Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and Tribal representatives and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states)	Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to addressing regional haze.	\$52,350.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	\$54,850.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2009 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2010 Goal/ Objective	FY 2010 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Sections 103, 105, 106	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA; Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states); Interstate air quality control region designated pursuant to section 107 of the CAA or of implementing section 176A, or section 184 NOTE: only the Ozone Transport Commission is eligible	Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program support costs, including monitoring activities (section 105); Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA (sections 103 and 106); Supporting training for CAA section 302(b) air pollution control agency staff (sections 103 and 105); Supporting research, investigative and demonstration projects(section 103)	\$171,730.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	\$171,730.0

<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Statutory Authorities</b>	<b>Eligible Recipients</b>	<b>Eligible Uses</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>	<b>FY 2010 Goal/ Objective</b>	<b>FY 2010 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>
Tribal Air Quality Management	CAA, Sections 103 and 105; Tribal Cooperative Agreements (TCA) in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribes; Intertribal Consortia; State/ Tribal College or University	Conducting air quality assessment activities to determine a Tribe's need to develop a CAA program; Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program costs; Supporting training for CAA for Federally-recognized Tribes	\$13,300.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	\$13,300.0
Radon	TSCA, Sections 10 and 306; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	State Agencies, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in the development and implementation of programs for the assessment and mitigation of radon	\$8,074.0	Goal 1, Obj. 2	\$8,074.0
Water Pollution Control (Section 106)	FWPCA, as amended, Section 106; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Interstate Agencies	Develop and carry out surface and ground water pollution control programs, including NPDES permits, TMDL's, WQ standards, monitoring, and NPS control activities.	\$218,495.0	Goal 2, Obj. 2	\$229,264.0
Nonpoint Source (NPS – Section 319)	FWPCA, as amended, Section 319(h); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement EPA-approved state and Tribal nonpoint source management programs and fund priority projects as selected by the state.	\$200,857.0	Goal 2, Obj. 2	\$200,857.0

<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Statutory Authorities</b>	<b>Eligible Recipients</b>	<b>Eligible Uses</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>	<b>FY 2010 Goal/Objective</b>	<b>FY 2010 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>
Wetlands Program Development	FWPCA, as amended, Section 104 (b)(3); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Interstate Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, Non-Profit Organizations	To develop new wetland programs or enhance existing programs for the protection, management and restoration of wetland resources.	\$16,830.0	Goal 4, Obj. 3	\$16,830.0
Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	SDWA, Section 1443(a); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assistance to implement and enforce National Primary Drinking Water Regulations to ensure the safety of the Nation's drinking water resources and to protect public health.	\$99,100.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	\$105,700.0
Homeland Security Grants	SDWA, Section 1442; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	To assist states and Tribes in coordinating their water security activities with other homeland security efforts.	\$4,950.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	\$0.0
Underground Injection Control (UIC)	SDWA, Section 1443(b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement and enforce regulations that protect underground sources of drinking water by controlling Class I-V underground injection wells.	\$10,891.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	\$10,891.0

<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Statutory Authorities</b>	<b>Eligible Recipients</b>	<b>Eligible Uses</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>	<b>FY 2010 Goal/Objective</b>	<b>FY 2010 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>
Beaches Protection	BEACH Act of 2000; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Local Governments	Develop and implement programs for monitoring and notification of conditions for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public.	\$9,900.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	\$9,900.0
Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	RCRA, Section 3011; FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Development & Implementation of Hazardous Waste Programs	\$101,346.0	Goal 3, Obj. 1 Obj. 2	\$106,346.0
Brownfields	CERCLA, as amended by the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (P.L. 107-118); GMRA (1990); FGCAA.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Build and support Brownfields programs which will assess contaminated properties, oversee private party cleanups, provide cleanup support through low interest loans, and provide certainty for liability related issues.	\$49,495.0	Goal 4, Obj. 2	\$49,495.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2009 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2010 Goal/ Objective	FY 2010 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Underground Storage Tanks (UST)	SWDA, as amended by the Superfund Reauthorization Amendments of 1986 (Subtitle I), Section 2007(f), 42 U.S.C. 6916(f)(2); EPA Act of 2005, Title XV – Ethanol and Motor Fuels, Subtitle B – Underground Storage Tank Compliance, Sections 1521-1533, P.L. 109-58, 42 U.S.C. 15801; Tribal Grants -P.L. 105-276.	States	Provide funding for SEE enrollees to work on the states' underground storage tanks and to support direct UST implementation programs.	\$2,500.0	Goal 3, Obj. 1	\$2,500.0
Pesticides Program Implementation	FIFRA, Sections 20 and 23; the FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement the following programs through grants to states, Tribes, partners, and supporters: Certification and Training / Worker Protection, Endangered Species Protection Program (ESPP) Field Activities, Pesticides in Water, Tribal Program, and Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program.	\$12,970.0	Goal 4, Obj. 1	\$13,520.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2009 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)	FY 2010 Goal/ Objective	FY 2010 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Lead	TSCA, Sections 10 and 404 (g); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement the lead-based paint activities in the Training and Certification program through EPA-authorized state, territorial and Tribal programs and, in areas without authorization, through direct implementation by the Agency. Activities conducted as part of this program include issuing grants for the training and certification of individuals and firms engaged in lead-based paint abatement and inspection activities and the accreditation of qualified training providers.	\$13,564.0	Goal 4, Obj. 1	\$14,564.0
Toxic Substances Compliance	TSCA, Sections 28(a) and 404 (g); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Territories, Federally recognized Indian Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in developing, maintaining and implementing compliance monitoring programs for PCBs, asbestos, and lead based paint, in addition to the enforcement of the lead-based paint program.	\$5,099.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	\$5,099.0

<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Statutory Authorities</b>	<b>Eligible Recipients</b>	<b>Eligible Uses</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>	<b>FY 2010 Goal/ Objective</b>	<b>FY 2010 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>
Pesticide Enforcement	FIFRA § 23(a)(1); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in implementing cooperative pesticide enforcement programs	\$18,711.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	\$18,711.0
National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN, aka "the Exchange Network")	As appropriate, CAA, Section 103; CWA, Section 104; RCRA, Section 8001; FIFRA, Section 20; TSCA, Sections 10 and 28; MPRSA, Section 203; SDWA, Section 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, Section 6605; FY 2002 Appropriations Act and FY 2003 Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Interstate Agencies, Tribal Consortium, Other Agencies with Related Environmental Information Activities	Helps states, territories, tribes, and intertribal consortia develop the information management and technology (IM/IT) capabilities they need to participate in the Exchange Network, to continue and expand data-sharing programs, and to improve access to environmental information.	\$10,000.0	Goal 5, Obj. 2	\$10,000.0



<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Statutory Authorities</b>	<b>Eligible Recipients</b>	<b>Eligible Uses</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>	<b>FY 2010 Goal/ Objective</b>	<b>FY 2010 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>
Pollution Prevention	Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, Section 6605; TSCA Section 10; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Provides assistance to states and state entities (i.e., colleges and universities) and Federally-recognized Tribes and intertribal consortia in order to deliver pollution prevention technical assistance to small and medium-sized businesses. A goal of the program is to assist businesses and industries with identifying improved environmental strategies and solutions for reducing waste at the source.	\$4,940.0	Goal 5, Obj. 2	\$4,940.0
Sector Program (previously Enforcement & Compliance Assurance)	As appropriate, CAA, Section 103; CWA, Section 104; FIFRA, Section 20; TSCA, Sections 10 and 28; MPRSA, Section 203; SDWA, Section 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	State, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Multi-Jurisdictional Organizations, Universities, Associations of Environmental Regulatory Personnel	Assist in developing innovative sector-based, multi-media, or single-media approaches to enforcement and compliance assurance. Provide training on sectors, compliance and enforcement, and single or multi-media programs.	\$1,828.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	\$1,828.0

<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Statutory Authorities</b>	<b>Eligible Recipients</b>	<b>Eligible Uses</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>	<b>FY 2010 Goal/ Objective</b>	<b>FY 2010 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)</b>
Tribal General Assistance Program	Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act (42 U.S.C. 4368b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribal Governments, Intertribal Consortia	Plan and develop Tribal environmental protection programs.	\$57,925.0	Goal 5, Obj. 3	\$62,875.0

**Environmental Protection Agency  
FY 2010 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification**

**PROGRAM PROJECTS BY APPROPRIATION  
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Acquisition Management</b>	<b>\$50,728.2</b>	<b>\$56,398.0</b>	<b>\$55,675.0</b>	<b>(\$723.0)</b>
EPM	\$29,868.9	\$31,872.0	\$32,281.0	\$409.0
LUST	\$154.2	\$165.0	\$165.0	\$0.0
Superfund	\$20,705.1	\$24,361.0	\$23,229.0	(\$1,132.0)
<b>Administrative Law</b>	<b>\$5,657.9</b>	<b>\$5,128.0</b>	<b>\$5,352.0</b>	<b>\$224.0</b>
EPM	\$5,657.9	\$5,128.0	\$5,352.0	\$224.0
<b>Alternative Dispute Resolution</b>	<b>\$1,913.7</b>	<b>\$2,248.0</b>	<b>\$2,318.0</b>	<b>\$70.0</b>
EPM	\$1,136.8	\$1,374.0	\$1,423.0	\$49.0
Superfund	\$776.9	\$874.0	\$895.0	\$21.0
<b>Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations</b>	<b>\$53,934.3</b>	<b>\$54,766.0</b>	<b>\$54,766.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
IG	\$41,896.5	\$44,791.0	\$44,791.0	\$0.0
Superfund	\$12,037.8	\$9,975.0	\$9,975.0	\$0.0
<b>Beach / Fish Programs</b>	<b>\$2,307.5</b>	<b>\$2,806.0</b>	<b>\$2,870.0</b>	<b>\$64.0</b>
EPM	\$2,307.5	\$2,806.0	\$2,870.0	\$64.0
<b>Brownfields</b>	<b>\$25,200.3</b>	<b>\$22,957.0</b>	<b>\$25,254.0</b>	<b>\$2,297.0</b>
EPM	\$25,200.3	\$22,957.0	\$25,254.0	\$2,297.0
<b>Brownfields Projects</b>	<b>\$101,682.5</b>	<b>\$97,000.0</b>	<b>\$100,000.0</b>	<b>\$3,000.0</b>
STAG	\$94,611.8	\$97,000.0	\$100,000.0	\$3,000.0
Superfund	\$7,070.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Beaches Protection</b>	<b>\$10,642.2</b>	<b>\$9,900.0</b>	<b>\$9,900.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$10,642.2	\$9,900.0	\$9,900.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Brownfields</b>	<b>\$51,070.6</b>	<b>\$49,495.0</b>	<b>\$49,495.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$51,070.6	\$49,495.0	\$49,495.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Environmental Information</b>	<b>\$14,402.4</b>	<b>\$10,000.0</b>	<b>\$10,000.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
STAG	\$14,402.4	\$10,000.0	\$10,000.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance</b>	<b>\$101,740.4</b>	<b>\$101,346.0</b>	<b>\$106,346.0</b>	<b>\$5,000.0</b>
STAG	\$101,740.4	\$101,346.0	\$106,346.0	\$5,000.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$5,688.0</b>	<b>\$4,950.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$4,950.0)</b>
STAG	\$5,688.0	\$4,950.0	\$0.0	(\$4,950.0)
<b>Categorical Grant: Lead</b>	<b>\$14,699.7</b>	<b>\$13,564.0</b>	<b>\$14,564.0</b>	<b>\$1,000.0</b>
STAG	\$14,699.7	\$13,564.0	\$14,564.0	\$1,000.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)</b>	<b>\$207,166.5</b>	<b>\$200,857.0</b>	<b>\$200,857.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$207,166.5	\$200,857.0	\$200,857.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Pesticides Enforcement</b>	<b>\$20,098.6</b>	<b>\$18,711.0</b>	<b>\$18,711.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$20,098.6	\$18,711.0	\$18,711.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Pesticides Program Implementation</b>	<b>\$14,014.7</b>	<b>\$12,970.0</b>	<b>\$13,520.0</b>	<b>\$550.0</b>
STAG	\$14,014.7	\$12,970.0	\$13,520.0	\$550.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)</b>	<b>\$243,836.1</b>	<b>\$218,495.0</b>	<b>\$229,264.0</b>	<b>\$10,769.0</b>
STAG	\$243,836.1	\$218,495.0	\$229,264.0	\$10,769.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention</b>	<b>\$5,076.8</b>	<b>\$4,940.0</b>	<b>\$4,940.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$5,076.8	\$4,940.0	\$4,940.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)</b>	<b>\$101,503.0</b>	<b>\$99,100.0</b>	<b>\$105,700.0</b>	<b>\$6,600.0</b>
STAG	\$101,503.0	\$99,100.0	\$105,700.0	\$6,600.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Radon</b>	<b>\$10,007.4</b>	<b>\$8,074.0</b>	<b>\$8,074.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$10,007.4	\$8,074.0	\$8,074.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Sector Program</b>	<b>\$1,666.3</b>	<b>\$1,828.0</b>	<b>\$1,828.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$1,666.3	\$1,828.0	\$1,828.0	\$0.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Categorical Grant: State and Local Air Quality Management</b>	<b>\$226,155.9</b>	<b>\$224,080.0</b>	<b>\$226,580.0</b>	<b>\$2,500.0</b>
STAG	\$226,155.9	\$224,080.0	\$226,580.0	\$2,500.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds</b>	<b>\$21,027.7</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$21,027.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Toxics Substances Compliance</b>	<b>\$5,273.6</b>	<b>\$5,099.0</b>	<b>\$5,099.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$5,273.6	\$5,099.0	\$5,099.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Tribal Air Quality Management</b>	<b>\$12,066.9</b>	<b>\$13,300.0</b>	<b>\$13,300.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$12,066.9	\$13,300.0	\$13,300.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Tribal General Assistance Program</b>	<b>\$58,628.8</b>	<b>\$57,925.0</b>	<b>\$62,875.0</b>	<b>\$4,950.0</b>
STAG	\$58,628.8	\$57,925.0	\$62,875.0	\$4,950.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Underground Injection Control (UIC)</b>	<b>\$12,114.5</b>	<b>\$10,891.0</b>	<b>\$10,891.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$12,114.5	\$10,891.0	\$10,891.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks</b>	<b>\$3,600.7</b>	<b>\$2,500.0</b>	<b>\$2,500.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$3,600.7	\$2,500.0	\$2,500.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training</b>	<b>\$670.3</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$670.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Water Quality Cooperative Agreements</b>	<b>\$445.3</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$445.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Wetlands Program Development</b>	<b>\$15,985.2</b>	<b>\$16,830.0</b>	<b>\$16,830.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$15,985.2	\$16,830.0	\$16,830.0	\$0.0
<b>Categorical Grant: Local Govt Climate Change</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$10,000.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$10,000.0)</b>
STAG	\$0.0	\$10,000.0	\$0.0	(\$10,000.0)

