Environmental Protection Agency
2007 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification

Table of Contents - Appendix

COORDINATION WITH OTHER 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 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 IMPROVE visibility monitoring network. The operation and analysis of data produced by the particulate matter (PM) monitoring system is an example of the close coordination of effort between the EPA and state and Tribal governments.

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

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

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

For the clean fuel programs, EPA works closely with the DOE on refinery cost modeling analyses. For mobile sources program outreach, the Agency is participating in a collaborative effort with FHWA and FTA designed to educate the public about the impacts of transportation choices on traffic congestion, air quality, and public health. This community-based public education initiative also includes the CDC. In addition, EPA works with DOE to identify opportunities in the Clean Cities program. EPA also works cooperatively with DOE to better characterize gasoline PM emissions and characterize the contribution of gasoline vehicles and engine emissions to ambient PM levels.

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

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

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

In developing regional and international air quality programs and projects and working on regional agreements, EPA works primarily with the Department of State, the Agency for International Development (USAID), and the DOE as well as with regional organizations. EPA's international air quality management program will complement EPA's programs on children's health, Trade and the Environment, and trans-boundary air pollution. In addition, EPA will partner with others worldwide, including international organizations such as the United Nations Environment Programme, the European Union, the Organization for Economic

Development and Co-operation (OECD), the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and our colleagues in Canada, Mexico, Europe, and Japan.

Objective: Healthier Indoor Air

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

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

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

Objective: Protect the Ozone Layer

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

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

EPA is working with USDA and the Department of State to facilitate research and development of alternatives to methyl bromide. EPA collaborates with these agencies to prepare U.S. requests

for emergency and critical use exemptions of methyl bromide. EPA is providing input to USDA on rulemakings for methyl bromide-related programs. EPA consults with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) on the potential for domestic methyl bromide needs.

EPA also coordinates closely with FDA to ensure that sufficient supplies of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are available for the production of life-saving metered-dose inhalers for the treatment of asthma and other lung diseases. This partnership between EPA and FDA combines the critical goals of protecting public health and limiting damage to the stratospheric ozone layer.

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

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

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

Objective: Radiation

In addition to the specific activities described above, EPA continues to work with Federal agencies including Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), DOE, and DHS to prevent metals and finished products suspected of having radioactive contamination from entering the country. EPA also works with the DOT on initiatives to promote use of non-nuclear density gauges for highway paving, and with the DOE and NRC to develop state-of-the-art tracking systems for radioactive sources in U.S. commerce.

Objective: Reduce Greenhouse Gas Intensity

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

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

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

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

EPA works primarily with the Department of State, the Agency for International Development as well as local and regional foreign governments 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 works with the National Park Service in operating Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNET). In addition, DOE will pursue actions such as promoting the research, development, and deployment of advanced technologies (for example, renewable energy sources). In the case of fuel cell vehicle technology, EPA is working closely with DOE as the Administration's FreedomCAR initiative develops, taking the lead on emissions-related issues.

The President's call for a greatly expanded and coordinated inter-agency particulate matter (PM) research effort led to the creation in 1999 of the Particulate Matter Workgroup, which is administered by the Air Quality Research Subcommittee of the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR). This workgroup, co-chaired by EPA and NIEHS, has completed its Strategic Research Plan for Particulate Matter[1] to guide the coordinated Federal research program over the next five to ten years.

[1] Committee on Environment and Natural Resources, Air Quality Research Subcommittee, *Strategic Research Plan for Particulate Matter (Washington: CENR, 2002).* Available at: <http://www.al.noaa.gov/AQRS/reports/SRPPM.pdf>

The body of national PM research dealing with atmospheric sciences is coordinated under North American Research Strategy for Tropospheric Ozone) NARSTO.[2] Its membership of more than 65 organizations, which includes all major Federal, state, and provincial governments, private industry, and utilities, recently released an assessment[3] of PM atmospheric science to help policy makers implement air quality standards for PM. It presents the latest understanding of PM atmospheric phenomena over North America and recommends additional work to fill identified gaps.

EPA's air toxics research is coordinated as needed with other Federal agencies, such as the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) and the National Toxicology Program (as a source of toxicity testing data). EPA also supports the Health Effects Institute (HEI),[4] which coordinates with industry partners. In addition, EPA conducts research on advanced source measurement approaches jointly with the Department of Defense through the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP).[5]

Goal 2- Clean and Safe Water

Objective: Protect Human Health

The 1996 SDWA amendments include a provision that mandates joint EPA/CDC study of waterborne diseases and occurrence studies in public water supplies. CDC is involved in assisting EPA in training health care providers (doctors, nurses, public health officials, etc.) on public health issues related to drinking water contamination and there is close CDC/EPA coordination on research on microbial contaminants in drinking water. EPA has in place a MOU and an Interagency Agreement (IAG) with the CDC to implement this provision.

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

Public Water Systems (PWS)

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

---

[2] Formerly an acronym for the North American Research Strategy for Tropospheric Ozone, the term NARSTO now describes a public-private partnership across the U.S., Canada, and Mexico for dealing with tropospheric pollution, including ozone and suspended particulate matter. For more information, visit: <http://www.cgenv.com/narsto>

[3] NARSTO, *Particulate Matter Science for Policy Makers: A NARSTO Assessment (London: Cambridge University Press, 2004).* Available at: <http://www.cambridge.org/us/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=0521842875>

[4] For more information, visit: <http://www.healtheffects.org>

[5] For more information, visit: <http://www.serdp.org>

Data Availability, Outreach and Technical Assistance

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

Tribal Access Coordination

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

Collaboration with USGS

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

Collaboration with Public and Private Partners on Critical Water Infrastructure Protection

EPA coordinates with other Federal agencies, primarily DHS, CDC, FDA and DoD on biological, chemical, and radiological contaminants, and how to respond to their presence in drinking water and wastewater systems. A close linkage with the FBI, particularly with respect to ensuring the effectiveness of the ISAC, will be continued. The Agency is strengthening its working relationships with the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, the Water Environment Research Federation and other research institutions to increase our knowledge on technologies to detect contaminants, monitoring protocols and techniques, and treatment effectiveness.

Collaboration with FDA

EPA and FDA have issued joint national fish consumption advisories to protect the public from exposure to mercury in commercially and recreationally caught fish, as well as fish caught for subsistence. EPA's advisory covers the recreational and subsistence fisheries in fresh waters where states and Tribes have not assessed the waters for the need for an advisory. ibid. http://map1.epa.gov/html/federaladv FDA's advisory covers commercially caught fish, and fish

caught in marine waters. Ibid. http://map1.epa.gov/html/federaladv EPA works closely with FDA to distribute the advisory to the public. In addition, EPA works with FDA to investigate the need for advisories for other contaminants and to ensure that these federal advisories support and augment advisories issued by states and Tribes.

Beach Monitoring and Public Notification

The BEACH Act requires that all Federal agencies with jurisdiction over coastal and Great Lakes recreation waters adjacent to beaches used by the public implement beach monitoring and public notification programs. These programs must be consistent with guidance published by EPA. ibid. "National Beach Guidance and Required Performance Criteria for Grants." EPA will continue to work with the USPS 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.

Construction Grants Program - US Army Corps of Engineers

Throughout the history of the construction grants program under Title II of the CWA, EPA and the delegated states have made broad use of the construction expertise of the COE to provide varied assistance in construction oversight and administrative matters. EPA works with the Corps to provide oversight for construction of the special projects that Congress has designated. The mechanism for this expertise has been and continues to be an IAG between the two agencies.

Nonpoint Sources

EPA will continue to work closely with its Federal partners to achieve the ambitious strategic objective of reducing pollutant discharges, including at least 20 percent from 1992 erosion levels. 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, whose programs can contribute significantly to reduced pollutant loadings of sediment, especially on the vast public lands that comprise 29 percent of all land in the United States. EPA will work with these agencies, USGS, and the states to document improvements in land management and water quality.

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

Vessel Discharges

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

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

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

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

Objective: Enhance Science and Research

While EPA is the Federal agency mandated to ensure safe drinking water, other Federal and non-Federal entities are conducting research that complements EPA's research program on priority contaminants in drinking water. For example, the CDC and NIEHS conduct health effects and exposure research. FDA also performs research on children's risks.

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

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

The issue of eutrophication, hypoxia, and harmful algal blooms (HABs) is a priority with the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR). An interagency research strategy for pfiesteria and other harmful algal species was developed in 1998, and EPA is continuing to implement that strategy. EPA is working closely with NOAA on the issue of nutrients and risks posed by HABs. This CENR is also coordinating the research efforts among Federal agencies to assess the impacts of nutrients and hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico.

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

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

Goal 3-Land Preservation and Restoration

Objective: Preserve Land

Pollution prevention activities entail coordination with other Federal departments/agencies, such as the General Services Administration (GSA) (use of safer products for indoor painting and cleaning), the DoD (use of safer paving materials for parking lots), and Defense Logistics Agency (safer solvents). The program also works with the NIST, the International Standards Organization, and other groups to develop standards for Environmental Management Systems.

In addition to business, industry and other non-governmental organizations, EPA will work with Federal, state, Tribal, and local governments to encourage reduced generation as well as the safe recycling of wastes. Frequently, successful programs require multiple partners to address the

multi-media nature of effective source reduction and recycling. The Agency has brought together a range of stakeholders to examine alternatives in specific industrial sectors, and several regulatory changes have followed which encourage hazardous waste recycling. Partners in this effort include the Environmental Council of States, the Tribal Association on Solid Waste and Emergency Response, and the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials.

As Federal partners, EPA and the USPS work together on several municipal solid waste projects. For instance, rather than dispose of returned or unwanted mail, EPA and the USPS developed and implemented successful recycling procedures and markets. For example, unwanted mail (advertisements, catalogues, etc.) is being returned to the Post Office for recycling rather than disposal by the recipient. In addition, Integrated Solid Waste Management Plans are being implemented at parks in western states because of Regional offices' assistance to the NPS. EPA also works with the SBA to provide support to recycling businesses.

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 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 13101 and in tracking and reporting purchases of products made with recycled contents.

In addition, the Agency is currently engaged with the DoD, DoEd, DOE, USPS, 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 participated in developing a draft interagency MOU which will lead to increased reuse and recycling of an array of computers and other electronics hardware used by civilian and military agencies. Implementation of this MOU will divert substantial quantities of plastic, glass, lead, mercury, silver, and other materials from disposal. Currently, EPA works with USDA and FDA on a variety of issues related to the disposal of agricultural products (food and/or animals), contaminated with chemical or biological pathogens.

Concerns about the use of contaminants of concern (e.g., methyl-tertiary-butyl-ether, or MTBE) in gasoline further underscores EPA's and the state's emphasis on promoting compliance with all Underground Storage Tanks (UST) requirements. EPA provides technical information, forums for information exchanges and training opportunities to sates, Tribes and Intertribal Consorita to encourage program development and/or implementation of the UST program. In FY 2007, EPA will continue to promote cross media opportunities (e.g. targeted public health protection through UST and Source Water Protection Programs, support core development and implementation of state and Tribal UST programs, strengthen partnerships among stakeholders and provide technical assistance, compliance assistance, and training to promote and enforce UST facilities' compliance.

Objective: Restore Land

Superfund Remedial Program

The Superfund Remedial program coordinates with many other Federal and state agencies in accomplishing its mission. Currently, EPA has active interagency agreements with NOAA, DOI, OSHA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and USCG.

These agencies provide numerous Superfund related services such as providing technical support during hazardous waste site investigations and identifying and evaluating the severity of risks posed to natural resources from hazardous waste sites; providing scientific support for response operations in EPA's Regional offices; supporting the national response system by providing emergency preparedness expertise and administrative support to the National Response Team and the Regional Response Teams; assisting in the coordination among Federal and state natural resource trustee agencies; conducting outreach to states, Indian Tribes and Federal natural resource trustee officials regarding natural resource damage assessments; conducting compliance assistance visits to review site safety and health plans and developing guidelines for assessing safety and health at hazardous waste sites; supporting the Superfund program in the management and coordination of training programs for local officials through the Emergency Management Institute and the National Fire Academy; responding to actual or potential releases of hazardous substances involving the coastal zones, including the Great Lakes and designated inland river ports; and, litigating and settling cleanup agreements and cost recovery cases.

Superfund Federal Facilities Program

The Superfund Federal Facilities Program coordinates with Federal agencies (e.g. DoD, DOE, DOI, etc.), states, Tribes and state associations and others to implement its statutory responsibilities to ensure cleanup and property reuse. The Federal Facilities Program provides technical and regulatory oversight at Federal facilities to ensure human health and environment are protected. Executive Order 12580 delegates certain authorities for implementing Superfund to other Federal agencies. EPA's participation in the acceleration process of the first four rounds of Base Realignment and Closures (BRAC) was funded through an IAG which expires on September 30, 2008. BRAC Round 5, finalized in 2005, will result in additional work requirements in FY 2006 and outyears. In expediting DOE's cleanup program, DOE has signed IAGs with EPA for technical input regarding innovative and flexible regulatory approaches, streamlining of documentation, integration of projects, deletion of sites from the NPL, field assessments, and development of management documents and processes. The IAGs have received recognition by DOE as a model for potential use at other DOE field offices.

The Agency also works in partnership with state and Tribal governments to strengthen their hazardous waste programs and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the nation's overall hazardous waste response capability. EPA assists the states in developing their Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) implementation programs through infrastructure support, financial and technical assistance, and training. Partnerships with states increase the number of site cleanups, improve the timeliness of responses, and make land

available for economic redevelopment earlier in the process, while allowing for more direct local involvement in the cleanup process.