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance</b>	<b>\$89,653.5</b>	<b>\$99,897.0</b>	<b>\$113,083.0</b>	<b>\$13,186.0</b>
EPM	\$68,083.1	\$73,432.0	\$85,215.0	\$11,783.0
LUST	\$708.9	\$987.0	\$1,122.0	\$135.0
Superfund	\$20,861.5	\$25,478.0	\$26,746.0	\$1,268.0
<b>Children and Other Sensitive Populations: Agency Coordination</b>	<b>\$7,226.7</b>	<b>\$6,071.0</b>	<b>\$6,515.0</b>	<b>\$444.0</b>
EPM	\$7,226.7	\$6,071.0	\$6,515.0	\$444.0
<b>Civil Enforcement</b>	<b>\$134,428.8</b>	<b>\$139,299.0</b>	<b>\$148,355.0</b>	<b>\$9,056.0</b>
EPM	\$131,986.8	\$137,182.0	\$145,949.0	\$8,767.0
Oil Spills	\$1,851.0	\$2,117.0	\$2,406.0	\$289.0
Superfund	\$591.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Civil Rights / Title VI Compliance</b>	<b>\$11,109.6</b>	<b>\$11,488.0</b>	<b>\$12,000.0</b>	<b>\$512.0</b>
EPM	\$11,109.6	\$11,488.0	\$12,000.0	\$512.0
<b>Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs</b>	<b>\$29,028.7</b>	<b>\$29,145.0</b>	<b>\$30,527.0</b>	<b>\$1,382.0</b>
EPM	\$19,774.8	\$19,993.0	\$20,548.0	\$555.0
S&T	\$9,253.9	\$9,152.0	\$9,979.0	\$827.0
<b>Clean School Bus Initiative</b>	<b>\$6,868.8</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
STAG	\$6,868.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Climate Protection Program</b>	<b>\$114,520.6</b>	<b>\$111,099.0</b>	<b>\$130,609.0</b>	<b>\$19,510.0</b>
EPM	\$97,364.3	\$94,271.0	\$111,634.0	\$17,363.0
S&T	\$17,156.3	\$16,828.0	\$18,975.0	\$2,147.0
<b>Commission for Environmental Cooperation</b>	<b>\$4,289.2</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
EPM	\$4,289.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Compliance Assistance and Centers</b>	<b>\$29,169.4</b>	<b>\$24,886.0</b>	<b>\$27,175.0</b>	<b>\$2,289.0</b>
EPM	\$28,063.5	\$23,770.0	\$26,070.0	\$2,300.0
LUST	\$787.5	\$817.0	\$788.0	(\$29.0)
Oil Spills	\$285.3	\$277.0	\$317.0	\$40.0
Superfund	\$33.1	\$22.0	\$0.0	(\$22.0)
<b>Compliance Incentives</b>	<b>\$10,309.4</b>	<b>\$9,129.0</b>	<b>\$10,702.0</b>	<b>\$1,573.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
EPM	\$10,250.7	\$8,992.0	\$10,702.0	\$1,710.0
Superfund	\$58.7	\$137.0	\$0.0	(\$137.0)
<b>Compliance Monitoring</b>	<b>\$93,299.4</b>	<b>\$97,256.0</b>	<b>\$101,106.0</b>	<b>\$3,850.0</b>
EPM	\$92,048.1	\$96,064.0	\$99,859.0	\$3,795.0
Superfund	\$1,251.3	\$1,192.0	\$1,247.0	\$55.0
<b>Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations</b>	<b>\$48,923.4</b>	<b>\$48,456.0</b>	<b>\$50,980.0</b>	<b>\$2,524.0</b>
EPM	\$48,777.5	\$48,456.0	\$50,980.0	\$2,524.0
Superfund	\$145.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Congressionally Mandated Projects</b>	<b>\$89,275.3</b>	<b>\$175,900.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$175,900.0)</b>
EPM	\$12,403.5	\$17,450.0	\$0.0	(\$17,450.0)
S&T	\$1,034.0	\$5,450.0	\$0.0	(\$5,450.0)
STAG	\$75,837.8	\$153,000.0	\$0.0	(\$153,000.0)
<b>Criminal Enforcement</b>	<b>\$47,815.8</b>	<b>\$53,530.0</b>	<b>\$57,735.0</b>	<b>\$4,205.0</b>
EPM	\$40,128.8	\$45,763.0	\$49,399.0	\$3,636.0
Superfund	\$7,687.0	\$7,767.0	\$8,336.0	\$569.0
<b>Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program</b>	<b>\$29,798.9</b>	<b>\$75,000.0</b>	<b>\$60,000.0</b>	<b>(\$15,000.0)</b>
STAG	\$29,798.9	\$75,000.0	\$60,000.0	(\$15,000.0)
<b>Drinking Water Programs</b>	<b>\$110,747.3</b>	<b>\$102,334.0</b>	<b>\$106,576.0</b>	<b>\$4,242.0</b>
EPM	\$107,454.8	\$98,779.0	\$102,856.0	\$4,077.0
S&T	\$3,292.5	\$3,555.0	\$3,720.0	\$165.0
<b>Endocrine Disruptors</b>	<b>\$7,102.4</b>	<b>\$8,498.0</b>	<b>\$8,659.0</b>	<b>\$161.0</b>
EPM	\$7,102.4	\$8,498.0	\$8,659.0	\$161.0
<b>Enforcement Training</b>	<b>\$3,710.0</b>	<b>\$3,731.0</b>	<b>\$3,948.0</b>	<b>\$217.0</b>
EPM	\$2,924.9	\$2,938.0	\$3,097.0	\$159.0
Superfund	\$785.1	\$793.0	\$851.0	\$58.0
<b>Environment and Trade</b>	<b>\$1,903.7</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
EPM	\$1,903.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Environmental Education</b>	<b>\$9,050.3</b>	<b>\$8,979.0</b>	<b>\$9,038.0</b>	<b>\$59.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
EPM	\$9,050.3	\$8,979.0	\$9,038.0	\$59.0
<b>Environmental Justice</b>	<b>\$4,834.2</b>	<b>\$7,811.0</b>	<b>\$8,025.0</b>	<b>\$214.0</b>
EPM	\$4,332.1	\$6,993.0	\$7,203.0	\$210.0
Superfund	\$502.1	\$818.0	\$822.0	\$4.0
<b>Exchange Network</b>	<b>\$15,563.0</b>	<b>\$18,293.0</b>	<b>\$19,646.0</b>	<b>\$1,353.0</b>
EPM	\$14,133.2	\$16,860.0	\$18,213.0	\$1,353.0
Superfund	\$1,429.8	\$1,433.0	\$1,433.0	\$0.0
<b>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations</b>	<b>\$467,188.5</b>	<b>\$482,398.0</b>	<b>\$502,423.0</b>	<b>\$20,025.0</b>
B&F	\$28,081.5	\$26,931.0	\$28,931.0	\$2,000.0
EPM	\$296,235.0	\$303,884.0	\$320,612.0	\$16,728.0
LUST	\$890.3	\$902.0	\$903.0	\$1.0
Oil Spills	\$498.6	\$596.0	\$498.0	(\$98.0)
S&T	\$69,239.2	\$73,835.0	\$72,882.0	(\$953.0)
Superfund	\$72,243.9	\$76,250.0	\$78,597.0	\$2,347.0
<b>Federal Stationary Source Regulations</b>	<b>\$27,253.7</b>	<b>\$26,488.0</b>	<b>\$27,179.0</b>	<b>\$691.0</b>
EPM	\$27,253.7	\$26,488.0	\$27,179.0	\$691.0
<b>Federal Support for Air Quality Management</b>	<b>\$107,232.0</b>	<b>\$107,613.0</b>	<b>\$112,052.0</b>	<b>\$4,439.0</b>
EPM	\$94,556.0	\$96,480.0	\$100,510.0	\$4,030.0
S&T	\$12,676.0	\$11,133.0	\$11,542.0	\$409.0
<b>Federal Support for Air Toxics Program</b>	<b>\$28,116.4</b>	<b>\$25,115.0</b>	<b>\$27,299.0</b>	<b>\$2,184.0</b>
EPM	\$25,208.5	\$22,836.0	\$24,960.0	\$2,124.0
S&T	\$2,907.9	\$2,279.0	\$2,339.0	\$60.0
<b>Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification</b>	<b>\$70,463.2</b>	<b>\$76,445.0</b>	<b>\$91,990.0</b>	<b>\$15,545.0</b>
S&T	\$70,463.2	\$76,445.0	\$91,990.0	\$15,545.0
<b>Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management</b>	<b>\$27,219.1</b>	<b>\$29,036.0</b>	<b>\$29,964.0</b>	<b>\$928.0</b>
EPM	\$24,174.4	\$25,868.0	\$26,681.0	\$813.0
Superfund	\$3,044.7	\$3,168.0	\$3,283.0	\$115.0