EPA partners with other Federal agencies, state and local governments, and private industry to fulfill Superfund program priorities when a site is radioactively contaminated. Under CERCLA, radioactively contaminated sites are addressed in a manner consistent with how chemically contaminated sites are addressed, accounting for the technical differences. The radiation program provides radiological scientific and technical expertise and leadership in evaluating projects as well as providing field and laboratory support.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

The Agency maintains a close relationship with the state agencies that are authorized to implement the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Permitting and Corrective Action Programs. EPA expects states to achieve the same level of Federal standards as the Agency, including annual performance goals of human exposures and groundwater releases controlled, as well as the number of facilities brought under approved controls. As part of the state grant process, Regional offices negotiate with the states their progress in meeting the corrective action environmental indicator goals.

Encouraging states to become authorized for the RCRA Corrective Action Program remains a priority. Currently, 41 states and territories have been authorized to implement the program. EPA also encourages states to use alternate (non-RCRA) authorities to accomplish the goals of the Corrective Action Program. These include state Superfund and voluntary programs.

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

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. Thirty-seven states have their own cleanup funds to pay for the majority of owners' and operators' cleanup costs. The vast majority of LUST cleanups are paid for by state LUST cleanup funds and not by private parties; state funds are separate from the Federal LUST Trust Fund.

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. The EPA LUST Program also coordinates its efforts with EPA's Office of Water to jointly work with the states to address contamination in areas that are the sources of drinking water.

Emergency Preparedness and Response

EPA plays a major role in reducing the risks accidental and intentional releases of harmful substances and oil pose to human health and the environment. This requires continuous coordination with many Federal, state and local agencies. As the Federal on-scene coordinator (OSC) in the inland zone, EPA evaluates and responds to thousands of releases annually as part of the National Response Plan (NRP). The NRP is a multi-agency preparedness and response mechanism that includes the following key components: the National Response Center (NRC); the National Response Team (NRT), composed of 16 Federal agencies; 13 Regional Response Teams (RRTs); and Federal OSCs. These organizations work with state and local officials to develop and maintain contingency plans will enable the Nation to respond effectively to hazardous substance and oil emergencies.

In addition, the Agency plays a leadership role in crisis management, requiring participation on a number of interagency committees and workgroups. Building on current efforts to enhance national emergency response management, EPA and its role on the NRT will continue implementation of the new National Incident Management System (NIMS).

The NRP, under the direction of 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 has the lead responsibility for the plan's Emergency Support Function covering hazardous materials and inland petroleum releases. Accordingly, EPA participates in the Federal Emergency Support Function Leaders Group which addresses NRP planning and implementation at the operational level. Through this interagency organization, Federal agencies handle issue formulation and resolution, review after-action reports, and evaluate the need for changes to NRP planning and implementation strategies. They also participate in NRP exercises, training and post event evaluation actions, coordinating these activities closely with the NRT.

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

EPA provides staff support to the Homeland Security Operations Center (HSOC) during national disasters and emergencies, response to terrorist incidents and other responses under the NRP. EPA will also continue to develop and participate in training courses on emergency support function responsibilities, deliver presentations on the NRP to national forums and participate in nationwide exercises to test and improve the Federal government's preparedness and response system as well as its capabilities.

Under the Oil Spill Program, EPA works with other Federal agencies such as USFWS, NOAA, USCG, FEMA, DOI, DOT, DOE, and other Federal agencies and states, as well as with local government authorities to develop Area Contingency Plans. DOJ also provides assistance to agencies with judicial referrals when enforcement of violations becomes necessary. EPA and the USCG work in coordination with other Federal authorities to implement the National Preparedness for Response Program.

The COE and the Bureau of Reclamation contribute to the cleanup of Superfund sites by providing technical support for the design and construction of many remediation projects through site-specific interagency agreements. These Federal partners have the technical design and construction expertise and contracting capability needed to assist EPA regions in implementing most of Superfund's high-cost fund-financed remedial action projects. The two agencies also provide technical on-site support to Regions in the enforcement oversight of numerous construction projects performed by Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs).

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.

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. The USGS also has a number of programs, such as the Toxic Substances Hydrology Program, that support studies related to contamination of surface water and groundwater by hazardous materials.

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. 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[6] with several other agencies [DOE, DoD, NRC, USGS, NOAA, and USDA] for multimedia modeling research and development.

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

Goal 4-Healthy Communities and Ecosystems

Objective: Chemical, Organism and Pesticide Risks

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

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

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

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

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

FQPA requires EPA to consult with other government agencies on major decisions. EPA, USDA and FDA work closely together using both a MOU and working committees to deal with

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

development of the annual report entitled "America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The success of EPA's lead program is due in part to effective coordination with other Federal agencies, states and Indian Tribes through the President's Task Force on Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children. EPA will continue to coordinate with HUD to clarify how new rules may affect existing EPA and HUD regulatory programs, and with the FHWA and OSHA on worker protection issues. EPA will continue to work closely with state and Federally

recognized Tribes to ensure that authorized state and Tribal programs continue to comply with requirements established under TSCA, that the ongoing Federal accreditation certification and training program for lead professionals is administered effectively, and states and Tribes adopt the Renovation and Remodeling and the Buildings and Structures Rules when these rules become effective.

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

Mitigation of existing risk is a common interest for other Federal agencies addressing issues of asbestos and PCBs. EPA will continue to coordinate interagency strategies for assessing and managing potential risks from asbestos and other fibers. Coordination on safe PCB disposal is an area of ongoing emphasis with the DoD, and particularly with the U.S. Navy, which has special concerns regarding PCBs encountered during ship scrapping. PCBs and 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 (NACEC), 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 persistant 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 Environmental Cooperation Commission (BECC) and the North American Development Bank (NADBank), which manages the Border Environmental Infrastructure Fund (BEIF), to support the financing and construction of much need 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 to further efforts to improve water and wastewater services to communities within 100 km of the U.S.-Mexico border. Recently, EPA has been involved in efforts to plan, design and construct more than 10 water and wastewater facilities in the border region.

EPA's environmental mandate and expertise make it uniquely qualified to represent the nation's environmental interests abroad. While the Department of State is responsible for the conduct of overall U.S. foreign policy, implementation of particular programs, projects, and agreements is often the responsibility of other agencies with specific technical expertise and resources. Relations between EPA and DOS cut across several offices and/or bureaus in both organizations.

EPA works extensively with the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), as well as the USTR-chaired interagency Trade Policy Staff Committee (TPSC) system, to ensure that U.S. trade and environmental polices are mutually supportive. (The TPSC system consists of various interagency workgroups that develop trade policy for political level review and decision.) For example, through the Agency's participation in the negotiation of both regional and bilateral trade agreements and the World Trade Organization Agreements, EPA works with USTR to ensure that U.S. obligations under international trade agreements do not hamper the ability of Federal and state governments to maintain high levels of domestic environmental protection.

The two agencies also work together to ensure that new obligations are consistent with U.S. law and EPA's rules, regulations, and programs. In addition to the work with USTR, EPA also cooperates with many other Federal agencies in the development and execution of U.S. trade policy, and in performing environmental reviews of trade agreements, developing and implementing environmental cooperation agreements associated with each new FTA, and developing and implementing the associated environmental capacity building projects. EPA works most closely with the Department of State, USAID and USTR in the capacity building area. Finally, the Agency also serves as the co-lead (with USTR) of the Trade and Environment Policy Advisory Committee (TEPAC), a formally-constituted advisory body made up of respected experts from industry, NGOs and academia.

Brownfields

Under the Brownfields Federal Partnership Action Agenda, EPA and its partnering agencies work together to prevent, assess, safely clean up, and sustainably reuse brownfields. More than 20 federal agencies dedicated to brownfields cleanup and redevelopment have committed their resources to help revitalize communities throughout the nation. Building on these partnerships, EPA is initiating a collaborative effort with other agencies involved in brownfields revitalization to develop a shared performance standard that focuses on property reuse. Through this effort, EPA and its partners will analyze methods to demonstrate and measure the transition of brownfields into productive reuse.

Objective: Ecosystems

National Estuary Program

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

Wetlands

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

Coastal America

In efforts to better leverage our collaborative authorities to address coastal communities' environmental issues (e.g., coastal habitat losses, nonpoint source pollution, endangered species,

invasive species, etc.), EPA, by memorandum of agreement in 2002 entered into an agreement with Multi-agency signatories. November 2002. *Coastal America 2002 Memorandum of Understanding.* Available online at http://www.coastalamerica.gov/text/mou02.htm

Great Lakes

Pursuant to the mandate in Section 118 of the Clean Water Act to "coordinate action of the Agency with the actions of other Federal agencies and state and local authorities..." Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) is engaged in extensive coordination efforts with state, Tribal, and other Federal agencies, as well as with our counterparts in Canada. EPA and its local, state, tribal and Federal partners are coordinating restoration of the Great Lakes pursuant to a Great Lakes Regional Collaboration. EPA previously joined with states, Tribes, and Federal agencies that have stewardship responsibilities for the Lakes in developing the new Great Lakes Strategy. In addition to the eight Great Lakes States and interested Tribes, partners include the COE, USCG, USFWS, USGS, NOAA and NRCS. The Strategy joins environmental protection agencies with natural resource agencies in pursuit of common goals. These organizations meet semi-annually as the Great Lakes U.S. Policy Committee to strategically plan and prioritize environmental actions. GLNPO monitoring involves extensive coordination among these partners, both in terms of implementing the monitoring program, and in utilizing results from the monitoring to manage environmental programs. GLNPO's sediments program works closely with the states and the Corps regarding dredging issues. Implementation of the Binational Toxics Strategy involves extensive coordination with Great Lakes States. GLNPO works closely with states, Tribes, FWS, and NRCS in addressing habitat issues in the Great Lakes. EPA also coordinates with these partners regarding development and implementation of Lakewide Management Plans for each of the Great Lakes and for Remedial Action Plans for the 31 U.S./binational Areas of Concern.

Chesapeake Bay

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

Gulf of Mexico

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

Objective: Enhance Science and Research

Several Federal agencies sponsor research on variability and susceptibility in risks from exposure to environmental contaminants. EPA collaborates with a number of the Institutes within the NIH and CDC. For example, NIEHS conducts multi-disciplinary biomedical research programs, prevention and intervention efforts, and communication strategies. The NIEHS program includes an effort to study the effects of chemicals, including pesticides and other toxics, on children. EPA collaborates with NIEHS in supporting the Centers for Children's Environmental Health and Disease Prevention, which study whether and how environmental factors play a role in children's health.

Research in ecosystems protection is coordinated government-wide through the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR). EPA is an active participant in the CENR, and all work is fully consistent and complementary with other Committee member activities. EPA researchers work within the CENR on the Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) and other ecosystems protection research, including the restoration of habitats and species, impacts of landscape change, invasive species and inventory and monitoring programs.

The Mid-Atlantic Landscape Atlas represents one of the EMAP's first regional-scale ecological assessments, and was developed in cooperation with NOAA, USFWS, the University of Tennessee, and DOE's Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Development of the Networking and Information Technology Research & Development (NITR) Modeling System is coordinated with the COE, USDA and DOE. Through interagency agreements with USGS, EPA has worked to investigate and develop tools for assessing the impact of hydrogeology on riparian restoration efforts. The collaborative work with the USGS continues to play a vital role in investigating the impact and fate of atmospheric loadings of nitrogen and nitrogen applications as part of restoration technologies on terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. All of these efforts have

significant implications for risk management in watersheds, total maximum daily load (TMDL) implementation, and management of non-point source pollutants.

The Agency, through partnerships with private sector companies, non-profits, other Federal agencies, universities, and states, including California EPA, has worked to identify and control human exposure to methyl-mercury. EPA has also been working with DOE and USGS to address risk management issues associated with mercury emissions from utilities.

Homeland Security research is conducted in collaboration with numerous agencies, leveraging funding across multiple programs and producing synergistic results. EPA's National Homeland Security Research Center (NHSRC) works closely with the DHS to assure that EPA's efforts are directly supportive of DHS priorities. EPA is also working with DHS to provide support and guidance to DHS in the startup of their University Centers of Excellence program. Recognizing that the DoD has significant expertise and facilities related to biological and chemical warfare agents, the NHSRC works closely with the Edgewood Chemical and Biological Center (ECBC), the Technical Support Working Group, the Army Corps of Engineers, and other Department of Defense organizations to address areas of mutual interest and concern. In conducting biological agent research, the NHSRC is also collaborating with CDC. The NHSRC works with DOE to access and support research conducted by DOE's National Laboratories, as well as to obtain data related to radioactive materials.

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

Goal 5-Compliance and Environmental Stewardship

Objective: Improve Compliance

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

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

addition, it coordinates with the SBA and a number of other Federal agencies in implementing the Business Compliance One-Stop Project, an "E-Government" project that is part 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 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 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.

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.

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 2007, 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 2007 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.

Objective: Improve Environmental Performance through Pollution Prevention and Innovation

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

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

Under the Suppliers' Partnership for the Environment program and its umbrella program, the GSN, EPA's P2 Program is working closely with NIST and its Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program to provide technical assistance to the process of "greening" industry supply

chains. The EPA is also working with the DOE's Industrial Technologies Program to provide energy audits and technical assistance to these supply chains.

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

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

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

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

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

To promote mutual goals as leadership programs with industry, the Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation (OPEI) through its National Environmental Performance Track, works with the Voluntary Protection Programs (VPP) in the Occupational Safety and Health Administration

(OSHA). EPA and OSHA collaborate in developing incentives for members, identifying potential members, providing joint recognition, and sharing best practices from their experience in managing leadership programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 pollution prevention research and incorporation of materials lifecycle analysis into the manufacturing process for weapons and military equipment. The agency has also made contact with USDA regarding lifecycle analysis of biologically- and genetically-altered products. EPA and the COE will address the costs and benefits associated with new engineering projects and technologies in order to respond to the economic impacts of environmental innovation. EPA's People, Prosperity, and Planet (P3) student design competition for sustainability will partner with NASA, NSF, OFEE, USAID, USDA, CEQ, and OSTP.