	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Forensics Support</b>	<b>\$16,671.8</b>	<b>\$17,465.0</b>	<b>\$18,417.0</b>	<b>\$952.0</b>
S&T	\$14,042.7	\$15,087.0	\$15,946.0	\$859.0
Superfund	\$2,629.1	\$2,378.0	\$2,471.0	\$93.0
<b>Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay</b>	<b>\$36,494.1</b>	<b>\$31,001.0</b>	<b>\$35,139.0</b>	<b>\$4,138.0</b>
EPM	\$36,494.1	\$31,001.0	\$35,139.0	\$4,138.0
<b>Geographic Program: Great Lakes</b>	<b>\$22,968.4</b>	<b>\$23,000.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$23,000.0)</b>
EPM	\$22,968.4	\$23,000.0	\$0.0	(\$23,000.0)
<b>Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico</b>	<b>\$4,429.0</b>	<b>\$4,578.0</b>	<b>\$4,638.0</b>	<b>\$60.0</b>
EPM	\$4,429.0	\$4,578.0	\$4,638.0	\$60.0
<b>Geographic Program: Lake Champlain</b>	<b>\$2,919.9</b>	<b>\$3,000.0</b>	<b>\$1,434.0</b>	<b>(\$1,566.0)</b>
EPM	\$2,919.9	\$3,000.0	\$1,434.0	(\$1,566.0)
<b>Geographic Program: Long Island Sound</b>	<b>\$4,827.0</b>	<b>\$3,000.0</b>	<b>\$3,000.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
EPM	\$4,827.0	\$3,000.0	\$3,000.0	\$0.0
<b>Geographic Program: Other</b>	<b>\$18,020.6</b>	<b>\$31,380.0</b>	<b>\$31,919.0</b>	<b>\$539.0</b>
EPM	\$18,020.6	\$31,380.0	\$31,919.0	\$539.0
<b>Great Lakes Legacy Act</b>	<b>\$27,416.2</b>	<b>\$37,000.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$37,000.0)</b>
EPM	\$27,416.2	\$37,000.0	\$0.0	(\$37,000.0)
<b>Great Lakes Restoration</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$475,000.0</b>	<b>\$475,000.0</b>
EPM	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$475,000.0	\$475,000.0
<b>Homeland Security: Communication and Information</b>	<b>\$6,611.6</b>	<b>\$6,899.0</b>	<b>\$7,030.0</b>	<b>\$131.0</b>
EPM	\$6,611.6	\$6,899.0	\$7,030.0	\$131.0
<b>Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection</b>	<b>\$39,237.4</b>	<b>\$28,033.0</b>	<b>\$37,167.0</b>	<b>\$9,134.0</b>
EPM	\$4,814.4	\$6,837.0	\$7,014.0	\$177.0
S&T	\$32,656.7	\$19,460.0	\$28,329.0	\$8,869.0
Superfund	\$1,766.3	\$1,736.0	\$1,824.0	\$88.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery</b>	<b>\$90,195.8</b>	<b>\$100,690.0</b>	<b>\$99,395.0</b>	<b>(\$1,295.0)</b>
EPM	\$4,105.3	\$3,378.0	\$3,443.0	\$65.0
S&T	\$40,807.3	\$43,671.0	\$42,409.0	(\$1,262.0)
Superfund	\$45,283.2	\$53,641.0	\$53,543.0	(\$98.0)
<b>Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure</b>	<b>\$15,701.5</b>	<b>\$16,143.0</b>	<b>\$16,272.0</b>	<b>\$129.0</b>
B&F	\$8,225.9	\$8,070.0	\$8,070.0	\$0.0
EPM	\$5,462.5	\$6,292.0	\$6,414.0	\$122.0
S&T	\$1,428.1	\$587.0	\$594.0	\$7.0
Superfund	\$585.0	\$1,194.0	\$1,194.0	\$0.0
<b>Human Health Risk Assessment</b>	<b>\$41,369.5</b>	<b>\$42,727.0</b>	<b>\$48,528.0</b>	<b>\$5,801.0</b>
S&T	\$34,569.9	\$39,350.0	\$45,133.0	\$5,783.0
Superfund	\$6,799.6	\$3,377.0	\$3,395.0	\$18.0
<b>Human Resources Management</b>	<b>\$45,570.8</b>	<b>\$49,530.0</b>	<b>\$55,174.0</b>	<b>\$5,644.0</b>
EPM	\$40,886.6	\$44,141.0	\$47,106.0	\$2,965.0
LUST	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$0.0	(\$3.0)
Superfund	\$4,681.2	\$5,386.0	\$8,068.0	\$2,682.0
<b>IT / Data Management</b>	<b>\$111,813.5</b>	<b>\$114,222.0</b>	<b>\$124,688.0</b>	<b>\$10,466.0</b>
EPM	\$91,928.2	\$93,171.0	\$103,305.0	\$10,134.0
LUST	\$178.0	\$162.0	\$162.0	\$0.0
Oil Spills	\$15.0	\$24.0	\$24.0	\$0.0
S&T	\$3,762.6	\$3,969.0	\$4,073.0	\$104.0
Superfund	\$15,929.7	\$16,896.0	\$17,124.0	\$228.0
<b>Indoor Air: Radon Program</b>	<b>\$5,707.3</b>	<b>\$5,786.0</b>	<b>\$5,998.0</b>	<b>\$212.0</b>
EPM	\$5,269.5	\$5,383.0	\$5,576.0	\$193.0
S&T	\$437.8	\$403.0	\$422.0	\$19.0
<b>Information Security</b>	<b>\$6,632.2</b>	<b>\$6,637.0</b>	<b>\$6,814.0</b>	<b>\$177.0</b>
EPM	\$6,157.6	\$5,854.0	\$6,015.0	\$161.0
Superfund	\$474.6	\$783.0	\$799.0	\$16.0
<b>Infrastructure Assistance: Alaska Native Villages</b>	<b>\$21,193.7</b>	<b>\$18,500.0</b>	<b>\$10,000.0</b>	<b>(\$8,500.0)</b>
STAG	\$21,193.7	\$18,500.0	\$10,000.0	(\$8,500.0)