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

COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES
ENABLING SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Office of the Administrator (OA)

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

The Agency also continues to work with other Federal agencies in the development of children's environmental health indicators used to monitor the outcomes of children's health efforts. The Agency collaborates with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Center for Health Statistics to obtain approval of the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics (www.childstats.gov) on the reporting of appropriate children's health indicators and data.

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

The Science Advisory Board (SAB) primarily provides the Administrator with independent peer reviews and advice on the scientific and technical aspects of environmental issues to inform the Agency's environmental decision-making. Often, the Agency program office seeking the SAB's review and advice has identified the Federal agencies interested in the scientific topic at issue.

The SAB coordinates with those Federal agencies by providing notice of its activities through the Federal Register, and as appropriate, inviting Federal agency experts to participate in the peer review or advisory activity. The SAB, from time to time, also convenes science workshops on emerging issues, and invites Federal agency participation through the greater Federal scientific and research community.

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

Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)

To achieve its mission, EPA has undertaken specific coordination efforts with Federal and state agencies and departments through two separate vehicles: 1) the National Academy of Public Administration's Consortium on Improving Government Performance; 2) active contributions to standing interagency management committees, including the Chief Financial Officers Council and the Federal Financial Managers' Council. These groups are focused on improving resources management and accountability throughout the Federal government. EPA also coordinates appropriately with Congress and other Federal agencies, such as Department of Treasury, Office of Management of Budget, and the Government Accountability Office.

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 the following activities:

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

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

The Agency is participating in the government's implementation of Public Law 106-107 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;

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

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

Office of Environmental Information (OEI)

EPA is a leader in many areas, such as E-dockets. EPA has a modern well-supported system that can host other Agencies' docket systems, thereby reducing their costs to develop or deploy such a system. EPA will also continue to coordinate with state agencies on IT infrastructure and security issues through state organizations such as the National Association of State Information Resources Executives. In addition, EPA, along with other Federal agencies, is involved in the OMB led e-Gov initiatives. As part of this effort, EPA, OMB, the Department of Transportation, and ten other Federal agencies are examining the expansion of EPA's Regulatory Public Access System, a consolidated on-line rule-making docket system providing a single point of access for all Federal rules. EPA is also coordinating efforts with the National Archives and Records Administration on an e-records initiative. This effort is aimed at establishing uniform procedures, requirements, and standards for electronic record keeping of Federal e-Gov records.

EPA works with its state partners under the State/EPA Information Management Workgroup and the Network Steering Board. This workgroup has created action teams to jointly develop key information projects. Action teams consist of EPA, state, and Tribal members. They are structured to result in consensus solutions to information management issues which affect states,

tribes, and EPA, such as the development and use of environmental data standards, and implementation of new technologies for collecting and reporting information.

EPA also participates in multiple workgroups with other Federal agencies including the United States Geological Survey (USGS), Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC), and CIO Council (http://www.cio.gov/). The Agency is actively involved with several agencies in developing government-wide e-government reforms, and continues to participate with the Office of Homeland Security and national security agencies on homeland security. These multi-agency workgroups are designed to ensure consistent implementation of standards and technologies across Federal agencies in order to support efficient data sharing.

EPA will continue to coordinate with key Federal data sharing partners including the USGS, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Fish and Wildlife Service as well as state and local data sharing partners in public access information initiatives. With respect to community-based environmental programs, EPA coordinates with state, Tribal, and local agencies, and with non-governmental organizations, to design and implement specific projects.

The nature and degree of EPA's interaction with other entities varies widely, depending on the nature of the project and the location(s) in which it is implemented. EPA is working closely with the FGDC and the USGS to develop and implement the infrastructure for national spatial data. EPA is coordinating its program with other state and Federal organizations, including the Council for Environmental Quality and the Environmental Council of States, to insure that the appropriate context is represented for observed environmental and human health conditions.

EPA will continue to coordinate with other Federal agencies on IT infrastructure and security issues by participating on the Federal CIO Council. For example, EPA (along with the Department of Labor) recently co-chaired a Federal government committee on security. EPA will continue to participate on the CIO Council committees on security, capital planning, workforce development, interoperability, and e-Gov, and will engage with other Federal agencies in ensuring the infrastructure for homeland security.

Office of the Inspector General (OIG)

The EPA Inspector General is a member of the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE), an organization comprised of Federal Inspectors General (IG). The PCIE coordinates and improves the way IGs conduct audits and investigations, and completes projects of government-wide interest. The EPA IG chairs the PCIE's Environmental Consortium, GPRA Roundtable, and Human Resources Committee. The Consortium, which seeks effective solutions to cross-cutting environmental issues, currently includes representatives from 19 executive agencies and GAO. The OIG Computer Crimes Unit coordinates activities with other law enforcement organizations that have computer crimes units such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Secret Service, and the Department of Justice. In addition, the OIG participates with various inter-governmental audit forums, professional associations, and other cross-governmental forums to exchange information, share best practices, and direct collaborative efforts.

MAJOR MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

In April 2005, EPA's Office of Inspector General (OIG) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) identified areas they consider to be EPA's most pressing management challenges. While OIG identified the majority of the areas, GAO raised a number of the same concerns, such as human capital and assistance agreements. Notably, neither OIG nor GAO suggested elevating any of the issues to the level of a material weakness—a reportable condition that could adversely impact the integrity of Agency programs and activities. Most of the challenges identified are recurring issues that take time to resolve. EPA has been working to address these long-standing issues and has made great progress.

EPA senior managers are committed to resolving current issues and identifying and addressing emerging issues before they become serious problems. EPA continues to strengthen its management practices by maintaining a system of internal controls that helps identify and resolve potential management vulnerabilities. In FY 2005, for the fourth consecutive year, EPA reported no material weaknesses under the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA). The Agency resolved two of its internal Agency-level weaknesses, which are reportable conditions less severe than material weaknesses, but that merit the attention of the Administrator. Currently, EPA has elevated three management challenges (human capital, assistance agreement, and homeland security) to the level of Agency-level weaknesses under FMFIA. EPA leaders meet periodically to review and discuss the progress the Agency is making to address the issues, and each year the Agency reports on the status of its efforts in its Performance and Accountability Report and Budget Submissions.

OMB continues to recognize EPA's efforts to maintain effective and efficient management controls. Since June 2003, the Agency has maintained its "green" status score for Improved Financial Performance under the President's Management Agenda (PMA). Following are discussions of the Agency's management challenges and the progress made in addressing them.

Challenges in Addressing the Air Toxics Regulatory Program Goals

Scope of Challenge: *While EPA has achieved its Phase I goal of issuing technology-based standards, there are concerns about EPA's efforts to assess and implement Phase 2, residual risk standards, as well as the accuracy of air toxics data used in measuring progress.*

Agency Response: The Air Toxics Program faces significant challenges because much remains to be done to address requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA) Amendments (e.g., issuance of final standards for 70 stationary area source categories). However, the Agency has made great progress in reducing air toxic emissions. In FY 2004, EPA closed Air Toxics Program as an Agency-level weakness because it had developed a strategy for achieving toxic risk reductions. EPA issued 96 MACT standards that apply to 174 industrial categories. These MACT standards have resulted in annual reductions of 1.5 million tons of toxic emissions. By 2007, even greater reductions will be achieved when all major stationary sources come into compliance under the MACT program. To date, EPA has completed 16 area source standards and is working to develop standards for an additional 25 (4 of which are under court-ordered deadlines). Once

completed, standards for the 25 area source categories will address a significant portion of urban hazardous air pollutant (HAP) emissions, as outlined in EPA's FY 1999 Integrated Urban Air Toxics Strategy. EPA also expects to have completed the first eight residual risk standards by the end of 2006.

Implementing the residual risk program, as dictated by the Clean Air Act, remains a significant time and resource challenge. The statute requires a comprehensive quantitative assessment of the exposures and risks associated with air emissions from all of the sources in each category to inform the potential development of a standard for the category which is more stringent than the original standard. It also, therefore, requires knowledge of the methods available to reduce emissions and risks beyond those required in the original standard, as well as the quantitative knowledge of the emission reductions expected from implementation of each of those methods. Each of these assessments is turning out to be quite extensive in terms of the resources and time required to conduct, and the uncertainties associated with the results remain fairly large compared to the desired outcome and the decisions required. For example, we estimate that the development of the average residual risk regulation, from start to finish, requires significant funding and FTE over the course of 4 years. Given the fact that this requirement extends to about 170 source categories over 10 years, it is easy to see that the entire program will entail significant resources to complete, and all of this is occurring in a time of dwindling resources for EPA in general and the air toxics program specifically

In the meantime, we have embarked on developing a voluntary process rule, which may reduce any potential cost burden associated with residual risk rules, and which will allow the residual risk program to focus its resources on addressing the most significant risks associated with major stationary sources of air toxics. This rule, the Total Facility Low Risk Demonstration (TFLRD) rule, will allow individual facilities which are currently subject to technology-based standards to conduct their own risk assessments in order to demonstrate to us and to their local permitting authority that they present negligible health and environmental risks to their surrounding community, and thereby ensure their future compliance with any subsequently developed residual risk rules. This will provide EPA with more accurate site-specific emissions information about low-risk sources and help to focus residual risk requirements on those sources which present significant risks. This should help to reduce the resource burden required to develop residual risk standards in addition to reducing the implementation burden associated with standards which are developed.

Modeling studies, such as the National Air Toxics Assessment (NATA), predict that the air toxic risks to the public occur on two distinct geographic scales. To improve our ability to characterize these risks, EPA along with its state, local government, and tribal partners recently started a national air toxic monitoring network with regional and local components to measure ambient levels of key air toxics pollutants. Several air toxic pollutants have been predicted to contribute to widespread regional and/or national exposures and risks. The regional component of the national air toxic monitoring network, the National Air Toxic Trends Sites (NATTS), comprises 22 sites nationwide designed to capture the impacts of these pollutants. The first year of NATTS monitoring was completed. The local component of the monitoring network comprises unique local scale monitoring projects designed to answer specific questions

pertaining to local air toxic issues. Thirteen local scale projects awarded in 2005 are nearing completion. In early 2006, the Agency will award grants to communities to initiate 19 new local scale monitoring projects.

The NATA provide**s** nationwide census tract resolution of cancer and non-cancer risk estimates from HAPs. The Agency uses NATA information to help set priorities, measure progress against goals, and develop study plans for more detailed local assessments. These detailed local assessments will help identify areas where potentially higher exposures (i.e., hotspots) may exist in urban environments and link these concerns to local risk reductions. The NATA is updated periodically.

The Agency will continue to make Air Toxics Program tracking a high priority and will adjust its strategy as necessary to comport with legal constraints and to maximize air toxic risk reduction.

Highlights of Progress:

- Completed one residual risk standard for coke ovens.
- Proposed 5 additional residual risk rules.
- Continue to work on seven residual risk assessments for the 2-, 4-year source categories with court-ordered dates.
- In addition to EPA's 23 National Air Toxics Trends Sites (NATTS), EPA funded $6.3 million in 19 separate grants to State and local agencies to support additional local-scale monitoring efforts and methods development in FY06.

Plans for Further Improvements:

- Continue to develop tools and databases to more accurately perform and improve the quality and the timeliness of risk characterization.
- Continue to develop a performance measure, toxicity-weight emission, to act as a surrogate for risk reduction progress.
- Exploring pollution prevention approaches for area sources and engaging with five industry groups to explore and pilot these ideas.
- Developing an "Area Source Program White Paper" to provide flexibility in how the states and /or EPA address the area source program.
- Continuing to improve the quality and timeliness of EPA's air toxic emissions inventories.
- Developing an air toxic monitoring network to supplement "toxicity-weighted emissions" as a measure of progress in risk reduction.
- Developing a mobile source air toxics rulemaking to examine the need for and feasibility of additional mobile source controls options for gasoline, motor vehicles, and portable gasoline containers.
- Conducting research on near-roadway exposure to assist federal, state, and local transportation and air quality planners.

Superfund Evaluation and Policy Identification

Scope of Challenge: *OIG believes EPA faces significant challenges in its ability to effectively meet current and future Superfund fiscal and program management challenges and needs to establish a strong working relationship between states and tribes in order to achieve its environmental goals.*

Agency Response: While acknowledging its fiscal and program management challenges, EPA does not believe it has any weaknesses in the area of Superfund evaluation and policy identification. Despite the program's complexity and unique administrative structure, the Agency has made and continues to make significant progress in cleaning up Superfund sites and reducing risk to human health and the environment.

With regard to OIG's concern that EPA has failed to proactively identify or communicate current fiscal and other program management challenges, EPA has taken a number of actions to improve program performance and address management challenges. During FY 2004, EPA completed and published an internal review of its Superfund program, *Superfund: Building on the Past, Looking to the Futur*e. The purpose of this 120-Day Study was to identify opportunities for program efficiencies that would enable the Agency to begin and ultimately complete more long-term cleanups with current resources. An in-house workgroup has been established to review and implement the recommendations and to track progress made in improving the Superfund program. Some of the recommendations that have been or are being addressed include: establishing the Superfund Board of Directors, which issued the "Principles for Superfund Cleanup in the 21st Century" and set a hierarchy of goals for the program; increasing the number of Records of Decisions that will be reviewed by the Remedy Review Board by 5 to 10 percent; and establishing a new enforcement performance measure to implement the "Enforcement First" policy.

The Agency's three major initiatives since 1998 have produced some positive results and lessons that have been incorporated into its current strategy for managing the tribal role. To ensure tribal needs are addressed, EPA established the Superfund tribal forum as a mechanism for sharing information among regions to provide learning or improvement opportunities. The Superfund program will continue to coordinate with tribes and EPA regions in implementing a final Superfund tribal strategy.

Highlights of Progress:

- Published *Superfund: Building on the Past, Looking to the Future*, an internal review of the Superfund program that contains recommendations for program improvements.
- Published the *120-Day Study Action Plan*, which outlines how EPA will carry out the recommendations of the study (February 2005).
- Initiated a formal benchmarking program to identify best practices that can be used throughout the program.