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water SRF</b>	<b>\$836,929.7</b>	<b>\$689,080.0</b>	<b>\$2,400,000.0</b>	<b>\$1,710,920.0</b>
STAG	\$836,929.7	\$689,080.0	\$2,400,000.0	\$1,710,920.0
<b>Infrastructure Assistance: Drinking Water SRF</b>	<b>\$949,968.9</b>	<b>\$829,029.0</b>	<b>\$1,500,000.0</b>	<b>\$670,971.0</b>
STAG	\$949,968.9	\$829,029.0	\$1,500,000.0	\$670,971.0
<b>Infrastructure Assistance: Mexico Border</b>	<b>\$65,138.5</b>	<b>\$20,000.0</b>	<b>\$10,000.0</b>	<b>(\$10,000.0)</b>
STAG	\$65,138.5	\$20,000.0	\$10,000.0	(\$10,000.0)
<b>International Capacity Building</b>	<b>\$5,107.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
EPM	\$5,107.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>International Sources of Pollution</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$7,830.0</b>	<b>\$8,851.0</b>	<b>\$1,021.0</b>
EPM	\$0.0	\$7,830.0	\$8,851.0	\$1,021.0
<b>LUST / UST</b>	<b>\$26,409.4</b>	<b>\$23,051.0</b>	<b>\$24,306.0</b>	<b>\$1,255.0</b>
EPM	\$11,157.9	\$11,946.0	\$12,451.0	\$505.0
LUST	\$15,251.5	\$11,105.0	\$11,855.0	\$750.0
<b>LUST Cooperative Agreements</b>	<b>\$89,552.8</b>	<b>\$62,461.0</b>	<b>\$63,192.0</b>	<b>\$731.0</b>
LUST	\$89,552.8	\$62,461.0	\$63,192.0	\$731.0
<b>LUST Prevention</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$35,500.0</b>	<b>\$34,430.0</b>	<b>(\$1,070.0)</b>
LUST	\$0.0	\$35,500.0	\$34,430.0	(\$1,070.0)
<b>Legal Advice: Environmental Program</b>	<b>\$39,823.7</b>	<b>\$40,955.0</b>	<b>\$42,668.0</b>	<b>\$1,713.0</b>
EPM	\$39,021.3	\$40,247.0	\$41,922.0	\$1,675.0
Superfund	\$802.4	\$708.0	\$746.0	\$38.0
<b>Legal Advice: Support Program</b>	<b>\$13,524.9</b>	<b>\$14,676.0</b>	<b>\$15,611.0</b>	<b>\$935.0</b>
EPM	\$13,524.9	\$14,676.0	\$15,611.0	\$935.0
<b>Marine Pollution</b>	<b>\$13,430.4</b>	<b>\$13,045.0</b>	<b>\$13,399.0</b>	<b>\$354.0</b>
EPM	\$13,430.4	\$13,045.0	\$13,399.0	\$354.0
<b>NEPA Implementation</b>	<b>\$14,690.1</b>	<b>\$16,281.0</b>	<b>\$18,295.0</b>	<b>\$2,014.0</b>
EPM	\$14,690.1	\$16,281.0	\$18,295.0	\$2,014.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>National Estuary Program / Coastal Waterways</b>	<b>\$26,046.7</b>	<b>\$26,557.0</b>	<b>\$26,967.0</b>	<b>\$410.0</b>
EPM	\$26,046.7	\$26,557.0	\$26,967.0	\$410.0
<b>Oil Spill: Prevention, Preparedness and Response</b>	<b>\$13,880.8</b>	<b>\$13,953.0</b>	<b>\$14,397.0</b>	<b>\$444.0</b>
Oil Spills	\$13,880.8	\$13,953.0	\$14,397.0	\$444.0
<b>POPs Implementation</b>	<b>\$1,811.9</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
EPM	\$1,811.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Pesticides: Field Programs</b>	<b>\$5,764.6</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
EPM	\$5,764.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Pesticides: Registration of New Pesticides</b>	<b>\$1,640.2</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
EPM	\$1,417.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
S&T	\$222.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Pesticides: Review / Reregistration of Existing Pesticides</b>	<b>\$4,087.5</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
EPM	\$3,918.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
S&T	\$169.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk</b>	<b>\$62,883.0</b>	<b>\$63,318.0</b>	<b>\$65,410.0</b>	<b>\$2,092.0</b>
EPM	\$59,536.1	\$60,103.0	\$61,747.0	\$1,644.0
S&T	\$3,346.9	\$3,215.0	\$3,663.0	\$448.0
<b>Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk</b>	<b>\$39,441.5</b>	<b>\$43,247.0</b>	<b>\$44,610.0</b>	<b>\$1,363.0</b>
EPM	\$37,443.3	\$41,236.0	\$42,318.0	\$1,082.0
S&T	\$1,998.2	\$2,011.0	\$2,292.0	\$281.0
<b>Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability</b>	<b>\$11,972.0</b>	<b>\$13,429.0</b>	<b>\$13,880.0</b>	<b>\$451.0</b>
EPM	\$11,529.6	\$12,984.0	\$13,372.0	\$388.0
S&T	\$442.4	\$445.0	\$508.0	\$63.0
<b>Pollution Prevention Program</b>	<b>\$15,538.0</b>	<b>\$18,334.0</b>	<b>\$18,874.0</b>	<b>\$540.0</b>
EPM	\$15,538.0	\$18,334.0	\$18,874.0	\$540.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>RCRA: Corrective Action</b>	<b>\$39,960.6</b>	<b>\$38,909.0</b>	<b>\$40,459.0</b>	<b>\$1,550.0</b>
EPM	\$39,960.6	\$38,909.0	\$40,459.0	\$1,550.0
<b>RCRA: Waste Management</b>	<b>\$66,432.8</b>	<b>\$64,511.0</b>	<b>\$67,550.0</b>	<b>\$3,039.0</b>
EPM	\$66,432.8	\$64,511.0	\$67,550.0	\$3,039.0
<b>RCRA: Waste Minimization &amp; Recycling</b>	<b>\$14,731.9</b>	<b>\$13,471.0</b>	<b>\$14,122.0</b>	<b>\$651.0</b>
EPM	\$14,731.9	\$13,471.0	\$14,122.0	\$651.0
<b>Radiation: Protection</b>	<b>\$15,054.9</b>	<b>\$15,408.0</b>	<b>\$16,110.0</b>	<b>\$702.0</b>
EPM	\$10,820.8	\$10,957.0	\$11,272.0	\$315.0
S&T	\$2,069.1	\$2,156.0	\$2,242.0	\$86.0
Superfund	\$2,165.0	\$2,295.0	\$2,596.0	\$301.0
<b>Radiation: Response Preparedness</b>	<b>\$6,679.7</b>	<b>\$6,964.0</b>	<b>\$7,251.0</b>	<b>\$287.0</b>
EPM	\$2,899.4	\$2,997.0	\$3,087.0	\$90.0
S&T	\$3,780.3	\$3,967.0	\$4,164.0	\$197.0
<b>Reduce Risks from Indoor Air</b>	<b>\$24,712.7</b>	<b>\$21,229.0</b>	<b>\$21,808.0</b>	<b>\$579.0</b>
EPM	\$24,009.8	\$20,512.0	\$21,073.0	\$561.0
S&T	\$702.9	\$717.0	\$735.0	\$18.0
<b>Regional Geographic Initiatives</b>	<b>\$5,515.8</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
EPM	\$5,515.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Regional Science and Technology</b>	<b>\$3,293.3</b>	<b>\$3,219.0</b>	<b>\$3,283.0</b>	<b>\$64.0</b>
EPM	\$3,293.3	\$3,219.0	\$3,283.0	\$64.0
<b>Regulatory Innovation</b>	<b>\$23,392.1</b>	<b>\$19,811.0</b>	<b>\$20,606.0</b>	<b>\$795.0</b>
EPM	\$23,392.1	\$19,811.0	\$20,606.0	\$795.0
<b>Regulatory/Economic-Management and Analysis</b>	<b>\$17,379.6</b>	<b>\$16,729.0</b>	<b>\$22,403.0</b>	<b>\$5,674.0</b>
EPM	\$17,379.6	\$16,729.0	\$22,403.0	\$5,674.0
<b>Research: Air Toxics</b>	<b>\$1,192.3</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
S&T	\$1,192.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Research: Computational Toxicology</b>	<b>\$13,987.1</b>	<b>\$15,156.0</b>	<b>\$19,602.0</b>	<b>\$4,446.0</b>
S&T	\$13,987.1	\$15,156.0	\$19,602.0	\$4,446.0
<b>Research: Drinking Water</b>	<b>\$48,228.2</b>	<b>\$46,873.0</b>	<b>\$47,909.0</b>	<b>\$1,036.0</b>
S&T	\$48,228.2	\$46,873.0	\$47,909.0	\$1,036.0
<b>Research: Endocrine Disruptor</b>	<b>\$11,158.9</b>	<b>\$11,486.0</b>	<b>\$11,442.0</b>	<b>(\$44.0)</b>
S&T	\$11,158.9	\$11,486.0	\$11,442.0	(\$44.0)
<b>Research: Fellowships</b>	<b>\$9,721.8</b>	<b>\$9,651.0</b>	<b>\$10,894.0</b>	<b>\$1,243.0</b>
S&T	\$9,721.8	\$9,651.0	\$10,894.0	\$1,243.0
<b>Research: Global Change</b>	<b>\$17,423.9</b>	<b>\$17,886.0</b>	<b>\$20,909.0</b>	<b>\$3,023.0</b>
S&T	\$17,423.9	\$17,886.0	\$20,909.0	\$3,023.0
<b>Research: Human Health and Ecosystems</b>	<b>\$146,871.2</b>	<b>\$153,760.0</b>	<b>\$158,310.0</b>	<b>\$4,550.0</b>
S&T	\$146,871.2	\$153,760.0	\$158,310.0	\$4,550.0
<b>Research: Land Protection and Restoration</b>	<b>\$31,967.7</b>	<b>\$35,686.0</b>	<b>\$36,404.0</b>	<b>\$718.0</b>
LUST	\$567.7	\$475.0	\$484.0	\$9.0
Oil Spills	\$794.6	\$720.0	\$737.0	\$17.0
S&T	\$11,212.5	\$13,586.0	\$13,782.0	\$196.0
Superfund	\$19,392.9	\$20,905.0	\$21,401.0	\$496.0
<b>Research: Pesticides and Toxics</b>	<b>\$24,616.7</b>	<b>\$26,949.0</b>	<b>\$27,839.0</b>	<b>\$890.0</b>
S&T	\$24,616.7	\$26,949.0	\$27,839.0	\$890.0
<b>Research: Water Quality</b>	<b>\$53,343.0</b>	<b>\$59,291.0</b>	<b>\$62,454.0</b>	<b>\$3,163.0</b>
S&T	\$53,343.0	\$59,291.0	\$62,454.0	\$3,163.0
<b>Research: Clean Air</b>	<b>\$57,575.5</b>	<b>\$80,541.0</b>	<b>\$83,164.0</b>	<b>\$2,623.0</b>
S&T	\$57,575.5	\$80,541.0	\$83,164.0	\$2,623.0
<b>Research: Economics and Decision Science(EDS)</b>	<b>\$1,877.3</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
S&T	\$1,877.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Research: NAAQS</b>	<b>\$17,428.3</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
S&T	\$17,428.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Research: Sustainability</b>	<b>\$22,445.7</b>	<b>\$21,236.0</b>	<b>\$24,107.0</b>	<b>\$2,871.0</b>
S&T	\$22,346.0	\$21,157.0	\$24,107.0	\$2,950.0
Superfund	\$99.7	\$79.0	\$0.0	(\$79.0)
<b>Science Advisory Board</b>	<b>\$5,653.4</b>	<b>\$5,451.0</b>	<b>\$5,631.0</b>	<b>\$180.0</b>
EPM	\$5,653.4	\$5,451.0	\$5,631.0	\$180.0
<b>Science Policy and Biotechnology</b>	<b>\$2,105.9</b>	<b>\$1,738.0</b>	<b>\$1,750.0</b>	<b>\$12.0</b>
EPM	\$2,105.9	\$1,738.0	\$1,750.0	\$12.0
<b>Small Business Ombudsman</b>	<b>\$3,778.4</b>	<b>\$2,981.0</b>	<b>\$3,065.0</b>	<b>\$84.0</b>
EPM	\$3,778.4	\$2,981.0	\$3,065.0	\$84.0
<b>Small Minority Business Assistance</b>	<b>\$2,995.6</b>	<b>\$2,296.0</b>	<b>\$2,364.0</b>	<b>\$68.0</b>
EPM	\$2,995.6	\$2,296.0	\$2,364.0	\$68.0
<b>State and Local Prevention and Preparedness</b>	<b>\$12,518.5</b>	<b>\$13,008.0</b>	<b>\$13,555.0</b>	<b>\$547.0</b>
EPM	\$12,518.5	\$13,008.0	\$13,555.0	\$547.0
<b>Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic Programs</b>	<b>\$4,939.0</b>	<b>\$5,703.0</b>	<b>\$5,844.0</b>	<b>\$141.0</b>
EPM	\$4,939.0	\$5,703.0	\$5,844.0	\$141.0
<b>Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund</b>	<b>\$9,683.0</b>	<b>\$9,697.0</b>	<b>\$9,865.0</b>	<b>\$168.0</b>
EPM	\$9,683.0	\$9,697.0	\$9,865.0	\$168.0
<b>Superfund: EPA Emergency Preparedness</b>	<b>\$9,608.7</b>	<b>\$9,442.0</b>	<b>\$9,791.0</b>	<b>\$349.0</b>
Superfund	\$9,608.7	\$9,442.0	\$9,791.0	\$349.0
<b>Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal</b>	<b>\$223,136.3</b>	<b>\$195,043.0</b>	<b>\$202,843.0</b>	<b>\$7,800.0</b>
Superfund	\$223,136.3	\$195,043.0	\$202,843.0	\$7,800.0
<b>Superfund: Enforcement</b>	<b>\$168,674.1</b>	<b>\$166,148.0</b>	<b>\$173,176.0</b>	<b>\$7,028.0</b>
Superfund	\$168,674.1	\$166,148.0	\$173,176.0	\$7,028.0
<b>Superfund: Federal Facilities</b>	<b>\$33,558.3</b>	<b>\$31,306.0</b>	<b>\$32,203.0</b>	<b>\$897.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
Superfund	\$33,558.3	\$31,306.0	\$32,203.0	\$897.0
<b>Superfund: Remedial</b>	<b>\$726,765.3</b>	<b>\$604,992.0</b>	<b>\$605,000.0</b>	<b>\$8.0</b>
Superfund	\$726,765.3	\$604,992.0	\$605,000.0	\$8.0
<b>Superfund: Support to Other Federal Agencies</b>	<b>\$4,888.0</b>	<b>\$6,575.0</b>	<b>\$6,575.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
Superfund	\$4,888.0	\$6,575.0	\$6,575.0	\$0.0
<b>Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement</b>	<b>\$9,124.8</b>	<b>\$9,872.0</b>	<b>\$10,378.0</b>	<b>\$506.0</b>
Superfund	\$9,124.8	\$9,872.0	\$10,378.0	\$506.0
<b>Surface Water Protection</b>	<b>\$197,780.0</b>	<b>\$197,772.0</b>	<b>\$210,437.0</b>	<b>\$12,665.0</b>
EPM	\$197,780.0	\$197,772.0	\$210,437.0	\$12,665.0
<b>TRI / Right to Know</b>	<b>\$15,213.2</b>	<b>\$15,719.0</b>	<b>\$15,656.0</b>	<b>(\$63.0)</b>
EPM	\$15,213.2	\$15,719.0	\$15,656.0	(\$63.0)
<b>Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Management</b>	<b>\$6,518.9</b>	<b>\$5,422.0</b>	<b>\$5,923.0</b>	<b>\$501.0</b>
EPM	\$6,518.9	\$5,422.0	\$5,923.0	\$501.0
<b>Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction</b>	<b>\$48,399.3</b>	<b>\$47,078.0</b>	<b>\$55,005.0</b>	<b>\$7,927.0</b>
EPM	\$48,399.3	\$47,078.0	\$55,005.0	\$7,927.0
<b>Toxic Substances: Lead Risk Reduction Program</b>	<b>\$12,083.7</b>	<b>\$13,927.0</b>	<b>\$14,442.0</b>	<b>\$515.0</b>
EPM	\$12,083.7	\$13,927.0	\$14,442.0	\$515.0
<b>Trade and Governance</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$6,273.0</b>	<b>\$6,451.0</b>	<b>\$178.0</b>
EPM	\$0.0	\$6,273.0	\$6,451.0	\$178.0
<b>Tribal - Capacity Building</b>	<b>\$12,152.4</b>	<b>\$11,973.0</b>	<b>\$12,439.0</b>	<b>\$466.0</b>
EPM	\$12,152.4	\$11,973.0	\$12,439.0	\$466.0
<b>US Mexico Border</b>	<b>\$6,110.1</b>	<b>\$5,561.0</b>	<b>\$5,047.0</b>	<b>(\$514.0)</b>
EPM	\$6,110.1	\$5,561.0	\$5,047.0	(\$514.0)
<b>Wetlands</b>	<b>\$21,868.0</b>	<b>\$22,539.0</b>	<b>\$23,336.0</b>	<b>\$797.0</b>
EPM	\$21,868.0	\$22,539.0	\$23,336.0	\$797.0



	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Not Specified</b>	<b>(\$5,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$10,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$10,000.0)</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
Rescissions	(\$5,000.0)	(\$10,000.0)	(\$10,000.0)	\$0.0
<b>TOTAL, EPA</b>	<b>\$7,993,075.1</b>	<b>\$7,643,674.0</b>	<b>\$10,486,000.0</b>	<b>\$2,842,326.0</b>