- Benchmarked site-specific payroll charging practices in the regions to identify and transfer best practices to properly account for staff time spent working on site-specific activities for cost recovery and public accountability purposes.
- Improved communication of site cleanup progress in new and innovative ways through the recently released Superfund Site Progress Profiles on the internet.
- Completed the Superfund Tribal Strategy and Implementation Plan (June 2005).

Plans for Further Improvements:

- Continue to develop an Out-year Liability Model to support forecasting costs and accomplishments of the Superfund Program over a 30-year period.
- Analyze all unliquidated obligations balances to determine whether they can be made available through the deobligation process.
- Initiate a workforce analysis on the effects of workload changes on FTE needs for Agency programs.
- Develop a brochure for EPA Superfund staff working with tribes that provides ideas for consultation.

Information System Security

Scope of Challenge: *Due to the dynamic nature of information security, EPA needs to continue its emphasis and vigilance on strong information security.*

Agency Response: EPA acknowledges that as technology evolves, security of all types (personnel, physical and cyber) remains a key concern for both public and private sector organizations. While OIG commends EPA for its efforts to enhance its security program through strengthened management controls, risk assessments, penetration testing, and monitoring of the Agency's firewalls, the dynamics of security require continued emphasis and vigilance. In FY 2004, EPA closed Information Security as an Agency-level weakness because it had addressed OIG's specific management control concerns.

OIG stated that the Agency needs to develop and ensure implementation of a training program for employees with significant security responsibilities. EPA currently has a robust training program that requires all EPA employees with significant security responsibilities to complete at least two role-based security training courses. This requirement is in addition to the annual mandatory Security Awareness Training that EPA employees are required to complete. The status of all employee security training is tracked in a web-based database.

In FY 2005, OMB identified EPA as one of only eight agencies deemed "green" in its color coded scorecard for progress and status under the President's Management Agenda (PMA). The Agency will continue to implement a PMA "green" security program which includes all necessary and many innovative security processes to ensure the collection and analysis of quality data now and in the future.

Highlights of Progress:

- Established a robust training program that requires all EPA employees with significant security responsibilities to complete at least two role-based security training courses.
- Developed a draft EPA Certification & Accreditation (C&A) Guide, a tool designed to help assist EPA staff in conducting C&A for EPA information systems.
- Continued to use the Plan of Action and Milestones process to effectively monitor program offices' mitigation progress for IT security weaknesses identified and reported to the Chief Information Officer.

Plans for Further Improvements:

- Continue to implement a PMA "green" security program which includes innovative security processes to ensure the collection and analysis of quality data now and in the future.

Information Resources Management (IRM) and Data Quality

Scope of Challenge: *EPA faces a number of challenges (e.g., implementing data standards to facilitate data sharing; establishing quality assurance practices to improve the reliability, accuracy, and scientific basis of environmental data) with the data it uses to make decisions and monitor progress against environmental goals.*

Agency Response: EPA has made significant progress in addressing this challenge. In FY 2001, EPA acknowledged both laboratory quality system practices and data management practices as Agency-level weaknesses. In FY 2004, the Agency corrected its laboratory quality system practices as a FMFIA weakness. The Agency's actions to address and validate the effectiveness of corrective actions included providing tools, technical evaluations, and training for environmental laboratories and coordinating discussions with internal and external representatives on how to assure the quality of laboratory data. Additionally, the Science Policy Council's Forum on Environmental Measurement developed an approach to ensure and document the competency of Agency laboratories, which was issued as a policy directive in February 2004. Under this policy, Agency laboratories must demonstrate on-going performance through independent external assessments and participation in inter-laboratory comparison studies.

In FY 2005, the Agency corrected its data management practices as an Agency-level weakness. EPA completed specific corrective actions for this weakness and validated those actions to ensure deficiencies identified were effectively eliminated. Specifically, EPA developed an effective data standards program and promulgated six Reinventing Environmental Information Data Standards for the Agency. Additionally, EPA developed an Agency Data Architecture which serves as a blueprint for the information needed to support cross-organizational activities. Having a well-defined and reliable architecture to guide information management decisions promotes improved data quality and enables multiple and secondary uses of the data. In FY

2005, the Agency developed a process for ensuring data management policies and procedures are planned, maintained, and revised as appropriate. For example, the Agency changed the structure and operating procedures of the Quality and Information Council (QIC) to better fulfill its role as the information-policy-making body.

Data standards are an essential component of EPA's information program. As part of its process for developing data standards, EPA has established a System of Registries that provides a reference point for implementing the standards. However, coordinating data standards in information collections, from initial planning to data analysis, is not yet routine in all programs. EPA requires a process for ensuring that each data standard adopted by the Agency is fully implemented in a cost-effective and timely manner. Therefore, EPA is proposing a new Agency-level weakness, Implementation of Data Standards, to address the issue.

Highlights of Progress:

- Developed an Agency-approved planning process to identify key data gaps by building on data gaps information included in EPA's *Draft Report on the Environment* 2003. [7]
- Proposed a new Agency-level weakness, Implementation of Data Standards, to ensure that new standards adopted by the Agency are fully implemented in a cost effective and timely manner.

Plans for Further Improvements:

- Establish a procedure for reporting on the process of implementation across the Agency to the QIC and the Chief Financial Officer on a regular basis.
- Develop a detailed description of the Agency's strategy to correct the *Implementation of Data Standards* weakness, including major milestones and a validation plan.

Human Capital Strategy Implementation/Employee Competencies

Scope of Challenge: *While EPA has made progress in addressing human capital concerns, OIG believes EPA continues to face challenges in developing and sustaining a highly skilled, diverse, result-oriented workforce with the right mix of technical expertise, experience and leadership capabilities.*

Agency Response: OIG and GAO acknowledge the Agency's progress in addressing human capital concerns, but believe EPA needs to continue monitoring its Agency-wide implementation of human capital activities. In FY 2005, EPA initiated a number of activities that helped the Agency make progress in addressing many of its human capital challenges. Specifically, EPA implemented a human capital accountability system to monitor and report on the Agency's progress in human capital management. This allows EPA to gauge the overall effectiveness of its *Strategy for Human Capital* and to determine whether the Agency is achieving its desired

[7] U.S. EPA, *EPA Draft Report on the Environment 2003* (EPA-260-R-02-006). Available at http://www.epa.gov/indicators/roe/index.htm

results. Additionally, each headquarters program and regional office was required to develop a local-level human capital action plan by adopting the required goals and strategies identified in the Agency's *Strategy for Human Capital* and reporting on its results. To further the Agency's workforce planning efforts in developing an agency-level Strategic Workforce Plan (SWP), each headquarters and regional office submitted workforce (occupation-based) needs using a planning template. This information was used to develop a high-level SWP to identify competency needs and frame the Agency's comprehensive National Recruitment and Outreach Strategy that coordinates outreach activities for a variety of positions and Agency programs, particularly focusing on Hispanics, African Americans, and American Indians/Alaska Natives.

EPA is committed to addressing its human capital challenges. The Agency will continue to implement an aggressive corrective action plan to ensure that deficiencies identified do not impair the Agency's ability to accomplish its mission.

Highlights of Progress:

- Established a Senior Human Capital Official in each program and regional office.
- Completed a review of the Human Capital Strategy conducted by EPA's Human Resources Council resulting in improved outcome-based goals.
- Revised EPA's approach to its Agency-wide strategic workforce planning and began integrating workforce planning into the Agency's planning and budgeting process.
- Developed human capital measures and achievements for inclusion in the FY 2007 Annual Plan.
- Completed advertising for EPA's eighth Intern Program class to facilitate outreach and recruitment efforts.

Plans for Further Improvements:

- Develop a Strategic Workforce Plan for the Agency that will be revised in conjunction with the Agency's *Strategic Plan*.
- Continue to train and develop coaches to increase the Agency's diverse "Coaching Cadre."
- Identify a competency assessment tool and/or survey instrument to capture workforce competencies mission critical occupations (MCO), including leaders (Senior Executive Service and GS-13, 14, and 15 supervisors and managers). Technical competencies will be developed for MCOs throughout FY 2006.
- Work with programs and regions to report on effective strategies and solutions used to close competency gap.

Agency Efforts in Support of Homeland Security (*formerly, Protecting Critical Infrastructure from Non-traditional Attacks***)**

Scope of Challenge: *EPA needs to continue to work with stakeholders to develop performance measures for water security, identify impediments preventing water systems from addressing*

vulnerabilities in computer systems, take steps to ensure it is performing all designated BioWatch responsibilities, and develop a better process for identifying, obtaining, maintaining, and tracking response equipment necessary for Nationally Significant Incidents.

Agency Response: EPA continues to refine its role and strengthen its efforts in Homeland Security. In FY 2005, EPA declared Homeland Security an Agency weakness and is developing a detailed strategy to correct the weakness, including major milestones, a validation plan, and anticipated correction date.

The Agency has done extensive research on various aspects of water security and is making important progress on the WaterSentinel surveillance and monitoring project, including beginning a pilot testing program. EPA continues to work with state and local stakeholders to develop comprehensive and accurate performance measures for water security and to identify impediments preventing water systems from addressing vulnerabilities in computer systems. EPA has taken multiple steps to ensure that all of its BioWatch responsibilities are performed. The Agency has on-going dialogue with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), as well as state and local stakeholders, to ensure strong lines of communication on this critical project. EPA is involved in many aspects of BioWatch: from the technical recommendations that aid in developing the monitors to their installation in the field. Additionally, EPA is directly involved with emergency response activities regarding BioWatch. The Agency is currently developing a better process for identifying, obtaining, maintaining, and tracking response equipment necessary for Nationally Significant Incidents using the lessons learned from the response to Hurricane Katrina. Using real-world examples like these will ensure the accuracy of the process and its applicability to the Agency's actual needs.

Highlights of Progress:

- Updated EPA's Homeland Security Strategic Plan to identify the range of EPA's homeland security activities, taking into consideration the evolving role of the DHS.
- Began the WaterSentinel pilot. This pilot will gather valuable information that will be used to design EPA's most important water monitoring projects.
- Strengthened relationships with the DHS, as well as with state and local stakeholders, relative to BioWatch. Constantly evaluating and revising techniques and standards of operation to ensure maximum efficiency.

Plans for Further Improvements:

- Continue to enhance and improve the WaterSentinel, based on lessons learned from the pilot.
- Finalize a process for identifying, obtaining, maintaining, and tracking response equipment necessary for Nationally Significant Incidents.
- Develop performance measures for EPA's major homeland security projects.

Linking Mission and Management

Scope of Challenge: *OIG believes that while EPA has begun linking costs to goals, it must continue to work with its partners to develop appropriate outcome measures and accounting systems that track environmental and human health results across the Agency's new goal structure. This information must then become an integral part of the Agency's decision-making process.*

Agency Response: EPA has sustained its commitment to improving the way the Agency manages for results and uses cost and performance information in decision making. During FY 2005, the Agency developed and implemented a new performance tracking feature in its Annual Commitment System (ACS). This function supports the entry and tracking of actual performance data against annual regional performance commitments, most of which are directly linked to national performance goals that support the Agency's *Strategic Plan*. The Agency continues to experience a high demand for access to the ACS as more national programs begin to use the system to track regional performance against key program measures. To date, six national program offices and all ten regional offices use the ACS. Also in FY 2005, the Agency redefined its cost accounting unit from Sub-Objective to Program/Project to allow EPA to develop a variety of reports to address financial requirements of Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards No. 4, Managerial Cost Accounting.

OMB continues to recognize EPA for its efforts to improve the way the Agency manages for results and uses cost and performance information in decision making. Since September 2003 (eight consecutive quarters), EPA has maintained a "green" status score for Improved Financial Performance under PMA. EPA has also received a progress score of "green" for Budget and Performance Integration for all but one consecutive quarter since June 2002.

Highlights of Progress:

- Developed and implemented a new performance tracking feature in the Agency's Annual Commitment System that supports the entry and tracking of annual performance data against annual regional performance commitments.
- Improved PART scores. (As of July 2005, 6 of the 32 EPA programs assessed show results not demonstrated.)
- Enhanced the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's Reporting and Business Intelligence Tool (ORBIT) functionality by expanding the programmatic and performance reporting capability and adding additional data sources (Administrative Data Mart).
- Began to develop the Agency's *2006-2011 Strategic Plan*, including outreach to partners and stakeholders and consultation with state and tribal partners.
- Implemented a comprehensive strategy to integrate PART measures and related performance information into EPA's external GPRA documents (i.e., OMB Submission, Annual Plan & Congressional Justification, Performance and Accountability Report).

Plans for Further Improvements:

- Continue to develop the Agency's *2006-20011 Strategic Plan*, including outreach to partners and stakeholders and consultation with state and tribal partners to develop outcome-oriented goals and objectives.
- Continue to improve PART scores by developing efficiency measures for environmental programs.

Grants Management and Use of Assistance Agreements

Scope of Challenge: *EPA needs to improve oversight for awarding and administering assistance agreements to ensure effective and efficient use of resources in attaining environmental goals. Recent OIG and GAO audits continue to identify problems in the use of assistance agreements.*

Agency Response: Assistance agreements are one of EPA's primary mechanisms for carrying out its mission to protect human health and the environment. The Agency awards approximately half of its budget to organizations through assistance agreements. Thus it is imperative that the Agency use good management practices in awarding and overseeing these agreements to ensure they contribute cost effectively to attaining environmental goals.

EPA acknowledges OIG and GAO concerns regarding the management of assistance agreements, and tracks this issue as an Agency weakness in the FMFIA process. The Agency has made significant progress in developing and implementing a comprehensive system of management controls to correct grants management problems. EPA issued its first long-term Grants Management Plan,[8] with associated performance measures, in April 2003. The plan, which GAO recognizes as a comprehensive and coordinated plan for strengthening grants management, outlines an aggressive approach to ensure that the commitments are fully implemented and that employees are held accountable for managing grants effectively. Also, EPA established a Grants Management Council, composed of EPA's Senior Resource Officials, to provide the leadership, coordination, and accountability needed to implement the plan.