**Environmental Protection Agency  
FY 2010 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification**

**PROGRAM PROJECTS BY PROGRAM AREA  
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2008 Actuals	FY 2009 Enacted	FY 2010 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
<b>Science &amp; Technology</b>				
<b>Air Toxics and Quality</b>				
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	\$9,253.9	\$9,152.0	\$9,979.0	\$827.0
Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$12,676.0	\$11,133.0	\$11,542.0	\$409.0
Federal Support for Air Toxics Program	\$2,907.9	\$2,279.0	\$2,339.0	\$60.0
Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification	\$70,463.2	\$76,445.0	\$91,990.0	\$15,545.0
Radiation: Protection	\$2,069.1	\$2,156.0	\$2,242.0	\$86.0
Radiation: Response Preparedness	\$3,780.3	\$3,967.0	\$4,164.0	\$197.0
<b>Subtotal, Air Toxics and Quality</b>	<b>\$101,150.4</b>	<b>\$105,132.0</b>	<b>\$122,256.0</b>	<b>\$17,124.0</b>
<b>Climate Protection Program</b>				
Climate Protection Program	\$17,156.3	\$16,828.0	\$18,975.0	\$2,147.0
<b>Enforcement</b>				
Forensics Support	\$14,042.7	\$15,087.0	\$15,946.0	\$859.0
<b>Homeland Security</b>				
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection				
<i>Water Sentinel</i>	\$26,547.5	\$14,982.0	\$23,726.0	\$8,744.0
<i>Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)</i>	\$6,109.2	\$4,478.0	\$4,603.0	\$125.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	\$32,656.7	\$19,460.0	\$28,329.0	\$8,869.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery				
<i>Decontamination</i>	\$19,964.2	\$26,407.0	\$25,430.0	(\$977.0)
<i>Laboratory Preparedness and Response</i>	\$507.9	\$494.0	\$500.0	\$6.0
<i>Safe Building</i>	\$2,794.4	\$1,976.0	\$2,000.0	\$24.0
<i>Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)</i>	\$17,540.8	\$14,794.0	\$14,479.0	(\$315.0)
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	\$40,807.3	\$43,671.0	\$42,409.0	(\$1,262.0)
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$1,428.1	\$587.0	\$594.0	\$7.0
<b>Subtotal, Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$74,892.1</b>	<b>\$63,718.0</b>	<b>\$71,332.0</b>	<b>\$7,614.0</b>
<b>Indoor Air</b>				
Indoor Air: Radon Program	\$437.8	\$403.0	\$422.0	\$19.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	\$702.9	\$717.0	\$735.0	\$18.0
<b>Subtotal, Indoor Air</b>	<b>\$1,140.7</b>	<b>\$1,120.0</b>	<b>\$1,157.0</b>	<b>\$37.0</b>
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>				
IT / Data Management	\$3,762.6	\$3,969.0	\$4,073.0	\$104.0
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations				
<i>Rent</i>	\$35,398.9	\$34,521.0	\$33,947.0	(\$574.0)
<i>Utilities</i>	\$17,894.3	\$18,547.0	\$19,177.0	\$630.0
<i>Security</i>	\$9,609.6	\$11,989.0	\$10,260.0	(\$1,729.0)
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)</i>	\$6,336.4	\$8,778.0	\$9,498.0	\$720.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$69,239.2	\$73,835.0	\$72,882.0	(\$953.0)
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$69,239.2</b>	<b>\$73,835.0</b>	<b>\$72,882.0</b>	<b>(\$953.0)</b>
<b>Pesticides Licensing</b>				
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	\$3,346.9	\$3,215.0	\$3,663.0	\$448.0
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	\$1,998.2	\$2,011.0	\$2,292.0	\$281.0
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	\$442.4	\$445.0	\$508.0	\$63.0
Pesticides: Registration of New Pesticides	\$222.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Pesticides: Review / Reregistration of Existing Pesticides	\$169.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing</b>	<b>\$6,179.2</b>	<b>\$5,671.0</b>	<b>\$6,463.0</b>	<b>\$792.0</b>
<b>Research: Clean Air</b>				
Research: Air Toxics	\$1,192.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Research: Clean Air	\$57,575.5	\$80,541.0	\$83,164.0	\$2,623.0
Research: Global Change	\$17,423.9	\$17,886.0	\$20,909.0	\$3,023.0
Research: NAAQS	\$17,428.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Research: Clean Air</b>	<b>\$93,620.0</b>	<b>\$98,427.0</b>	<b>\$104,073.0</b>	<b>\$5,646.0</b>
<b>Research: Clean Water</b>				
Research: Drinking Water	\$48,228.2	\$46,873.0	\$47,909.0	\$1,036.0
Research: Water Quality	\$53,343.0	\$59,291.0	\$62,454.0	\$3,163.0
<b>Subtotal, Research: Clean Water</b>	<b>\$101,571.2</b>	<b>\$106,164.0</b>	<b>\$110,363.0</b>	<b>\$4,199.0</b>
<b>Research / Congressional Priorities</b>				
Congressionally Mandated Projects	\$1,034.0	\$5,450.0	\$0.0	(\$5,450.0)
<b>Research: Human Health and Ecosystems</b>				
Human Health Risk Assessment	\$34,569.9	\$39,350.0	\$45,133.0	\$5,783.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
Research: Computational Toxicology	\$13,987.1	\$15,156.0	\$19,602.0	\$4,446.0
Research: Endocrine Disruptor	\$11,158.9	\$11,486.0	\$11,442.0	(\$44.0)
Research: Fellowships	\$9,721.8	\$9,651.0	\$10,894.0	\$1,243.0
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems				
<i>Human Health</i>	\$45,199.1	\$77,942.0	\$82,071.0	\$4,129.0
<i>Ecosystems</i>	\$57,965.6	\$75,818.0	\$76,239.0	\$421.0
<i>Research: Human Health and Ecosystems (other activities)</i>	\$43,706.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, Research: Human Health and Ecosystems	\$146,871.2	\$153,760.0	\$158,310.0	\$4,550.0
<b>Subtotal, Research: Human Health and Ecosystems</b>	<b>\$216,308.9</b>	<b>\$229,403.0</b>	<b>\$245,381.0</b>	<b>\$15,978.0</b>
<b>Research: Land Protection</b>				
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	\$11,212.5	\$13,586.0	\$13,782.0	\$196.0
<b>Research: Sustainability</b>				
Research: Economics and Decision Science(EDS)	\$1,877.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Research: Sustainability	\$22,346.0	\$21,157.0	\$24,107.0	\$2,950.0
<b>Subtotal, Research: Sustainability</b>	<b>\$24,223.3</b>	<b>\$21,157.0</b>	<b>\$24,107.0</b>	<b>\$2,950.0</b>
<b>Toxic Research and Prevention</b>				
Research: Pesticides and Toxics	\$24,616.7	\$26,949.0	\$27,839.0	\$890.0
<b>Water: Human Health Protection</b>				
Drinking Water Programs	\$3,292.5	\$3,555.0	\$3,720.0	\$165.0
<b>Total, Science &amp; Technology</b>	<b>\$763,442.3</b>	<b>\$790,051.0</b>	<b>\$842,349.0</b>	<b>\$52,298.0</b>
<b>Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>				
<b>Air Toxics and Quality</b>				
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	\$19,774.8	\$19,993.0	\$20,548.0	\$555.0
Federal Stationary Source Regulations	\$27,253.7	\$26,488.0	\$27,179.0	\$691.0
Federal Support for Air Quality Management				
<i>Clean Diesel Initiative</i>	\$349.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Federal Support for Air Quality Management (other activities)</i>	\$94,206.5	\$96,480.0	\$100,510.0	\$4,030.0
Subtotal, Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$94,556.0	\$96,480.0	\$100,510.0	\$4,030.0
Federal Support for Air Toxics Program	\$25,208.5	\$22,836.0	\$24,960.0	\$2,124.0
Radiation: Protection	\$10,820.8	\$10,957.0	\$11,272.0	\$315.0
Radiation: Response Preparedness	\$2,899.4	\$2,997.0	\$3,087.0	\$90.0
Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic Programs	\$4,939.0	\$5,703.0	\$5,844.0	\$141.0
Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund	\$9,683.0	\$9,697.0	\$9,865.0	\$168.0
<b>Subtotal, Air Toxics and Quality</b>	<b>\$195,135.2</b>	<b>\$195,151.0</b>	<b>\$203,265.0</b>	<b>\$8,114.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Brownfields</b>				
Brownfields	\$25,200.3	\$22,957.0	\$25,254.0	\$2,297.0
<b>Climate Protection Program</b>				
Climate Protection Program				
<i>Energy STAR</i>	\$38,713.6	\$49,735.0	\$50,748.0	\$1,013.0
<i>Methane to markets</i>	\$6,348.1	\$4,497.6	\$4,582.0	\$84.4
<i>Asian Pacific Partnership</i>	\$1,567.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Greenhouse Gas Reporting Registry</i>	\$3,205.7	\$6,388.0	\$17,005.0	\$10,617.0
<i>Climate Protection Program (other activities)</i>	\$47,529.9	\$33,650.4	\$39,299.0	\$5,648.6
Subtotal, Climate Protection Program	\$97,364.3	\$94,271.0	\$111,634.0	\$17,363.0
<b>Subtotal, Climate Protection Program</b>	<b>\$97,364.3</b>	<b>\$94,271.0</b>	<b>\$111,634.0</b>	<b>\$17,363.0</b>
<b>Compliance</b>				
Compliance Assistance and Centers	\$28,063.5	\$23,770.0	\$26,070.0	\$2,300.0
Compliance Incentives	\$10,250.7	\$8,992.0	\$10,702.0	\$1,710.0
Compliance Monitoring	\$92,048.1	\$96,064.0	\$99,859.0	\$3,795.0
<b>Subtotal, Compliance</b>	<b>\$130,362.3</b>	<b>\$128,826.0</b>	<b>\$136,631.0</b>	<b>\$7,805.0</b>
<b>Enforcement</b>				
Civil Enforcement	\$131,986.8	\$137,182.0	\$145,949.0	\$8,767.0
Criminal Enforcement	\$40,128.8	\$45,763.0	\$49,399.0	\$3,636.0
Enforcement Training	\$2,924.9	\$2,938.0	\$3,097.0	\$159.0
Environmental Justice	\$4,332.1	\$6,993.0	\$7,203.0	\$210.0
NEPA Implementation	\$14,690.1	\$16,281.0	\$18,295.0	\$2,014.0
<b>Subtotal, Enforcement</b>	<b>\$194,062.7</b>	<b>\$209,157.0</b>	<b>\$223,943.0</b>	<b>\$14,786.0</b>
<b>Environmental Protection / Congressional Priorities</b>				
Congressionally Mandated Projects	\$12,403.5	\$17,450.0	\$0.0	(\$17,450.0)
<b>Geographic Programs</b>				
Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay	\$36,494.1	\$31,001.0	\$35,139.0	\$4,138.0
Geographic Program: Great Lakes	\$22,968.4	\$23,000.0	\$0.0	(\$23,000.0)
Geographic Program: Long Island Sound	\$4,827.0	\$3,000.0	\$3,000.0	\$0.0
Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico	\$4,429.0	\$4,578.0	\$4,638.0	\$60.0
Geographic Program: Lake Champlain	\$2,919.9	\$3,000.0	\$1,434.0	(\$1,566.0)
Geographic Program: Other				
<i>San Francisco Bay</i>	\$0.0	\$5,000.0	\$5,000.0	\$0.0
<i>Puget Sound</i>	\$8,696.1	\$20,000.0	\$20,000.0	\$0.0
<i>Lake Pontchartrain</i>	\$1,490.0	\$978.0	\$978.0	\$0.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<i>Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE)</i>	\$3,360.1	\$2,000.0	\$2,448.0	\$448.0
<i>Geographic Program: Other (other activities)</i>	\$4,474.4	\$3,402.0	\$3,493.0	\$91.0
Subtotal, Geographic Program: Other	\$18,020.6	\$31,380.0	\$31,919.0	\$539.0
Great Lakes Restoration	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$475,000.0	\$475,000.0
Regional Geographic Initiatives	\$5,515.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Geographic Programs</b>	<b>\$95,174.8</b>	<b>\$95,959.0</b>	<b>\$551,130.0</b>	<b>\$455,171.0</b>
<b>Homeland Security</b>				
Homeland Security: Communication and Information	\$6,611.6	\$6,899.0	\$7,030.0	\$131.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection				
<i>Decontamination</i>	\$124.7	\$98.0	\$99.0	\$1.0
<i>Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)</i>	\$4,689.7	\$6,739.0	\$6,915.0	\$176.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	\$4,814.4	\$6,837.0	\$7,014.0	\$177.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery				
<i>Decontamination</i>	\$592.6	\$3,378.0	\$3,443.0	\$65.0
<i>Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)</i>	\$3,512.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	\$4,105.3	\$3,378.0	\$3,443.0	\$65.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$5,462.5	\$6,292.0	\$6,414.0	\$122.0
<b>Subtotal, Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$20,993.8</b>	<b>\$23,406.0</b>	<b>\$23,901.0</b>	<b>\$495.0</b>
<b>Indoor Air</b>				
Indoor Air: Radon Program	\$5,269.5	\$5,383.0	\$5,576.0	\$193.0
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	\$24,009.8	\$20,512.0	\$21,073.0	\$561.0
<b>Subtotal, Indoor Air</b>	<b>\$29,279.3</b>	<b>\$25,895.0</b>	<b>\$26,649.0</b>	<b>\$754.0</b>
<b>Information Exchange / Outreach</b>				
Children and Other Sensitive Populations: Agency Coordination	\$7,226.7	\$6,071.0	\$6,515.0	\$444.0
Environmental Education	\$9,050.3	\$8,979.0	\$9,038.0	\$59.0
Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations	\$48,777.5	\$48,456.0	\$50,980.0	\$2,524.0
Exchange Network	\$14,133.2	\$16,860.0	\$18,213.0	\$1,353.0
Small Business Ombudsman	\$3,778.4	\$2,981.0	\$3,065.0	\$84.0
Small Minority Business Assistance	\$2,995.6	\$2,296.0	\$2,364.0	\$68.0
State and Local Prevention and Preparedness	\$12,518.5	\$13,008.0	\$13,555.0	\$547.0
TRI / Right to Know	\$15,213.2	\$15,719.0	\$15,656.0	(\$63.0)
Tribal - Capacity Building	\$12,152.4	\$11,973.0	\$12,439.0	\$466.0
<b>Subtotal, Information Exchange / Outreach</b>	<b>\$125,845.8</b>	<b>\$126,343.0</b>	<b>\$131,825.0</b>	<b>\$5,482.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>International Programs</b>				
US Mexico Border	\$6,110.1	\$5,561.0	\$5,047.0	(\$514.0)
Commission for Environmental Cooperation	\$4,289.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Environment and Trade	\$1,903.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
International Capacity Building	\$5,107.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
POPs Implementation	\$1,811.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
International Sources of Pollution	\$0.0	\$7,830.0	\$8,851.0	\$1,021.0
Trade and Governance	\$0.0	\$6,273.0	\$6,451.0	\$178.0
<b>Subtotal, International Programs</b>	<b>\$19,221.9</b>	<b>\$19,664.0</b>	<b>\$20,349.0</b>	<b>\$685.0</b>
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>				
Information Security	\$6,157.6	\$5,854.0	\$6,015.0	\$161.0
IT / Data Management	\$91,928.2	\$93,171.0	\$103,305.0	\$10,134.0
<b>Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security</b>	<b>\$98,085.8</b>	<b>\$99,025.0</b>	<b>\$109,320.0</b>	<b>\$10,295.0</b>
<b>Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>				
Administrative Law	\$5,657.9	\$5,128.0	\$5,352.0	\$224.0
Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$1,136.8	\$1,374.0	\$1,423.0	\$49.0
Civil Rights / Title VI Compliance	\$11,109.6	\$11,488.0	\$12,000.0	\$512.0
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	\$39,021.3	\$40,247.0	\$41,922.0	\$1,675.0
Legal Advice: Support Program	\$13,524.9	\$14,676.0	\$15,611.0	\$935.0
Regional Science and Technology	\$3,293.3	\$3,219.0	\$3,283.0	\$64.0
Regulatory Innovation	\$23,392.1	\$19,811.0	\$20,606.0	\$795.0
Regulatory/Economic-Management and Analysis	\$17,379.6	\$16,729.0	\$22,403.0	\$5,674.0
Science Advisory Board	\$5,653.4	\$5,451.0	\$5,631.0	\$180.0
<b>Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>	<b>\$120,168.9</b>	<b>\$118,123.0</b>	<b>\$128,231.0</b>	<b>\$10,108.0</b>
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations				
<i>Rent</i>	\$157,406.5	\$160,366.0	\$162,040.0	\$1,674.0
<i>Utilities</i>	\$7,019.4	\$10,973.0	\$13,514.0	\$2,541.0
<i>Security</i>	\$24,194.9	\$25,676.0	\$27,997.0	\$2,321.0
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)</i>	\$107,614.2	\$106,869.0	\$117,061.0	\$10,192.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$296,235.0	\$303,884.0	\$320,612.0	\$16,728.0
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$68,083.1	\$73,432.0	\$85,215.0	\$11,783.0
Acquisition Management	\$29,868.9	\$31,872.0	\$32,281.0	\$409.0
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	\$24,174.4	\$25,868.0	\$26,681.0	\$813.0
Human Resources Management	\$40,886.6	\$44,141.0	\$47,106.0	\$2,965.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$459,248.0</b>	<b>\$479,197.0</b>	<b>\$511,895.0</b>	<b>\$32,698.0</b>
<b>Pesticides Licensing</b>				
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	\$59,536.1	\$60,103.0	\$61,747.0	\$1,644.0
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	\$37,443.3	\$41,236.0	\$42,318.0	\$1,082.0
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	\$11,529.6	\$12,984.0	\$13,372.0	\$388.0
Pesticides: Field Programs	\$5,764.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Pesticides: Registration of New Pesticides	\$1,417.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Pesticides: Review / Reregistration of Existing Pesticides	\$3,918.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Science Policy and Biotechnology	\$2,105.9	\$1,738.0	\$1,750.0	\$12.0
<b>Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing</b>	<b>\$121,715.5</b>	<b>\$116,061.0</b>	<b>\$119,187.0</b>	<b>\$3,126.0</b>
<b>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)</b>				
RCRA: Waste Management	\$66,432.8	\$64,511.0	\$67,550.0	\$3,039.0
RCRA: Corrective Action	\$39,960.6	\$38,909.0	\$40,459.0	\$1,550.0
RCRA: Waste Minimization & Recycling	\$14,731.9	\$13,471.0	\$14,122.0	\$651.0
<b>Subtotal, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)</b>	<b>\$121,125.3</b>	<b>\$116,891.0</b>	<b>\$122,131.0</b>	<b>\$5,240.0</b>
<b>Toxics Risk Review and Prevention</b>				
Endocrine Disruptors	\$7,102.4	\$8,498.0	\$8,659.0	\$161.0
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction	\$48,399.3	\$47,078.0	\$55,005.0	\$7,927.0
Pollution Prevention Program	\$15,538.0	\$18,334.0	\$18,874.0	\$540.0
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Management	\$6,518.9	\$5,422.0	\$5,923.0	\$501.0
Toxic Substances: Lead Risk Reduction Program	\$12,083.7	\$13,927.0	\$14,442.0	\$515.0
<b>Subtotal, Toxics Risk Review and Prevention</b>	<b>\$89,642.3</b>	<b>\$93,259.0</b>	<b>\$102,903.0</b>	<b>\$9,644.0</b>
<b>Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)</b>				
LUST / UST	\$11,157.9	\$11,946.0	\$12,451.0	\$505.0
<b>Water: Ecosystems</b>				
Great Lakes Legacy Act	\$27,416.2	\$37,000.0	\$0.0	(\$37,000.0)
National Estuary Program / Coastal Waterways	\$26,046.7	\$26,557.0	\$26,967.0	\$410.0
Wetlands	\$21,868.0	\$22,539.0	\$23,336.0	\$797.0
<b>Subtotal, Water: Ecosystems</b>	<b>\$75,330.9</b>	<b>\$86,096.0</b>	<b>\$50,303.0</b>	<b>(\$35,793.0)</b>
<b>Water: Human Health Protection</b>				
Beach / Fish Programs	\$2,307.5	\$2,806.0	\$2,870.0	\$64.0
Drinking Water Programs	\$107,454.8	\$98,779.0	\$102,856.0	\$4,077.0
<b>Subtotal, Water: Human Health Protection</b>	<b>\$109,762.3</b>	<b>\$101,585.0</b>	<b>\$105,726.0</b>	<b>\$4,141.0</b>