Highlights of Progress:

- Issued a long-term Training Plan that outlines the Agency's strategy for ensuring that employees and grant applicants are knowledgeable about their grant management obligations.
- Issued a revised Grants Competition Policy that substantially reduced the competition threshold from $75,000 to $15,000. In FY 2005, EPA competed approximately 87% of new non-profit grants covered by the policy.
- Posted grant opportunities and application packages to www.grants.gov making it easier for potential recipients to obtain information about Federal grants and submit application for those grants.

[8] U.S. EPA, EPA Grants Management Plan. Available at http://www.epa.gov/ogd/EO/finalreport.pdf

- Established a new "Grant Awards Database" to improve the transparency and accessibility of grants data to the public. The database contains a summary of records for all non-construction EPA grants awarded in the last 10 years and can be accessed at http://yosemite.epa.gov/oarm/igms_egf.nsf/HomePage?ReadForm
- Issued a new Environment Results Order designed to ensure that grants are outcome-oriented and linked to EPA strategic goals.
- Issued a new policy on the internal review of discretionary grants. The policy requires Assistant and Regional Administrators to certify that non-competitive discretionary grants and competitive announcements have appropriate environmental outcomes and support program goals.
- Issued a new Order designed to assess, at the pre-award stage, the administrative and programmatic capabilities of non-profit organizations applying for EPA assistance agreements.

Plans for Further Improvements:

- Improve the delivery and availability of training programs by developing on-line training for project officers, grant specialists, managers and supervisors, and grant recipients.
- Strengthen external peer review of competitive grant applications to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used appropriately and promote accountability, transparency and results.
- Improve EPA project officers' efficiency and effectiveness by developing project officer workforce plans. In 2006, each EPA office/region will be required to develop a strategy for managing its workforce to promote more accountable grants management.
- Strengthen Agency processes under the Environmental Results Order for identifying and reporting on significant grant results information (e.g., highlighting results achieved through grants in the FY 2005 *Performance and Accountability Report*).
- Enhance accountability by incorporating grants management responsibilities in the Agency's new Performance Assessment Rating System.
- Begin pilot testing a statistical approach for selecting recipients for post-award monitoring reviews, which should help the Agency obtain more accurate information on trends in grantee compliance.

Inconsistency Among EPA's Regional Offices

Scope of Challenge: *GAO feels that inconsistency in program delivery among EPA's regional offices has often gone beyond the level that should be expected to take into account geographical diversity.*

GAO has reported inconsistent approaches in program delivery among regions, particularly in approving or disapproving proposals by states to change their water quality standards and in enforcement philosophy. GAO feels that while EPA attempts to achieve some level of consistency to ensure that the public is afforded equal protection under environmental laws and that regulated parties, taxpayers, and rate payers are not subjected to widely varying costs of environmental compliance, the extent of variations is well beyond the level that should be expected.

While EPA has mechanisms in place to ensure basic consistency in environmental programs, the Agency expects and encourages some variation in regional-state interaction. States are allowed, by statute, to have variations in their programs, and some states have chosen to put standards in place that are more stringent than federal requirements. States and regions have differing ecological, economic, and other factors that influence which environmental laws and regulations require the most immediate attention, and the manner in which they can be most effectively managed.

EPA has a significant effort underway with the states to better align state, regional, and national planning processes and better define performance expectations. This effort, which began in 2004, provides expanded opportunities for states to participate in all aspects of the EPA planning process—setting mutual goals and priorities and accountability for results. Efforts underway include:

- The EPA Strategic Plan is the overarching framework for all of the planning, budgeting and priority setting systems. The EPA Annual Plan and Budget establishes annual performance targets and funding levels for the fiscal year to support accomplishment of the Strategic Plan. Regional Plans, new in 2005, explain how regional offices will make progress toward the Agency's strategic goals over the next three to five years.
- Workplans for Performance Partnership Agreements and Performance Partnership Grants reflect the results of previous joint planning and priority setting efforts.
- An automated Annual Commitment System through which the regions identify their performance commitments for the upcoming fiscal year. The system allows states and tribes to review and comment on draft commitments, offering an unprecedented level of transparency and collaboration and increasing opportunities to align national, regional, state and tribal priorities.
- Several Strategic Planning Pilots are underway, through a cooperative agreement with the Environmental Council of the States. The pilots help build states' planning capabilities, stimulate state-regional joint planning, improve performance reporting, and support improvements to Performance Partnership Agreements and other state-EPA agreements. For example, Texas focused on improving alignment of EPA and state performance measures. A crosswalk of the measures showed that 43% to 53% of water measures and 55% of air measures were highly related. Region 6 and Texas are now striving to revise or establish complementary measures.

Some additional activities and studies are underway that will also look at the issues of flexibility and consistency in environmental programs. First, the U.S. Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee is initiating a review of oversight of enforcement approaches among EPA regions. EPW staff will visit EPA's regional offices to review enforcement consistency. This is expected to be a major, comprehensive study. Second, GAO is scoping a potential study that will focus on the EPA-state relationship with regard to enforcement: how priorities are established, and how the programs are implemented. Third, EPA expects to receive a report

from the National Academy of Public Administration by the end of 2006 that discusses how environmental services are delivered in the nation.

Highlights of Progress:

- Improved alignment of EPA and state planning and budgeting processes to better define performance expectations (as discussed above).
- Developed the State Enforcement Program Review Framework to achieve greater consistency among state and regional enforcement programs.
- Established various internal and external working groups to improve program consistency, communications and coordination on water quality standards issues across regions and states.

Plans for Further Improvements:

- Continue to convene monthly meetings of the Water Quality Standards (WQS) Managers Association, Regional WQS Coordinators, and Regional Endangered Species Act Coordinators to discuss issues of national significance and ensure an appropriate level of consistency.
- Reflect regional and state priorities in EPA's FY2007 Regional Plans and include a strong measurement component and better link priorities to PART, the EPA Annual Commitment System, and the Agency's budget and accounting system.

EPA USER FEE PROGRAM

In FY 2007, EPA will have several user fee programs in operation. These user fee programs and proposals are as follows:

Current Fees: Pesticides

The FY 2007 President's Budget reflects the continued collection of Maintenance Fees for review of existing pesticide registrations, and Enhanced Registration Service Fees for the accelerated review of new pesticide registration applications.

- **Pesticides Maintenance Fee Extension**

  The Maintenance Fee provides funding for the Reregistration program and a certain percentage supports the processing of applications involving "me-too" or inert ingredients. The Agency is scheduled to complete issuance of Reregistration Eligibility Decisions for the Reregistration program in 2008. In FY 2007, the Agency expects to collect $21,000,000 in Maintenance fees.

- **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 2007, the Agency expects to collect $10,000,000 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 Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances. PMN Fees are authorized by the Toxic Substances Control Act and contain a cap on the amount the Agency may charge for a PMN review. EPA is authorized to collect up to $1,800,000 in PMN Fees in FY 2007 under current law.

- **Lead Accreditation and Certification Fee**

  The Toxic Substances Control Act, Title IV, Section 402(a)(3), mandates the development of a schedule of fees for persons operating lead training programs accredited under the 402/404 rule and for lead-based paint contractors certified under this

rule. The training programs ensure that lead paint abatement is done safely. Fees collected for this activity are deposited in the U.S. Treasury. EPA estimates that less than $500,000 will be deposited in FY 2007.

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

  This fee is authorized by the Clean Air Act of 1990 and is managed by the Office of Air and Radiation. Fee collections began in August 1992. This fee is imposed on manufacturers of light-duty vehicles, light and heavy trucks and motorcycles. 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 engines (chainsaws, weed-whackers, leaf-blowers, lawnmowers, tillers, etc.), marine (boat motors, tugs, watercraft, jet-skis), locomotive, aircraft and recreational vehicles (off-road motorcycles, snowmobiles). In FY 2007, EPA expects to collect $19,000,000 from this fee.

Fee Proposals: Pesticides

- **Registration Review Fees**

  As the Reregistration program approaches completion, the Registration Review program, through periodic 15-year cycle reviews, will be initiated to ensure that registered pesticides in the marketplace continue to be safe for use in accordance with the latest scientific information. In 2007, the President's Budget proposes to collect $22,000,000 through a new Registration Review fee aligned with estimated costs associated with registration review and evaluating potential effects of pesticides on endangered species.

- **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 Congressional action through 2008. Language will be submitted to eliminate the prohibition on collecting pesticide Tolerance fees. In FY 2007, the President's Budget proposes to collect $13,000,000 in Tolerance Fees.

- **Enhanced Registration Services**

  In FY 2007, the President's Budget proposes to publish a new fee schedule and restructuring proposal for registration services to collect an additional $12,000,000.

- **Pesticides Maintenance Fee Extension**

  Under current law, the Agency expects to collect $21,000,000 in Maintenance fees in FY 2007. Language will be submitted to increase the authorized level of collections and restructure the fee in 2007 to collect an additional $9,000,000 in order to align more closely with program costs.

Fee Proposals: Other

- **Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee**

  Under the current fee structure, the Agency would collect $1,800,000 in FY 2007. Language will be submitted to remove the statutory cap in the Toxic Substances Control Act on Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fees. In FY 2007, EPA expects to collect an additional $4,000,000 by removing the statutory cap.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

In FY 2007, the Agency begins its eleventh 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 initiated the WCF in FY 1997 as part of an effort to: (1) be accountable to Agency offices, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congress; (2) increase the efficiency of the administrative services provided to program offices; and (3) increase customer service and responsiveness. The Agency has a WCF Board which provides policy and planning oversight and advises the CFO regarding the WCF financial position. The Board, chaired by the Associate Chief Financial Officer, is composed of eighteen permanent members from the program and regional offices.

Two Agency Activities begun in FY 1997 will continue into FY 2007. These are the Agency's information technology and telecommunications operations, managed by the Office of Environmental Information, and Agency postage costs, managed by the Office of Administration. A third Activity, Financial Management, will be provided pending a successful WCF pilot program in FY 2006. This Activity provides the Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS), which is the core accounting system for the Agency, and it is managed by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

The Agency's FY 2007 budget request includes resources for these three Activities in each National Program Manager's submission, totaling approximately $170.0 million. These estimated resources may be increased to incorporate program office's additional service needs during the operating year. To the extent that these increases are subject to Congressional reprogramming notifications, the Agency will comply with all applicable requirements. In FY 2007, the Agency will continue to market its information technology services to other Federal agencies in an effort to deliver high quality services external to EPA, which will result in lower costs to EPA customers.

ACRONYMS FOR STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

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

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

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

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

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

Environmental Protection Agency
FY 2007 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification

FY 2007 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS

Statutory Authority and Eligible Uses
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	Clean Air Act, §103	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA	S/L monitoring and data collection activities in support of the establishment of a $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring network and associated program costs	$42,500.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	$0.0
State and Local Air Quality Management	Clean Air Act, §103	Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and Tribal representatives and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states)	Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to addressing regional haze	$5,000.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	$2,500.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	Clean Air Act, Sections 103, 105, 106	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA; Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states); Interstate air quality control region designated pursuant to section 107 of the CAA or of implementing section 176A, or section 184 NOTE: only the Ozone Transport Commission is eligible as of 2/1/99	Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program support costs; Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA; Supporting training for CAA section 302(b) air pollution control agency staff; and Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to control interstate air pollution	$172,761.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	$182,679.5

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
Tribal Air Quality Management	Clean Air Act, Sections 103 and 105; Tribal Cooperative Agreements (TCA) in annual Appropriations Acts	Tribes; Intertribal Consortia; State/ Tribal college or university	Conducting air quality assessment activities to determine a Tribe's need to develop a CAA program; Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program costs; Supporting training for CAA for federally recognized Tribes	$10,887.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1	$10,939.5
Radon	Toxic Substances Control Act, Sections 10 and 306; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts	State Agencies, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in the development and implementation of programs for the assessment and mitigation of radon	$7,439.0	Goal 1, Obj. 2	$8,073.5
Water Pollution Control (Section 106)	FWPCA, as amended, §106; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts	States, Tribes and Intertribal Consortia, and Interstate Agencies	Develop and carry out surface and ground water pollution control programs, including NPDES permits, TMDL's, WQ standards, monitoring, and NPS control activities.	$216,172.0	Goal 2, Obj. 2	$221,661.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
Nonpoint Source (NPS – Section 319)	FWPCA, as amended, § 319(h); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement EPA-approved state and tribal nonpoint source management programs and fund priority projects as selected by the State.	$204,278.0	Goal 2, Obj. 2	$194,040.0
Wetlands Program Development	FWPCA, as amended, §104 (b)(3); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Interstate Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, and Non-Profit Organizations	To develop new wetland programs or enhance existing programs for the protection, management and restoration of wetland resources.	$15,765.0	Goal 4, Obj. 3	$16,830.0
Targeted Watershed Grants	Department of Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 2006 Public Law 109-54	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Interstate Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, and Non-Profit Organizations	Assistance for watersheds to expand and improve existing watershed protection efforts.	$16,608.0	Goal 4, Obj. 3	$6,930.0
Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	Safe Drinking Water Act, §1443(a); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, and Intertribal Consortia	Assistance to implement and enforce National Primary Drinking Water Regulations to ensure the safety of the Nation's drinking water resources and to protect public health.	$98,279.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	$99,099.0
Homeland Security Grants	Safe Drinking Water Act, 1442; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, and Intertribal Consortia	To assist States and Tribes in coordinating their water security activities with other homeland security efforts.	$4,926.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	$4,950.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
Underground Injection Control [UIC]	Safe Drinking Water Act, § 1443(b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement and enforce regulations that protect underground sources of drinking water by controlling Class I-V underground injection wells.	$10,838.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	$10,890.0
Beaches Protection	Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Local Governments	Develop and implement programs for monitoring and notification of conditions for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public.	$9,853.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1	$9,900.0
Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	Resource Conservation Recovery Act, § 3011; FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Development & Implementation of Hazardous Waste Programs	$101,944.0	Goal 3, Obj. 1 Obj. 2	$103,345.5

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
Brownfields	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, Section 128	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Build and support Brownfields programs which will assess contaminated properties, oversee private party cleanups, provide cleanup support through low interest loans, and provide certainty for liability related issues.	$49,264.0	Goal 4, Obj. 2	$49,494.9

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
Underground Storage Tanks [UST]	Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1976, Section 2007(f)(2), as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6916(f)(2) and implemented by regulations at 40 CFR 35.330; Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, as amended at 42 U.S.C. 3334; Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act of 1999, Public Law 105-276, (112 Stat. 2461, 2499; 42 U.S.C. 6908a); Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act of 2005; Section 2007 (f)	States, federally-recognized Tribes and Intertribal Consortia	Develop and/or implement state or Indian UST program; provide funding for SEE enrollees to work on the state's underground storage tanks and to support direct UST implementation programs.	$11,774.0	Goal 3 Obj. 1	$37,566.7

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
Pesticides Program Implementation	The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act § 20 & 23; the FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes and Intertribal Consortia	Assist States and Tribes to develop and implement pesticide programs, including programs that protect workers, ground-water, and endangered species from pesticide risks , and other pesticide management programs designated by the Administrator; develop and implement programs for certification and training of pesticide applicators; develop Integrated Pesticides Management (IPM) programs; support pesticides education, outreach, and sampling efforts for Tribes.	$12,907.0	Goal 4, Obj. 1	$12,968.9
Lead	Toxic Substances Control Act, § 404 (g); TSCA 10; FY2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	To support and assist States and Tribes to develop and carry out authorized state lead abatement certification, training and accreditation programs; and to assist tribes in development of lead programs.	$13,499.0	Goal 4, Obj. 1	$13,563.1

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
Toxic Substances Compliance	Toxic Substances Control Act, §28(a) and 404 (g); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in developing and implementing toxic substances enforcement programs for PCBs, asbestos, and lead-based paint	$5,074.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	$5,098.5
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	$18,622.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	$18,711.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN, aka "the Exchange Network")	As appropriate, Clean Air Act, Sec. 103; Clean Water Act, Sec. 104; Solid Waste Disposal Act, Sec. 8001; FIFRA, Sec 20; TSCA, Sec. 10 and 28; Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, Sec. 203; Safe Drinking Water Act, Sec. 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); Pollution Prevention Act, Sec. 6605; FY 2002 Appropriations Act and FY 2003 Appropriations Acts.	States, tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortium, and other agencies with related environmental information activities.	Assists states and others to better integrate environmental information systems, better enable data-sharing across programs, and improve access to information.	$19,706.0	Goal 4 Obj. 2	$14,850.0
Pollution Prevention	Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, §6605; TSCA 10; FY2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	To assist state and tribal programs to promote the use of source reduction techniques by businesses and to promote other Pollution Prevention activities at the state and tribal levels.	$4,926.0	Goal 4, Obj. 1	$5,940.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2006 Enacted Dollars(X1000)	FY 2007 Goal/ Objective	FY 2007 Request Dollars(X1000)
Sector Program (previously Enforcement & Compliance Assurance)	As appropriate, Clean Air Act, Sec. 103; Clean Water Act, Sec. 104; Solid Waste Disposal Act, Sec. 8001; FIFRA, Sec 20; TSCA, Sec. 10 and 28; Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, Sec. 203; Safe Drinking Water Act, Sec. 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	State, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Multi-jurisdictional Organizations	Assist in developing innovative sector-based, multi-media, or single-media approaches to enforcement and compliance assurance	$2,217.0	Goal 5, Obj. 1	$2,227.5
Tribal General Assistance Program	Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribal Governments and Intertribal Consortia	Plan and develop Tribal environmental protection programs.	$56,654.0	Goal 5, Obj. 3	$56,925.0

INFRASTRUCTURE / STAG PROJECT FINANCING

(Dollars in Millions)

	FY 2006 Enacted Budget	FY 2007 President's Budget Request
Infrastructure Financing		
Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF)	$886.8	$687.6
Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF)	$837.5	$841.5
STAG Projects		
Brownfields Environmental Projects	$88.7	$89.1
Clean School Bus Initiative	$6.9	$0.0
Diesel Emissions Reduction Program	$0.0	$49.5
Mexico Border Projects	$49.3	$24.8
Alaska Native Villages	$34.5	$14.9
Targeted Projects - Puerto Rico	$0.0	$1.0
TOTAL	***$1,903.7***	***$1,708.4***

Infrastructure and Special Projects Funds

The President's Budget includes a total of $1,708.4 million in 2007 for EPA's Infrastructure programs and State and Tribal Assistance Grant (STAG) projects. Approximately $1,545 million will support EPA's Goal 2: Clean and Safe Water, $114 million will support EPA's Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems and $50 million will support Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change.

Infrastructure and targeted projects funding under the STAG appropriation provides financial assistance to states, municipalities, interstates, and Tribal governments to fund a variety of drinking water, wastewater, air and Brownfields environmental projects. These funds are essential to fulfill the Federal government's commitment to help our state, Tribal and local partners obtain adequate funding to construct the facilities required to comply with Federal environmental requirements and ensure public health and revitalize contaminated properties.

Providing STAG funds to capitalize State Revolving Fund (SRF) programs, EPA works in partnership with the states to provide low-cost loans to municipalities for infrastructure construction. As set-asides of the SRF programs, grants are available to Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Villages for drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs based on national priority lists. The Brownfields Environmental Program provides states, Tribes, and political subdivisions (including cities, towns, and counties) the necessary tools, information, and strategies for promoting a unified approach to environmental assessment, cleanup, characterization, and redevelopment at sites contaminated with hazardous wastes and petroleum contaminants.

The resources included in this budget will enable the Agency, in conjunction with EPA's state, local, and Tribal partners, to achieve several important goals for 2007. Some of these goals include:

- 94 percent of the population served by community water systems will receive drinking water meeting all health-based standards.

- Award 101 assessment grants under the Brownfields program, bringing the cumulative total grants awarded to 1,081 by the end of FY 2007 paving the way for productive reuse of these properties. This will bring the total number of sites assessed to 9,000 while leveraging a total of $10 billion in cleanup and redevelopment funds since 1995.

Goal 1: Clean Air and Global Climate Change

Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program

In FY 2007, EPA will support the National Clean Diesel program, authorized in Sections 791-797 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This program focuses on reducing particulate matter (PM) by up to 95% from existing diesel engines, including on-highway and nonroad equipment and reducing other, smog-forming emissions such as nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons. Five sectors are targeted for reduction: freight, construction, school buses, agriculture, and ports. Grants will be provided to eligible entities in areas of the country that are not meeting ambient air quality standards. This program will help provide immediate reductions by retrofitting the engines with emission control technologies sooner than would otherwise occur through normal turnover of the fleet because these engines often remain in service for 20 or more years. In 2007, up to 30 percent of the appropriated funds will be used to provide formula grants to states for the purpose of establishing state grant and loan programs. EPA expects to fund at least 200 new grants deploying technology in various sectors using diesel engines. These funds will also support competitive grants for replacing, repowering and retrofitting older school buses with emission control technology, potentially reducing PM emissions by up to 95 percent.

Goal 2: Clean and Safe Water

Capitalizing Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds

The Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund programs demonstrate a true partnership between states, localities and the Federal government. These programs provide Federal financial assistance to states, localities, and Tribal governments to protect the nation's water resources by providing funds for the construction of drinking water and wastewater treatment facilities. The state revolving funds are two important elements of the nation's substantial investment in sewage treatment and drinking water systems, which provides Americans with significant benefits in the form of reduced water pollution and safe drinking water.

EPA will continue to provide financial assistance for wastewater and other water projects through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF). CWSRF projects include nonpoint source, estuary, storm water, and sewer overflow projects. The dramatic progress made in improving the quality of wastewater treatment since the 1970s is a national success. In 1972, only 84 million people were served by secondary or advanced wastewater treatment facilities. Today, 99 percent of community wastewater treatment plants, serving 181 million people, use secondary treatment or better. Water infrastructure projects supported by the program contribute to direct ecosystem improvements by lowering the amount of nutrients and toxic pollutants in all types of surface waters. While great progress has been made, many rivers, lakes and ocean/coastal areas still suffer an enormous influx of pollutants after heavy rains. The contaminants result in beach closures, infect fish and degrade the ability of the watersheds to sustain a healthy ecosystem. Improvements to our cities infrastructure remain a top priority if we are to reclaim our water resources.

The FY 2007 President's Budget Request includes $687.6 million in funding for the CWSRF. More than $23 billion has already been provided to capitalize the CWSRF, well over twice the original Clean Water Act authorized level of $8.4 billion. Total CWSRF funding available for loans since 1987, reflecting loan repayments, state match dollars, and other funding sources, is approximately $55 billion, of which more than $52 billion has been provided to communities as financial assistance.

The dramatic progress made in improving the quality of wastewater treatment since the 1970s is a national success. In 1972, only 84 million people were served by secondary or advanced wastewater treatment facilities. Today, 99 percent of community wastewater treatment plants, serving 181 million people, use secondary treatment or better.

The DWSRF will be self-sustaining in the long run and will help offset the costs of ensuring safe drinking water supplies and assisting small communities in meeting their responsibilities. Since its inception in 1997, the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) program has made available $11.1 billion to finance 4,196 infrastructure improvement projects nationwide, with a return of $1.73 for every $1 of Federal funds invested.

Set-Asides for Tribes: To improve public health and water quality on Tribal lands, the Agency will continue the 1 ½ percent CWSRF set-aside for funding wastewater grants to tribes as provided in the Agency's 2002 appropriation. The 2002 World Summit in Johannesburg adopted the goal of reducing the number of people lacking access to basic sanitation by 50 percent by 2015. Through this program, EPA contributes to this goal which will provide for the development of sanitation facilities for tribes and Alaska Native Villages.

Alaska Native Villages

The President's Budget provides $15 million for Alaska native villages for the construction of wastewater and drinking water facilities to address serious sanitation problems. EPA will continue to work with the Department of Health and Human Services' Indian Health Service, the

State of Alaska, the Alaska Native Tribal Health Council and local communities to provide needed financial and technical assistance.

Puerto Rico

The President's Budget includes $1.0 million for the next design phase of upgrades to Metropolitano's Sergio Cuevas treatment plant in San Juan, Puerto Rico. EPA and Puerto Rico provided $7 million to date ($3.8 and $3.2 million, respectively). When all upgrades are complete, EPA estimates that about 1.4 million people will enjoy safer, cleaner drinking water.

Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems

Brownfields Environmental Projects

The President's Budget includes $89.0 million for Brownfields environmental projects. EPA will award grants for assessment activities, cleanup, and revolving loan funds (RLF). Additionally, this includes cleanup of sites contaminated by petroleum or petroleum products and environmental job training grants. In FY 2007, the funding provided will result in the assessment of 1,000 Brownfields properties. Brownfields grantees will leverage cleanup and redevelopment jobs and $900,000 in cleanup and redevelopment funding.

Mexico Border

The OMB Submission includes a total of $25.0 million for water infrastructure projects along the U.S./Mexico Border. The goal of this program is to reduce environmental and human health risks along the U.S./Mexico Border. EPA's U.S./Mexico Border program provides funds to support the planning, design and construction of high priority water and wastewater treatment projects along the border. The Agency's goal is to provide protection of people in the U.S.-Mexico border area for health risks by increasing the number of homes connected to potable water supply and wastewater collection and treatment systems. The program has sufficient resources to carry out currently approved projects and provides $25 million to address new needs in FY 2007.

PROGRAM PROJECTS BY APPROPRIATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Science & Technology				
Air Toxics and Quality				
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	$8,476.1	$8,527.0	$9,259.4	$732.4
Federal Support for Air Quality Management	$10,747.8	$10,012.0	$10,272.9	$260.9
Federal Support for Air Toxics Program	$3,040.8	$2,225.0	$2,264.7	$39.7
Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification				
Energy Policy Act & Related Authorities Implementation	$0.0	$0.0	$11,400.0	$11,400.0
Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification (other activities)	$60,614.9	$58,613.0	$56,924.5	($1,688.5)
Subtotal, Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification	$60,614.9	$58,613.0	$68,324.5	$9,711.5
Radiation: Protection	$2,552.0	$2,086.0	$2,054.3	($31.7)
Radiation: Response Preparedness	$2,460.0	$3,468.0	$3,585.9	$117.9
Subtotal, Air Toxics and Quality	**$87,891.6**	**$84,931.0**	**$95,761.7**	**$10,830.7**
Climate Protection Program				
Climate Protection Program	$20,448.0	$18,648.0	$12,549.6	($6,098.4)
Enforcement				
Forensics Support	$13,377.9	$13,129.0	$13,185.2	$56.2
Homeland Security				
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection				
Water sentinel and related training	$0.0	$8,131.0	$41,735.2	$33,604.2
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)	$17,952.2	$4,262.0	$3,515.8	($746.2)
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	$17,952.2	$12,393.0	$45,251.0	$32,858.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery				
Decontamination	$0.0	$16,868.0	$24,666.7	$7,798.7
Laboratory Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	$0.0	$591.0	$600.0	$9.0
Safe Building	$0.0	$3,722.0	$4,000.0	$278.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)	$33,417.3	$14,571.0	$15,231.4	$660.4
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	$33,417.3	$35,752.0	$44,498.1	$8,746.1
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	$2,517.6	$2,050.0	$2,079.0	$29.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security	**$53,887.1**	**$50,195.0**	**$91,828.1**	**$41,633.1**