	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Water Quality Protection</b>				
Marine Pollution	\$13,430.4	\$13,045.0	\$13,399.0	\$354.0
Surface Water Protection	\$197,780.0	\$197,772.0	\$210,437.0	\$12,665.0
<b>Subtotal, Water Quality Protection</b>	<b>\$211,210.4</b>	<b>\$210,817.0</b>	<b>\$223,836.0</b>	<b>\$13,019.0</b>
<b>Total, Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>	<b>\$2,362,491.2</b>	<b>\$2,392,079.0</b>	<b>\$2,940,564.0</b>	<b>\$548,485.0</b>
<b>Inspector General</b>				
<b>Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations</b>				
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	\$41,896.5	\$44,791.0	\$44,791.0	\$0.0
<b>Total, Inspector General</b>	<b>\$41,896.5</b>	<b>\$44,791.0</b>	<b>\$44,791.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
<b>Building and Facilities</b>				
<b>Homeland Security</b>				
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$8,225.9	\$8,070.0	\$8,070.0	\$0.0
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$28,081.5	\$26,931.0	\$28,931.0	\$2,000.0
<b>Total, Building and Facilities</b>	<b>\$36,307.4</b>	<b>\$35,001.0</b>	<b>\$37,001.0</b>	<b>\$2,000.0</b>
<b>Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>				
<b>Air Toxics and Quality</b>				
Radiation: Protection	\$2,165.0	\$2,295.0	\$2,596.0	\$301.0
<b>Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations</b>				
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	\$12,037.8	\$9,975.0	\$9,975.0	\$0.0
<b>Compliance</b>				
Compliance Assistance and Centers	\$33.1	\$22.0	\$0.0	(\$22.0)
Compliance Incentives	\$58.7	\$137.0	\$0.0	(\$137.0)
Compliance Monitoring	\$1,251.3	\$1,192.0	\$1,247.0	\$55.0
<b>Subtotal, Compliance</b>	<b>\$1,343.1</b>	<b>\$1,351.0</b>	<b>\$1,247.0</b>	<b>(\$104.0)</b>
<b>Enforcement</b>				
Environmental Justice	\$502.1	\$818.0	\$822.0	\$4.0
Superfund: Enforcement	\$168,674.1	\$166,148.0	\$173,176.0	\$7,028.0
Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement	\$9,124.8	\$9,872.0	\$10,378.0	\$506.0
Civil Enforcement	\$591.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Criminal Enforcement	\$7,687.0	\$7,767.0	\$8,336.0	\$569.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
Enforcement Training	\$785.1	\$793.0	\$851.0	\$58.0
Forensics Support	\$2,629.1	\$2,378.0	\$2,471.0	\$93.0
<b>Subtotal, Enforcement</b>	<b>\$189,993.2</b>	<b>\$187,776.0</b>	<b>\$196,034.0</b>	<b>\$8,258.0</b>
<b>Homeland Security</b>				
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection				
<i>Decontamination</i>	\$181.4	\$198.0	\$198.0	\$0.0
<i>Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)</i>	\$1,584.9	\$1,538.0	\$1,626.0	\$88.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	\$1,766.3	\$1,736.0	\$1,824.0	\$88.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery				
<i>Decontamination</i>	\$8,153.4	\$10,613.0	\$10,774.0	\$161.0
<i>Laboratory Preparedness and Response</i>	\$3,792.6	\$9,588.0	\$9,621.0	\$33.0
<i>Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)</i>	\$33,337.2	\$33,440.0	\$33,148.0	(\$292.0)
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	\$45,283.2	\$53,641.0	\$53,543.0	(\$98.0)
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$585.0	\$1,194.0	\$1,194.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$47,634.5</b>	<b>\$56,571.0</b>	<b>\$56,561.0</b>	<b>(\$10.0)</b>
<b>Information Exchange / Outreach</b>				
Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations	\$145.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Exchange Network	\$1,429.8	\$1,433.0	\$1,433.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Information Exchange / Outreach</b>	<b>\$1,575.7</b>	<b>\$1,433.0</b>	<b>\$1,433.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>				
Information Security	\$474.6	\$783.0	\$799.0	\$16.0
IT / Data Management	\$15,929.7	\$16,896.0	\$17,124.0	\$228.0
<b>Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security</b>	<b>\$16,404.3</b>	<b>\$17,679.0</b>	<b>\$17,923.0</b>	<b>\$244.0</b>
<b>Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>				
Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$776.9	\$874.0	\$895.0	\$21.0
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	\$802.4	\$708.0	\$746.0	\$38.0
<b>Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>	<b>\$1,579.3</b>	<b>\$1,582.0</b>	<b>\$1,641.0</b>	<b>\$59.0</b>
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations				
<i>Rent</i>	\$44,867.0	\$45,353.0	\$44,300.0	(\$1,053.0)
<i>Utilities</i>	\$1,176.7	\$3,042.0	\$3,397.0	\$355.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<i>Security</i>	\$6,392.7	\$6,524.0	\$8,299.0	\$1,775.0
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)</i>	\$19,807.5	\$21,331.0	\$22,601.0	\$1,270.0
<b>Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations</b>	<b>\$72,243.9</b>	<b>\$76,250.0</b>	<b>\$78,597.0</b>	<b>\$2,347.0</b>
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	\$3,044.7	\$3,168.0	\$3,283.0	\$115.0
Acquisition Management	\$20,705.1	\$24,361.0	\$23,229.0	(\$1,132.0)
Human Resources Management	\$4,681.2	\$5,386.0	\$8,068.0	\$2,682.0
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$20,861.5	\$25,478.0	\$26,746.0	\$1,268.0
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$121,536.4</b>	<b>\$134,643.0</b>	<b>\$139,923.0</b>	<b>\$5,280.0</b>
<b>Research: Human Health and Ecosystems</b>				
Human Health Risk Assessment	\$6,799.6	\$3,377.0	\$3,395.0	\$18.0
<b>Research: Land Protection</b>				
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	\$19,392.9	\$20,905.0	\$21,401.0	\$496.0
<b>Research: Sustainability</b>				
Research: Sustainability	\$99.7	\$79.0	\$0.0	(\$79.0)
<b>Superfund Cleanup</b>				
Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal	\$223,136.3	\$195,043.0	\$202,843.0	\$7,800.0
Superfund: EPA Emergency Preparedness	\$9,608.7	\$9,442.0	\$9,791.0	\$349.0
Superfund: Federal Facilities	\$33,558.3	\$31,306.0	\$32,203.0	\$897.0
Superfund: Remedial	\$726,765.3	\$604,992.0	\$605,000.0	\$8.0
Superfund: Support to Other Federal Agencies	\$4,888.0	\$6,575.0	\$6,575.0	\$0.0
Brownfields Projects	\$7,070.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Superfund Cleanup</b>	<b>\$1,005,027.3</b>	<b>\$847,358.0</b>	<b>\$856,412.0</b>	<b>\$9,054.0</b>
<b>Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>	<b>\$1,425,588.8</b>	<b>\$1,285,024.0</b>	<b>\$1,308,541.0</b>	<b>\$23,517.0</b>
<b>Leaking Underground Storage Tanks</b>				
<b>Compliance</b>				
Compliance Assistance and Centers	\$787.5	\$817.0	\$788.0	(\$29.0)
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>				
IT / Data Management	\$178.0	\$162.0	\$162.0	\$0.0
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations				
<i>Rent</i>	\$685.0	\$696.0	\$696.0	\$0.0
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)</i>	\$205.3	\$206.0	\$207.0	\$1.0
<b>Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations</b>	<b>\$890.3</b>	<b>\$902.0</b>	<b>\$903.0</b>	<b>\$1.0</b>