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Indoor Air				
Indoor Air: Radon Program	$696.7	$429.0	$442.2	$13.2
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	$909.5	$810.0	$828.7	$18.7
Subtotal, Indoor Air	**$1,606.2**	**$1,239.0**	**$1,270.9**	**$31.9**
IT / Data Management / Security				
IT / Data Management	$4,141.3	$4,173.0	$4,268.0	$95.0
Operations and Administration				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$8,892.1	$8,511.0	$70,239.5	$61,728.5
Pesticides Licensing				
Pesticides: Registration of New Pesticides	$2,473.1	$2,463.0	$2,766.1	$303.1
Pesticides: Review / Reregistration of Existing Pesticides	$2,471.1	$2,480.0	$2,820.4	$340.4
Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing	**$4,944.2**	**$4,943.0**	**$5,586.5**	**$643.5**
Research / Congressional Priorities	$74,485.5	$32,919.0	$0.0	($32,919.0)
Research: Clean Air				
Research: Air Toxics	$14,472.5	$16,226.0	$12,274.2	($3,951.8)
Research: Global Change	$19,395.9	$18,619.0	$17,456.4	($1,162.6)
Research: NAAQS	$63,156.4	$66,777.0	$65,455.6	($1,321.4)
Subtotal, Research: Clean Air	**$97,024.8**	**$101,622.0**	**$95,186.2**	**($6,435.8)**
Research: Clean Water				
Research: Drinking Water	$46,824.0	$45,170.0	$49,242.5	$4,072.5
Research: Water Quality	$46,243.2	$51,269.0	$56,988.2	$5,719.2
Subtotal, Research: Clean Water	**$93,067.2**	**$96,439.0**	**$106,230.7**	**$9,791.7**
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems				
Human Health Risk Assessment	$33,247.5	$35,637.0	$34,488.5	($1,148.5)
Research: Computational Toxicology	$12,002.9	$12,327.0	$14,983.1	$2,656.1
Research: Endocrine Disruptor	$12,559.5	$10,494.0	$9,081.2	($1,412.8)
Research: Fellowships	$14,476.8	$11,691.0	$8,383.0	($3,308.0)
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems	$169,805.8	$167,703.0	$161,312.7	($6,390.3)
Subtotal, Research: Human Health and Ecosystems	**$242,092.5**	**$237,852.0**	**$228,248.5**	**($9,603.5)**
Research: Land Protection				
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	$10,257.6	$11,606.0	$10,552.8	($1,053.2)

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Research: Sustainability				
Research: Economics and Decision Science(EDS)	$2,465.6	$2,361.0	$2,494.6	$133.6
Research: Environmental Technology Verification (ETV)	$3,364.9	$2,990.0	$0.0	($2,990.0)
Research: Sustainability	$36,354.6	$25,803.0	$21,404.9	($4,398.1)
Subtotal, Research: Sustainability	**$42,185.1**	**$31,154.0**	**$23,899.5**	**($7,254.5)**
Toxic Research and Prevention				
Research: Pesticides and Toxics	$28,276.0	$30,357.0	$26,223.7	($4,133.3)
Water: Human Health Protection				
Drinking Water Programs	$3,326.0	$3,092.0	$3,243.1	$151.1
Rescission of Prior Year Expired Contracts, Grants, and Interagency Agreements	$0.0	($1,000.0)	$0.0	$1,000.0
Total, Science & Technology	**$785,903.1**	**$729,810.0**	**$788,274.0**	**$58,464.0**
Environmental Program & Management				
Air Toxics and Quality				
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	$17,513.5	$17,708.0	$19,126.4	$1,418.4
Federal Stationary Source Regulations	$20,555.3	$23,215.0	$25,678.3	$2,463.3
Federal Support for Air Quality Management				
Energy Policy Act Implementation	$0.0	$0.0	$2,800.0	$2,800.0
Clean Diesel Initiative	$0.0	$5,867.0	$0.0	($5,867.0)
Federal Support for Air Quality Management (other activities)	$89,350.1	$90,082.0	$85,265.6	($4,816.4)
Subtotal, Federal Support for Air Quality Management	$89,350.1	$95,949.0	$88,065.6	($7,883.4)
Federal Support for Air Toxics Program	$23,518.7	$25,405.0	$25,513.7	$108.7
Radiation: Protection	$11,694.4	$11,178.0	$10,648.6	($529.4)
Radiation: Response Preparedness	$2,284.4	$2,632.0	$2,688.7	$56.7
Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic Programs	$4,478.1	$4,938.0	$5,221.4	$283.4
Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund	$9,920.0	$8,600.0	$13,365.0	$4,765.0
Subtotal, Air Toxics and Quality	**$179,314.5**	**$189,625.0**	**$190,307.7**	**$682.7**
Brownfields				
Brownfields	$27,248.4	$24,534.0	$24,637.3	$103.3
Climate Protection Program				
Climate Protection Program				
Energy Star	$0.0	$49,536.0	$45,722.8	($3,813.2)
Methane to Markets	$0.0	$1,971.0	$4,420.5	$2,449.5

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Climate Protection Program (other activities)	$92,457.2	$39,327.0	$41,700.0	$2,373.0
Subtotal, Climate Protection Program	$92,457.2	$90,834.0	$91,843.3	$1,009.3
Subtotal, Climate Protection Program	**$92,457.2**	**$90,834.0**	**$91,843.3**	**$1,009.3**
Compliance				
Compliance Assistance and Centers				
Energy Policy Act Implementation	$0.0	$0.0	$111.2	$111.2
Compliance Assistance and Centers (other activities)	$27,207.0	$27,935.0	$28,779.5	$844.5
Subtotal, Compliance Assistance and Centers	$27,207.0	$27,935.0	$28,890.7	$955.7
Compliance Incentives	$10,135.7	$9,412.0	$9,702.2	$290.2
Compliance Monitoring				
Energy Policy Act Implementation	$0.0	$0.0	$986.9	$986.9
Compliance Monitoring (other activities)	$85,297.9	$85,463.0	$92,031.9	$6,568.9
Subtotal, Compliance Monitoring	$85,297.9	$85,463.0	$93,018.8	$7,555.8
Subtotal, Compliance	**$122,640.6**	**$122,810.0**	**$131,611.7**	**$8,801.7**
Enforcement				
Civil Enforcement				
Energy Policy Act Implementation	$0.0	$0.0	$753.2	$753.2
Civil Enforcement (other activities)	$113,719.7	$117,807.0	$120,024.5	$2,217.5
Subtotal, Civil Enforcement	$113,719.7	$117,807.0	$120,777.7	$2,970.7
Criminal Enforcement	$35,109.3	$37,565.0	$37,793.5	$228.5
Enforcement Training	$3,766.2	$2,945.0	$2,503.7	($441.3)
Environmental Justice	$4,853.2	$5,569.0	$3,859.0	($1,710.0)
NEPA Implementation	$13,016.8	$12,640.0	$13,787.5	$1,147.5
Subtotal, Enforcement	**$170,465.2**	**$176,526.0**	**$178,721.4**	**$2,195.4**
Environmental Protection / Congressional Priorities	$89,868.8	$49,799.0	$0.0	($49,799.0)
Geographic Programs				
Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay	$22,886.6	$22,118.0	$26,397.7	$4,279.7
Geographic Program: Great Lakes	$21,098.8	$21,164.0	$20,577.1	($586.9)
Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico	$3,739.8	$4,809.0	$4,310.7	($498.3)
Geographic Program: Lake Champlain	$686.3	$1,926.0	$933.8	($992.2)
Geographic Program: Long Island Sound	$2,132.7	$470.0	$466.9	($3.1)
Geographic Program: Other				
Geographic Program: Puget Sound	$0.0	$1,971.0	$0.0	($1,971.0)

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE)	$0.0	$2,862.0	$4,448.4	$1,586.4
Geographic Program: Other (other activities)	$6,786.1	$5,124.0	$4,601.6	($522.4)
Subtotal, Geographic Program: Other	$6,786.1	$9,957.0	$9,050.0	($907.0)
Regional Geographic Initiatives	$8,057.0	$8,060.0	$9,137.3	$1,077.3
Subtotal, Geographic Programs	**$65,387.3**	**$68,504.0**	**$70,873.5**	**$2,369.5**
Homeland Security				
Homeland Security: Communication and Information				
Laboratory Preparedness and Response	$0.0	$1,212.0	$1,200.0	($12.0)
Homeland Security: Communication and Information (other activities)	$5,432.4	$5,263.0	$5,599.7	$336.7
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Communication and Information	$5,432.4	$6,475.0	$6,799.7	$324.7
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection				
Decontamination	$0.0	$98.0	$99.0	$1.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)	$6,700.6	$6,689.0	$7,143.7	$454.7
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	$6,700.6	$6,787.0	$7,242.7	$455.7
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery				
Decontamination	$2,620.2	$3,252.0	$3,328.7	$76.7
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	$2,620.2	$3,252.0	$3,328.7	$76.7
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	$9,102.2	$6,199.0	$6,268.9	$69.9
Subtotal, Homeland Security	**$23,855.4**	**$22,713.0**	**$23,640.0**	**$927.0**
Indoor Air				
Indoor Air: Radon Program	$5,986.6	$5,159.0	$5,519.2	$360.2
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	$21,464.4	$23,137.0	$23,464.3	$327.3
Subtotal, Indoor Air	**$27,451.0**	**$28,296.0**	**$28,983.5**	**$687.5**
Information Exchange / Outreach				
Children and Other Sensitive Populations: Agency Coordination	$7,135.8	$5,633.0	$6,063.8	$430.8
Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations	$48,407.3	$50,291.0	$52,142.7	$1,851.7
Environmental Education	$8,648.1	$8,889.0	$0.0	($8,889.0)
Exchange Network	$16,723.0	$17,700.0	$16,048.5	($1,651.5)
Small Business Ombudsman	$3,691.3	$3,343.0	$3,501.7	$158.7
Small Minority Business Assistance	$2,245.7	$2,503.0	$2,646.6	$143.6

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
State and Local Prevention and Preparedness	$11,327.5	$11,377.0	$12,508.4	$1,131.4
TRI / Right to Know	$15,380.7	$14,289.0	$15,243.4	$954.4
Tribal - Capacity Building	$10,937.7	$11,049.0	$11,435.7	$386.7
Subtotal, Information Exchange / Outreach	**$124,497.1**	**$125,074.0**	**$119,590.8**	**($5,483.2)**
International Programs				
Commission for Environmental Cooperation	$3,370.5	$4,116.0	$4,137.0	$21.0
Environment and Trade	$2,211.7	$1,766.0	$1,861.2	$95.2
International Capacity Building	$10,548.5	$6,138.0	$6,390.3	$252.3
POPs Implementation	$3,196.5	$1,697.0	$1,808.7	$111.7
US Mexico Border	$5,951.5	$5,749.0	$6,061.0	$312.0
Subtotal, International Programs	**$25,278.7**	**$19,466.0**	**$20,258.2**	**$792.2**
IT / Data Management / Security				
Information Security	$4,745.6	$3,751.0	$5,562.1	$1,811.1
IT / Data Management	$84,371.1	$94,567.0	$96,807.2	$2,240.2
Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security	**$89,116.7**	**$98,318.0**	**$102,369.3**	**$4,051.3**
Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review				
Administrative Law	$4,784.2	$4,607.0	$4,860.9	$253.9
Alternative Dispute Resolution	$1,531.0	$1,048.0	$1,229.8	$181.8
Civil Rights / Title VI Compliance	$10,905.7	$10,575.0	$11,053.7	$478.7
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	$32,764.8	$35,931.0	$37,525.5	$1,594.5
Legal Advice: Support Program	$13,864.0	$13,206.0	$13,465.9	$259.9
Regional Science and Technology	$3,424.8	$3,522.0	$3,520.7	($1.3)
Regulatory Innovation	$21,215.1	$21,511.0	$25,853.6	$4,342.6
Regulatory/Economic-Management and Analysis	$13,875.1	$16,551.0	$17,554.8	$1,003.8
Science Advisory Board	$4,660.8	$4,402.0	$4,615.7	$213.7
Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review	**$107,025.5**	**$111,353.0**	**$119,680.6**	**$8,327.6**
Operations and Administration				
Acquisition Management	$21,830.4	$23,265.0	$25,418.3	$2,153.3
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	$68,045.9	$73,680.0	$83,548.1	$9,868.1
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$317,744.7	$343,908.0	$294,760.1	($49,147.9)
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	$22,223.9	$23,168.0	$21,847.0	($1,321.0)
Human Resources Management	$46,795.7	$41,275.0	$40,202.5	($1,072.5)
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	**$476,640.6**	**$505,296.0**	**$465,776.0**	**($39,520.0)**

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Pesticides Licensing				
Pesticides: Field Programs	$25,649.5	$24,516.0	$24,926.3	$410.3
Pesticides: Registration of New Pesticides	$39,321.6	$41,604.0	$39,767.6	($1,836.4)
Pesticides: Review / Reregistration of Existing Pesticides	$49,074.7	$57,458.0	$51,814.6	($5,643.4)
Science Policy and Biotechnology	$1,961.5	$1,694.0	$1,754.0	$60.0
Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing	**$116,007.3**	**$125,272.0**	**$118,262.5**	**($7,009.5)**
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)				
RCRA: Corrective Action	$36,575.0	$39,396.0	$40,372.3	$976.3
RCRA: Waste Management	$67,842.9	$65,793.0	$67,887.3	$2,094.3
RCRA: Waste Minimization & Recycling	$10,878.7	$11,825.0	$12,235.1	$410.1
Subtotal, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)	**$115,296.6**	**$117,014.0**	**$120,494.7**	**$3,480.7**
Toxics Risk Review and Prevention				
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Management	$8,462.3	$9,008.0	$7,736.5	($1,271.5)
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction	$45,781.1	$46,542.0	$44,637.0	($1,905.0)
Endocrine Disruptors	$8,696.4	$8,767.0	$7,985.4	($781.6)
Toxic Substances: Lead Risk Reduction Program	$13,280.9	$10,162.0	$11,367.6	$1,205.6
Pollution Prevention Program	$15,889.3	$16,621.0	$21,292.4	$4,671.4
Subtotal, Toxics Risk Review and Prevention	**$92,110.0**	**$91,100.0**	**$93,018.9**	**$1,918.9**
Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)				
LUST / UST	$6,459.2	$7,763.0	$11,713.7	$3,950.7
Water: Ecosystems				
Great Lakes Legacy Act	$13,946.6	$28,989.0	$49,600.0	$20,611.0
National Estuary Program / Coastal Waterways	$25,902.3	$23,773.0	$18,417.2	($5,355.8)
Wetlands	$20,126.7	$19,416.0	$20,992.2	$1,576.2
Subtotal, Water: Ecosystems	**$59,975.6**	**$72,178.0**	**$89,009.4**	**$16,831.4**
Water: Human Health Protection				
Beach / Fish Programs	$3,723.7	$3,156.0	$2,653.9	($502.1)
Drinking Water Programs	$94,559.1	$95,656.0	$99,121.0	$3,465.0
Subtotal, Water: Human Health Protection	**$98,282.8**	**$98,812.0**	**$101,774.9**	**$2,962.9**
Water Quality Protection				
Marine Pollution	$13,114.0	$12,212.0	$12,462.4	$250.4
Surface Water Protection				

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Water Quality Monitoring	$0.0	$7,193.0	$7,120.7	($72.3)
Surface Water Protection (other activities)	$186,745.5	$182,019.0	$184,466.5	$2,447.5
Subtotal, Surface Water Protection	$186,745.5	$189,212.0	$191,587.2	$2,375.2
Subtotal, Water Quality Protection	**$199,859.5**	**$201,424.0**	**$204,049.6**	**$2,625.6**
Rescission of Prior Year Expired Contracts, Grants, and Interagency Agreements	$0.0	($2,000.0)	$0.0	$2,000.0
Total, Environmental Program & Management	**$2,309,238.0**	**$2,344,711.0**	**$2,306,617.0**	**($38,094.0)**
Inspector General				
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations				
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	$44,580.7	$36,904.0	$35,100.0	($1,804.0)
Inspector General Congressionally Mandated Projects	$426.4	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Total, Inspector General	**$45,007.1**	**$36,904.0**	**$35,100.0**	**($1,804.0)**
Building and Facilities				
Homeland Security				
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	$12,936.5	$11,331.0	$11,385.1	$54.1
Operations and Administration				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$32,244.5	$28,295.0	$28,430.9	$135.9
Total, Building and Facilities	**$45,181.0**	**$39,626.0**	**$39,816.0**	**$190.0**
Hazardous Substance Superfund				
Air Toxics and Quality				
Radiation: Protection	$1,969.4	$2,120.0	$2,323.3	$203.3
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations				
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	$15,182.0	$13,337.0	$13,316.0	($21.0)
Compliance				
Compliance Assistance and Centers	$0.0	$11.0	$22.2	$11.2
Compliance Incentives	$148.9	$186.0	$142.7	($43.3)
Compliance Monitoring	$1,452.4	$955.0	$1,144.1	$189.1
Subtotal, Compliance	**$1,601.3**	**$1,152.0**	**$1,309.0**	**$157.0**
Enforcement				

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Civil Enforcement	$625.2	$796.0	$883.0	$87.0
Criminal Enforcement	$8,070.1	$8,275.0	$8,502.2	$227.2
Enforcement Training	$897.8	$581.0	$621.9	$40.9
Environmental Justice	$921.5	$827.0	$756.7	($70.3)
Forensics Support	$3,599.5	$3,643.0	$4,184.2	$541.2
Superfund: Enforcement	$165,634.0	$156,653.0	$163,650.5	$6,997.5
Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement	$8,900.3	$9,410.0	$10,196.9	$786.9
Subtotal, Enforcement	**$188,648.4**	**$180,185.0**	**$188,795.4**	**$8,610.4**
Homeland Security				
Homeland Security: Communication and Information				
Laboratory Preparedness and Response	$0.0	$296.0	$300.0	$4.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Communication and Information	$0.0	$296.0	$300.0	$4.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection				
Decontamination	$0.0	$197.0	$198.0	$1.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection (other activities)	$1,348.2	$1,245.0	$1,373.6	$128.6
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	$1,348.2	$1,442.0	$1,571.6	$129.6
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery				
Decontamination	$0.0	$10,395.0	$12,271.3	$1,876.3
Laboratory Preparedness and Response	$0.0	$0.0	$9,500.0	$9,500.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery (other activities)	$38,131.8	$27,184.0	$28,003.6	$819.6
Subtotal, Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	$38,131.8	$37,579.0	$49,774.9	$12,195.9
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	$694.2	$588.0	$594.2	$6.2
Subtotal, Homeland Security	**$40,174.2**	**$39,905.0**	**$52,240.7**	**$12,335.7**
Information Exchange / Outreach				
Congressional, Intergovernmental, External Relations	$111.7	$48.0	$130.4	$82.4
Exchange Network	$2,330.3	$1,650.0	$1,432.4	($217.6)
Subtotal, Information Exchange / Outreach	**$2,442.0**	**$1,698.0**	**$1,562.8**	**($135.2)**
IT / Data Management / Security				
Information Security	$234.6	$341.0	$788.6	$447.6
IT / Data Management	$17,734.0	$17,053.0	$17,120.4	$67.4
Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security	**$17,968.6**	**$17,394.0**	**$17,909.0**	**$515.0**

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review				
Alternative Dispute Resolution	$980.4	$975.0	$887.2	($87.8)
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	$722.8	$755.0	$690.8	($64.2)
Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review	**$1,703.2**	**$1,730.0**	**$1,578.0**	**($152.0)**
Operations and Administration				
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	$3,109.3	$3,060.0	$2,920.8	($139.2)
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$65,156.8	$69,667.0	$73,944.7	$4,277.7
Acquisition Management	$17,464.2	$19,727.0	$23,514.3	$3,787.3
Human Resources Management	$5,250.8	$5,665.0	$5,270.2	($394.8)
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	$20,620.3	$24,349.0	$25,540.8	$1,191.8
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	**$111,601.4**	**$122,468.0**	**$131,190.8**	**$8,722.8**
Research: Human Health and Ecosystems				
Human Health Risk Assessment	$3,848.8	$3,755.0	$3,847.2	$92.2
Research: Land Protection				
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	$23,322.6	$22,927.0	$21,963.9	($963.1)
Research: SITE Program	$6,730.9	$1,206.0	$0.0	($1,206.0)
Subtotal, Research: Land Protection	**$30,053.5**	**$24,133.0**	**$21,963.9**	**($2,169.1)**
Research: Sustainability				
Research: Sustainability	$501.0	$292.0	$0.0	($292.0)
Superfund Cleanup				
Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal	$197,032.3	$193,584.0	$192,398.9	($1,185.1)
Superfund: EPA Emergency Preparedness	$11,387.4	$10,540.0	$8,863.1	($1,676.9)
Superfund: Federal Facilities	$31,063.4	$31,336.0	$31,486.6	$150.6
Superfund: Remedial	$711,969.6	$588,905.0	$581,594.9	($7,310.1)
Superfund: Support to Other Federal Agencies	$5,444.0	$9,540.0	$8,575.4	($964.6)
Brownfields Projects	$2,299.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Subtotal, Superfund Cleanup	**$959,195.7**	**$833,905.0**	**$822,918.9**	**($10,986.1)**
Rescission of Prior Year Expired Contracts, Grants, and Interagency Agreements	$0.0	($11,000.0)	$0.0	$11,000.0
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund	**$1,374,889.5**	**$1,231,074.0**	**$1,258,955.0**	**$27,881.0**
(Transfer to Office of Inspector General)	**($15,182.0)**	**($13,337.0)**	**($13,316.0)**	**$21.0**

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
(Transfer to Science and Technology)	**($38,821.1)**	**($30,156.0)**	**($27,811.1)**	**$2,344.9**
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks				
Compliance				
Compliance Assistance and Centers	$531.6	$711.0	$839.1	$128.1
IT / Data Management / Security				
IT / Data Management	$108.0	$182.0	$175.9	($6.1)
Operations and Administration				
Acquisition Management	$337.0	$358.0	$360.8	$2.8
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	$730.4	$1,010.0	$1,014.8	$4.8
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$982.9	$894.0	$916.8	$22.8
Human Resources Management	$5.0	$3.0	$3.0	$0.0
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	**$2,055.3**	**$2,265.0**	**$2,295.4**	**$30.4**
Research: Land Protection				
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	$699.3	$634.0	$651.3	$17.3
Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)				
LUST / UST	$10,146.4	$10,514.0	$10,590.1	$76.1
LUST Cooperative Agreements	$57,048.9	$65,647.0	$58,207.2	($7,439.8)
Subtotal, Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)	**$67,195.3**	**$76,161.0**	**$68,797.3**	**($7,363.7)**
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	**$70,589.5**	**$79,953.0**	**$72,759.0**	**($7,194.0)**
Oil Spill Response				
Compliance				
Compliance Assistance and Centers	$270.1	$284.0	$280.2	($3.8)
Enforcement				
Civil Enforcement	$1,900.7	$1,910.0	$1,826.3	($83.7)
IT / Data Management / Security				
IT / Data Management	$39.5	$31.0	$32.5	$1.5
Oil				
Oil Spill: Prevention, Preparedness and Response	$13,991.5	$12,066.0	$12,964.6	$898.6
Operations and Administration				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	$552.1	$500.0	$499.3	($0.7)

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Research: Land Protection				
Research: Land Protection and Restoration	$841.0	$838.0	$903.1	$65.1
Total, Oil Spill Response	**$17,594.9**	**$15,629.0**	**$16,506.0**	**$877.0**
State and Tribal Assistance Grants				
Air Toxics and Quality				
Clean School Bus Initiative	$0.0	$6,897.0	$0.0	($6,897.0)
Brownfields				
Brownfields Projects	$88,065.1	$88,676.0	$89,119.4	$443.4
Infrastructure Assistance				
Infrastructure Assistance: Alaska Native Villages	$50,866.5	$34,485.0	$14,850.0	($19,635.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water SRF	$1,110,473.7	$886,759.0	$687,555.0	($199,204.0)
Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program	$0.0	$0.0	$49,500.0	$49,500.0
Infrastructure Assistance: Drinking Water SRF	$847,519.2	$837,495.0	$841,500.0	$4,005.0
Infrastructure Assistance: Mexico Border	$66,176.9	$49,264.0	$24,750.0	($24,514.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Puerto Rico	$0.0	$0.0	$990.0	$990.0
Subtotal, Infrastructure Assistance	**$2,075,036.3**	**$1,808,003.0**	**$1,619,145.0**	**($188,858.0)**
STAG Infrastructure Grants / Congressional Priorities	$255,255.6	$197,058.0	$0.0	($197,058.0)
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants (excluding categorical grants)	**$2,418,357.0**	**$2,100,634.0**	**$1,708,264.4**	**($392,369.6)**
Categorical Grants				
Categorical Grant: Beaches Protection	$13,262.7	$9,853.0	$9,900.0	$47.0
Categorical Grant: Brownfields	$47,411.0	$49,264.0	$49,494.9	$230.9
Categorical Grant: Environmental Information	$19,837.0	$19,706.0	$14,850.0	($4,856.0)
Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	$105,786.4	$101,944.0	$103,345.5	$1,401.5
Categorical Grant: Homeland Security	$4,988.8	$4,926.0	$4,950.0	$24.0
Categorical Grant: Lead	$14,169.0	$13,499.0	$13,563.1	$64.1
Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)	$225,194.2	$204,278.0	$194,040.0	($10,238.0)
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Enforcement	$20,468.4	$18,622.0	$18,711.0	$89.0
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Program Implementation	$13,347.2	$12,907.0	$12,968.9	$61.9
Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)				
Water Quality Monitoring Grants	$0.0	$18,228.0	$18,500.0	$272.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106) (other activities)	$211,124.6	$197,944.0	$203,161.0	$5,217.0
Subtotal, Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)	$211,124.6	$216,172.0	$221,661.0	$5,489.0

	FY 2005 Obligations	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Pres Bud	Pres Bud vs. Enacted
Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention	$5,161.7	$4,926.0	$5,940.0	$1,014.0
Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	$104,043.6	$98,279.0	$99,099.0	$820.0
Categorical Grant: Radon	$8,739.4	$7,439.0	$8,073.5	$634.5
Categorical Grant: Sector Program	$2,464.3	$2,217.0	$2,227.5	$10.5
Categorical Grant: State and Local Air Quality Management	$233,758.6	$220,261.0	$185,179.5	($35,081.5)
Categorical Grant: Targeted Watersheds	$17,706.0	$16,608.0	$6,930.0	($9,678.0)
Categorical Grant: Toxics Substances Compliance	$5,516.4	$5,074.0	$5,098.5	$24.5
Categorical Grant: Tribal Air Quality Management	$12,977.1	$10,887.0	$10,939.5	$52.5
Categorical Grant: Tribal General Assistance Program	$72,212.5	$56,654.0	$56,925.0	$271.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Injection Control (UIC)	$11,537.5	$10,838.0	$10,890.0	$52.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks	$12,073.1	$11,774.0	$37,566.7	$25,792.7
Categorical Grant: Wastewater Operator Training	$943.0	$1,182.0	$0.0	($1,182.0)
Categorical Grant: Water Quality Cooperative Agreements	$12,372.9	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0
Categorical Grant: Wetlands Program Development	$15,027.2	$15,765.0	$16,830.0	$1,065.0
Subtotal, Categorical Grants	**$1,190,122.6**	**$1,113,075.0**	**$1,089,183.6**	**($23,891.4)**
Rescission of Prior Year Expired Contracts, Grants, and Interagency Agreements	$0.0	($66,000.0)	$0.0	$66,000.0
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants	**$3,608,479.6**	**$3,147,709.0**	**$2,797,448.0**	**($350,261.0)**

Appendix