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
Acquisition Management	\$154.2	\$165.0	\$165.0	\$0.0
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$708.9	\$987.0	\$1,122.0	\$135.0
Human Resources Management	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$0.0	(\$3.0)
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$1,756.4</b>	<b>\$2,057.0</b>	<b>\$2,190.0</b>	<b>\$133.0</b>
<b>Research: Land Protection</b>				
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	\$567.7	\$475.0	\$484.0	\$9.0
<b>Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)</b>				
LUST / UST				
<i>EPAct &amp; Related Authorities Implementation</i>	\$1,058.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>LUST / UST (other activities)</i>	\$14,193.0	\$11,105.0	\$11,855.0	\$750.0
Subtotal, LUST / UST	\$15,251.5	\$11,105.0	\$11,855.0	\$750.0
LUST Cooperative Agreements				
<i>EPAct &amp; Related Authorities Implementation</i>	\$26,496.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>LUST Cooperative Agreements (other activities)</i>	\$63,056.0	\$62,461.0	\$63,192.0	\$731.0
Subtotal, LUST Cooperative Agreements	\$89,552.8	\$62,461.0	\$63,192.0	\$731.0
LUST Prevention				
<i>EPAct &amp; Related Authorities Implementation</i>	\$0.0	\$35,500.0	\$34,430.0	(\$1,070.0)
Subtotal, LUST Prevention	\$0.0	\$35,500.0	\$34,430.0	(\$1,070.0)
<b>Subtotal, Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)</b>	<b>\$104,804.3</b>	<b>\$109,066.0</b>	<b>\$109,477.0</b>	<b>\$411.0</b>
<b>Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks</b>	<b>\$108,093.9</b>	<b>\$112,577.0</b>	<b>\$113,101.0</b>	<b>\$524.0</b>
<b>Oil Spill Response</b>				
<b>Compliance</b>				
Compliance Assistance and Centers	\$285.3	\$277.0	\$317.0	\$40.0
<b>Enforcement</b>				
Civil Enforcement	\$1,851.0	\$2,117.0	\$2,406.0	\$289.0
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>				
IT / Data Management	\$15.0	\$24.0	\$24.0	\$0.0
<b>Oil</b>				
Oil Spill: Prevention, Preparedness and Response	\$13,880.8	\$13,953.0	\$14,397.0	\$444.0
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations				
<i>Rent</i>	\$431.0	\$538.0	\$438.0	(\$100.0)
<i>Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (other activities)</i>	\$67.6	\$58.0	\$60.0	\$2.0
Subtotal, Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$498.6	\$596.0	\$498.0	(\$98.0)

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$498.6</b>	<b>\$596.0</b>	<b>\$498.0</b>	<b>(\$98.0)</b>
<b>Research: Land Protection</b>				
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	\$794.6	\$720.0	\$737.0	\$17.0
<b>Total, Oil Spill Response</b>	<b>\$17,325.3</b>	<b>\$17,687.0</b>	<b>\$18,379.0</b>	<b>\$692.0</b>
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>				
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)</b>				
Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water SRF	\$836,929.7	\$689,080.0	\$2,400,000.0	\$1,710,920.0
Infrastructure Assistance: Drinking Water SRF	\$949,968.9	\$829,029.0	\$1,500,000.0	\$670,971.0
Congressionally Mandated Projects	\$75,837.8	\$153,000.0	\$0.0	(\$153,000.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Alaska Native Villages	\$21,193.7	\$18,500.0	\$10,000.0	(\$8,500.0)
Brownfields Projects	\$94,611.8	\$97,000.0	\$100,000.0	\$3,000.0
Clean School Bus Initiative	\$6,868.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program				
<i>EPA Act &amp; Related Authorities Implementation</i>	\$0.0	\$60,000.0	\$60,000.0	\$0.0
<i>CA Emission Reduction Project Grants</i>	\$9,844.0	\$15,000.0	\$0.0	(\$15,000.0)
<i>Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program (other activities)</i>	\$19,954.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program	\$29,798.9	\$75,000.0	\$60,000.0	(\$15,000.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Mexico Border	\$65,138.5	\$20,000.0	\$10,000.0	(\$10,000.0)
<b>Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)</b>	<b>\$2,080,348.1</b>	<b>\$1,881,609.0</b>	<b>\$4,080,000.0</b>	<b>\$2,198,391.0</b>
<b>Categorical Grants</b>				
Categorical Grant: Beaches Protection	\$10,642.2	\$9,900.0	\$9,900.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Brownfields	\$51,070.6	\$49,495.0	\$49,495.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Environmental Information	\$14,402.4	\$10,000.0	\$10,000.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	\$101,740.4	\$101,346.0	\$106,346.0	\$5,000.0
Categorical Grant: Homeland Security	\$5,688.0	\$4,950.0	\$0.0	(\$4,950.0)
Categorical Grant: Lead	\$14,699.7	\$13,564.0	\$14,564.0	\$1,000.0
Categorical Grant: Local Govt Climate Change	\$0.0	\$10,000.0	\$0.0	(\$10,000.0)
Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)	\$207,166.5	\$200,857.0	\$200,857.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Enforcement	\$20,098.6	\$18,711.0	\$18,711.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Program Implementation	\$14,014.7	\$12,970.0	\$13,520.0	\$550.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)				
<i>Monitoring Grants</i>	\$26,737.7	\$18,500.0	\$18,500.0	\$0.0
<i>Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106) (other activities)</i>	\$217,098.4	\$199,995.0	\$210,764.0	\$10,769.0
Subtotal, Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)	\$243,836.1	\$218,495.0	\$229,264.0	\$10,769.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention	\$5,076.8	\$4,940.0	\$4,940.0	\$0.0

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>Pres Bud vs. Enacted</b>
Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	\$101,503.0	\$99,100.0	\$105,700.0	\$6,600.0
Categorical Grant: Radon	\$10,007.4	\$8,074.0	\$8,074.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Sector Program	\$1,666.3	\$1,828.0	\$1,828.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: State and Local Air Quality Management	\$226,155.9	\$224,080.0	\$226,580.0	\$2,500.0
Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds	\$21,027.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Toxics Substances Compliance	\$5,273.6	\$5,099.0	\$5,099.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Tribal Air Quality Management	\$12,066.9	\$13,300.0	\$13,300.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Tribal General Assistance Program	\$58,628.8	\$57,925.0	\$62,875.0	\$4,950.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Injection Control (UIC)	\$12,114.5	\$10,891.0	\$10,891.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks	\$3,600.7	\$2,500.0	\$2,500.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training	\$670.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Water Quality Cooperative Agreements	\$445.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Wetlands Program Development	\$15,985.2	\$16,830.0	\$16,830.0	\$0.0
<b>Subtotal, Categorical Grants</b>	<b>\$1,157,581.6</b>	<b>\$1,094,855.0</b>	<b>\$1,111,274.0</b>	<b>\$16,419.0</b>
<b>Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>	<b>\$3,237,929.7</b>	<b>\$2,976,464.0</b>	<b>\$5,191,274.0</b>	<b>\$2,214,810.0</b>
<b>Not Specified</b>				
<b>Rescission of Prior Year Funds</b>	(\$5,000.0)	(\$10,000.0)	(\$10,000.0)	\$0.0
<b>Total, Rescission of Prior Year Funds</b>	<b>(\$5,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$10,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$10,000.0)</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
<b>TOTAL, EPA</b>	<b>\$7,993,075.1</b>	<b>\$7,643,674.0</b>	<b>\$10,486,000.0</b>	<b>\$2,842,326.0</b>

## **DISCONTINUED PROGRAMS**

**Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training**

Program Area: Categorical Grants

Goal: Clean and Safe Water

Objective(s): Protect Water Quality

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud v. FY 2009 Enacted</b>
<i>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</i>	<i>\$670.3</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>(\$0.0)</i>
Total Budget Authority / Obligations	\$670.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.0)
Total Workyears	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**Program Project Description:**

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

**FY 2010 Activities and Performance Plan:**

There is no request for this program in FY 2010. There are no current performance measures for this program (previously under EPA's Protect Water Quality Objective).

**FY 2010 Change from FY 2009 Enacted Budget (Dollars in Thousands):**

- No change in program funding.

**Statutory Authority:**

CWA.



**Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds**

Program Area: Categorical Grants

Goal: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems

Objective(s): Restore and Protect Critical Ecosystems

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud v. FY 2009 Enacted</b>
<i>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</i>	<i>\$21,027.7</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>(\$0.0)</i>
Total Budget Authority / Obligations	\$21,027.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.0)
Total Workyears	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**Program Project Description:**

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

**FY 2010 Activities and Performance Plan:**

There is no request for this program in FY 2010. There are no current performance measures for this program (previously under EPA's Protect Water Quality objective).

**FY 2010 Change from FY 2009 Enacted Budget (Dollars in Thousands):**

- No change in program funding.

**Statutory Authority:**

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

**Categorical Grant: Water Quality Cooperative Agreements**

Program Area: Categorical Grants

Goal: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems

Objective(s): Restore and Protect Critical Ecosystems

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud v. FY 2009 Enacted</b>
<i>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</i>	\$21,027.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.0)
Total Budget Authority / Obligations	\$21,027.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.0)
Total Workyears	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**Program Project Description:**

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

**FY 2010 Activities and Performance Plan:**

There is no request for this program in FY 2010. There are no current performance measures for this program (previously under EPA's Protect Water Quality objective).

**FY 2010 Change from FY 2009 Enacted Budget (Dollars in Thousands):**

- No change in program funding.

**Statutory Authority:**

CWA.

**Regional Geographic Initiatives**

Program Area: Geographic Programs  
Goal: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems  
Objective(s): Communities

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<b>FY 2008 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2009 Enacted</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud</b>	<b>FY 2010 Pres Bud v. FY 2009 Enacted</b>
<b><i>Environmental Program Management</i></b>	<b>\$5,515.8</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$0.0)</b>
Total Budget Authority / Obligations	\$5,515.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.0)
Total Workyears	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0

**Program Project Description:**

EPA’s Regional Geographic Initiative (RGI) supported innovative and geographically based projects. These funds were available to EPA Regional offices to support priority local and Regional environmental projects, which have included protecting children’s health, restoring watersheds, providing for clean air, preventing pollution and fostering environmental stewardship. RGI provided a tool to facilitate holistic and innovative resolutions to complex environmental problems.

**FY 2010 Activities and Performance Plan**

There is no request for this program in FY 2010. There are no current performance measures for this program (previously under EPA’s Objective 4.2: Communities).

**FY 2010 Change from FY 2009 Enacted Budget (Dollars in Thousands):**

- No change in program funding.

**Statutory Authority:**

CWA; CAA; TSCA; CERLA; SDWA; PPA; RCRA.

## EXPECTED BENEFITS OF THE PRESIDENT'S E-GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

### Grants.gov

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

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

EPA received 2,885 applications through Grants.gov in 2008.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-04-00-04-0160-24	\$517.763
2010	020-00-04-00-04-0160-24	\$486.450

### Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE)

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

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

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

Federal Business Opportunities (FBO) website, where the information is accessible to the public. Vendors use this website to identify business opportunities in federal contracting.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	\$151.282
2010	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	\$124.454

**Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) Grants and Loans**

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

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01-16-02-4300-24	\$89.973
2010	020-00-01-16-02-4300-24	\$89.973*

**Enterprise Human Resource Integration Initiative**

The Enterprise Human Resource Integration's (EHRI) Electronic Official Personnel Folder (eOPF) is designed to provide a consolidated repository that digitally documents the employment actions and history of individuals employed by the Federal government. EPA will migrate from a manual Official Personnel File (OPF) process to the federal eOPF system. The Agency used a phased deployment approach in calendar year 2008. This initiative will benefit the Agency by reducing file room maintenance costs and improve customer service for employees and productivity for HR specialists. Customer service will improve for employees since they will have 24/7 access to view and print their official personnel documents and HR specialists will no longer be required to manually file, retrieve or mail personnel actions to employees thus improving productivity.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01-16-03-1219-24	\$474.230
2010	020-00-01-16-03-1219-24	\$406.120

**Recruitment One-Stop (ROS)**

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

increased job seeker satisfaction with the Federal job application process and is helping the Agency to locate highly-qualified candidates and improve response times to applicants.

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

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01-16-04-1218-24	\$106.293
2010	020-00-01-16-04-1218-24	\$106.293*

### **eTraining**

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

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01-16-03-1217-24	\$80.000
2010	020-00-01-16-03-1217-24	\$80.000*

### **Human Resources LoB**

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

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

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$65.217
2010	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$65.217

### **Grants Management LoB**

In FY 2008, EPA managed 7,960 grant awards equaling approximately \$3.8 billion. EPA anticipates the key benefit will be having a centralized location to download all applications, make awards, and track awards to closeout. Automated business processes, available through consortium service providers, will decrease agency reliance on manual and paper-based processing. Consortium lead agencies will spread operations and maintenance (O&M) costs, and development, modernization, and enhancement (DME) costs across agencies, decreasing the burden that any one agency must bear.

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

Service to constituents will be improved through the standardization and streamlining of government-wide grants business processes. The public will save time as a result of quicker notification and faster payments due to an automated system for grants processing. Furthermore, GM LoB will minimize complex and varying agency-specific requirements and increase grantee ease of use on Federal grants management systems. Constituents will benefit as they will have fewer unique agency systems and processes to learn; grantees' ability to learn how to use the system will be improved and reliance on call center technical support will be reduced. Consortium lead agencies also will provide grantees with online access to standard post-award reports, decreasing the number of unique agency-specific reporting requirements.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$59.316
2010	020-00-04-00-04-1300-24	\$40.757

### **Business Gateway**

By creating a single entry-point for business information, such as the e-Forms catalog, Business Gateway directly benefits EPA's regulated communities, many of whom are subject to complex regulatory requirements across multiple agencies. This initiative also benefits EPA by centralizing OMB reporting requirements under the Small Business Paperwork Relief Act of 2002. Finally, EPA has over 100 initiatives, activities, and services directed at small business needs. Many of those initiatives are highlighted to small businesses through periodic features in Business.gov. This allows special focus to be brought to bear at critical times to the intended audiences for those initiatives. Business.gov also continues to provide a one-stop compliance tool enabling small and emerging businesses access to compliance information, forms and tools across the Federal Government. Business Gateway supports EPA's small business activities function by providing the following benefits:

- a single point of access for electronic regulatory forms;
- "plain English" compliance guidance, fact sheets and links to checklists for small businesses; and

- an extensive Web site with numerous links to other internal and external assistance sources.

EPA anticipates similar benefits from Business Gateway in FYs 2009 and 2010.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01-16-04-0100-24	\$209.308
2010	020-00-01-16-04-0100-24	\$52.758

### **Geospatial LoB**

The Geospatial Line of Business (GeoLoB) is an intergovernmental project to improve the ability of the public and government to use geospatial information to support the business of government and facilitate decision-making. This initiative will reduce EPA costs and improve our operations in several areas. The investment in FY 2009 and FY 2010 will provide the necessary planning and coordination to begin providing significant benefits to EPA in the following ways:

EPA's geospatial program has achieved a cost avoidance of approximately \$2 million per year by internally consolidating procurements for data and tools into multi-year enterprise licenses. The Agency is currently applying these lessons learned for the benefit of our partners in the GeoLoB as well as colleagues in State, Local and Tribal government organizations. The GeoLoB will reduce costs by providing an opportunity for EPA and other agencies to share approaches on procurement consolidation that other agencies can follow. Throughout FY 2008, EPA has played a key leadership role in a GeoLoB Workgroup to explore opportunities for Federal-wide acquisition of key geospatial software and data. During FY 2009, we anticipate the first of these acquisitions will be released to the vendor community through our GeoLoB partners at GSA.

EPA benefits from Geospatial LoB in FY 2010 are anticipated to be the same as those described for FY 2009.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01-16-04-3100-24	\$42.000
2010	020-00-01-16-04-3100-24	\$42.000

### **eRulemaking**

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

The eRulemaking Program's Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) supports and services all 15 Cabinet Departments and 14 of the largest independent rulemaking agencies which collectively promulgate more than 90 percent of Federal regulations each year. FDMS has simplified the public's participation in the rulemaking process and made EPA's rulemaking



business processes more accessible as well as transparent. FDMS provides EPA's 1,430 registered users with a secure, centralized electronic repository for managing the Agency's rulemaking development via distributed management of data and robust role-based user access. EPA posts regulatory and non-regulatory documents in *Regulations.gov* for public viewing, downloading, bookmarking, email notification, and commenting. During the first six months of FY 2009, EPA posted 307 rules and proposed rules, 604 Federal Register notices, and 31,800 public submissions in *Regulations.gov*. In FY 2009, the public is submitting comments at a rate 250 percent higher than the rate for the prior year. EPA also posted 7.9 thousand supporting and related materials. Overall, EPA provides public access to more than 387,000 documents organized into 8,100 dockets in *Regulations.gov*.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01016-04-0060-24	\$1,531.123
2010	020-00-01016-04-0060-24	\$1,057.931

### **E-Travel**

E-Travel is designed to provide EPA more efficient and effective travel management services, with cost savings from cross-government purchasing agreements and improved functionality through streamlined travel policies and processes, strict security and privacy controls, and enhanced agency oversight and audit capabilities. EPA employees also will benefit from the integrated travel planning provided through E-Travel. EPA implemented the goal of the ETravel initiative by fully deploying GovTrip in FY 2008.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01-01-03-0221-24	\$1,327.924
2010	020-00-01-01-03-0220-24	\$1,145.224

### **Financial Management Line of Business (FMLoB)**

The FMLoB is a multi-agency effort whose goals include: achieving process improvements and cost savings in the acquisition, development, implementation, and operation of financial management systems. EPA will complete the planning and acquisition phase of its Financial System Modernization Project (FSMP) and will begin migration to a shared service provider. This work will benefit from the migration guidance developed in FY 2006, including the use of performance metrics developed for service level agreements and the use of standard business processes developed for four core financial management sub-functions: Payments, Receipts, Funds and Reporting. By incorporating the same FM LoB-standard processes as those used by central agency systems, interfaces among the systems will be streamlined and the quality of information available for decision-making will be improved. In addition, EPA expects to achieve operational savings in future years because of the use of the shared service provider for operations and maintenance of the new system.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	\$44.444
2010	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	\$44.444

### **Budget Formulation and Execution (BFE) LoB**

The Budget Formulation and Execution Lines of Business (BFE LoB) allow EPA and other agencies to access budget-related benefits and services. The Agency has the option to implement LoB sponsored tools and services.

EPA has benefited from the BFE LoB by sharing valuable information on what has or hasn't worked on the use of different budget systems and software. This effort has created a government only capability for electronic collaboration (*Wiki*) in which the Budget Community website allows EPA to share budget information with OMB (and other Federal agencies). The LoB is working on giving EPA and other agencies the capability to have secure, virtual on-line meetings where participants can not only hear what's been said by conference calling into the meeting, but also view budget-related presentations directly from their workspace. The LoB has provided budget-related training to EPA budget employees on OMB's MAX budget system, and on Treasury's FACTS II statements explaining how it ties to the budget process.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2009	010-00-01-01-04-3200-24	\$95.000
2010	010-00-01-01-04-3200-24	\$95.000

### **IT LoB**

The Information Technology Line of Business (ITLoB), utilizing Gartner's benchmarking tools and research services, will benefit EPA by providing an understanding of improved IT performance, greater efficiencies in IT infrastructure investments, and consistency and standardization of infrastructure platforms. This process is critical to our forward planning for improved service offerings at competitive prices. The sharing of best practices, industry standards, and pricing will help EPA drive towards efficiencies and best practices, such as standardization of desktop, computer rooms, server, and storage management systems.

The planning of EPA's next generation telecommunication's network, Wide Area Network (WAN) 2010, will be facilitated by the information on standards, metrics, best practices, and sourcing options that the ITLoB brings to the Federal community.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2009	020-00-02-00-04-3300-24	\$0.0
2010	020-00-02-00-04-3300-24	\$40.000

---

\* The FY 2010 allocation of the Agency's contribution is still pending. The Agency has assumed the same level as FY 2009.