

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN COMPONENTS

Introduction

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

Annual Plan Organization

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

I. Goals

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

II. Objectives

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

III. Appendix

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

Relationship Between the Annual Plan and the Strategic Plan

MAJOR MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

Introduction

One of the most critical challenges facing federal managers today is preserving the public's trust in the integrity of government programs. EPA is strongly committed to achieving its goals and objectives in a manner that maintains this integrity. Over the past several years EPA senior managers have placed a high priority on strengthening results-based management and overall accountability and on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of environmental programs.

EPA made substantial progress in the last decade toward resolving programmatic and administrative issues that had the potential to impact the Agency's ability to achieve its mission. Since 1990 EPA has corrected 27 integrity weaknesses and numerous management challenges. One of the most significant accomplishments is the progress the Agency has made in addressing General Accounting Office (GAO) concerns regarding the Superfund program. In FY 1990 GAO designated Superfund as a high-risk area, citing recurring management problems that heightened the risk of fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. After ten years, in its January 2001 report, *High-Risk Series: An Update*, GAO removed the Superfund program from the high-risk list, indicating that EPA had made significant progress in addressing this long-standing management challenge and has demonstrated a continuing commitment to these efforts.

In its November 30, 2000 letter to Congressman Dick Armey, EPA's Office of Inspector General (OIG) reported that the Agency had made significant progress in two areas previously identified as major management challenges. First, EPA is progressing faster than expected in eliminating the backlog of Superfund five-year reviews. Completion of the remaining corrective actions is expected by the end of FY 2002. Second, the majority of the OIG recommendations regarding the Great Lakes Program have been resolved and EPA is committed to completing the Great Lakes Strategy.

Over the next several years EPA faces a number of management challenges, including two that the GAO January 2001 high-risk update identified as government-wide high-risk areas: (1) human capital management, and (2) information security. Information is provided below on efforts underway to address these issues and other critical management challenges facing the Agency.

Human Capital Strategy Implementation

EPA faces significant challenges in maintaining a workforce with the highly specialized skills and knowledge required to accomplish the Agency's work. The challenges EPA faces are faced by many organizations where the core work must be performed by scarce, highly sought-after scientific and technical experts. The expected retirement of a large number of senior employees over the next several years threatens to deplete EPA's pool of critical skills. The Agency must devote considerable attention to building a workforce with the highly specialized skills and knowledge required or risk seriously weakening

its ability to fulfill its legal, regulatory, and fiduciary responsibilities. OIG identified EPA's employee competencies as a major management challenge in FY 1998-2000. GAO identified human capital as a management challenge for EPA in FY 2000 and as a government-wide high-risk area in FY 2001. The Agency declared human capital strategy implementation as an internal Agency weakness in its FY 2000 Integrity Act Report and laid out a comprehensive corrective action plan.

The corrective action strategy is based on the Agency's Human Capital Strategic Plan, which provides a blueprint for the initial and longer-term steps. The Strategy represents the first time the Agency has developed a strategic direction for investing in and managing the Agency's human resources. Under the umbrella of the Human Capital Strategy, the workforce assessment program calls for identifying the skills needed in every program unit based on an assessment of future program needs, determining the gap between those needs and the current state, and tying those needs to future budget development. Developmental programs aimed at support staff, mid-level professionals, managers, and the Senior Executive Service (SES) are either being implemented or in final design stages. The first SES Candidate Development Program to be offered in more than a decade will begin this spring. During FY 2000 EPA recruited the third class of interns, providing the Agency with a diverse, high-potential cadre of future leaders, and tasked Agency managers and employees to continue to work collaboratively in accomplishing diversity action goals and ensuring review of the Agency's hiring, promotion, and award practices. Completion of corrective actions is expected by FY 2003.

Information System Security

The availability and reliability of environmental information is dependent on the security of the technology platform on which it resides. OIG and GAO reviews and audits found that EPA's security plans for many of the Agency's major applications and general support systems were deficient or non-existent. The oversight agencies believe that EPA needs a centralized security program with strong oversight processes to address risks adequately and ensure that valuable information technology resources and environmental data are secure. The Agency is strengthening its information security program by instituting a comprehensive strategy that incorporates all security-related deficiencies. OIG identified EPA's information system security as a management challenge in FY 1997-2000, and GAO and OMB identified it as a major management challenge in FY 2000. EPA declared information system security as a material weakness in FY 1997 and expanded the weakness in FY 2000 to take a systematic approach to correct the security problems and to address fully Agency, OIG, GAO and OMB concerns.

EPA has made substantial progress toward ensuring the security of its information assets. Following a FY 2000 audit by GAO, EPA temporarily disconnected its network from the Internet to accelerate installation of improved security features. EPA has taken steps to further separate the entire EPA Wide Area Network from the Internet and to implement better approaches to monitor, detect, and deter Internet attacks and unauthorized users. During FY 2000 the Agency established a special Technical Information Security Staff to provide a focal point for protecting the Agency's information. Additional corrective actions currently underway include completing security risk assessments of critical applications

and systems, evaluating network and data security, conducting training, certifying security plans for all critical security systems, finalizing EPA's National Network Security Policy, validating success of policy and guidance, and conducting random program office formal security plan reviews of mission-critical systems. All corrective actions are expected to be completed by the end of FY 2002.

Data Management Practices

EPA's information management challenges, which focus on several major themes, were identified in one or more audits conducted by OIG and GAO. To address these challenges, EPA needs to improve the management, comprehensiveness, consistency, reliability, and accuracy of its data to help better measure performance and achieve environmental results. In addition, EPA needs to develop error detection processes to ensure that errors in EPA databases are appropriately addressed in a timely and documented fashion. OIG and GAO identified EPA's information management as a major management challenge in FY 1998-2000. OMB also identified it as a management challenge in FY 2000. EPA broadened the scope of an existing internal Agency weakness on Data Management in FY 2000 to consolidate the Agency's efforts to address the multiplicity of issues related to data management, accuracy, and error correction.

EPA's new Office of Environmental Information (OEI) was established early in FY 2000 with the challenge to integrate the Agency's information policy, management, and technology. EPA is working internally and in partnership with the states to improve the management, comprehensiveness, consistency, reliability, and accuracy of its data to help better measure performance and achieve environmental results. To ensure the strong leadership needed for improving the quality of EPA's information, the Agency established the Quality Information Council (QIC) of representatives from the Agency's senior management. In FY 2000, the QIC presided over an assessment of the quality of information in four of the Agency's data systems.

EPA, states, and tribes formed the Environmental Data Standards Council to promote further development and implementation of key data standards. Work is underway to develop additional standards for permitting, enforcement and compliance, tribal identifiers, and geolocational data in FY 2001. All six data standards previously adopted by the Agency are now in the process of being implemented, as appropriate, in its information systems. The systems are at varying stages of adopting standards, but all of the thirteen major data systems have completed implementation of at least one of the six data standards, and at least one system has implemented all of the applicable standards. In addition, as part of its environmental information integration effort, EPA developed a 5-year Integration Management Plan that outlines a series of specific actions and milestones.

To further achievement of shared Agency/state objectives for improving data management integration, EPA collaborated with the states to develop a Network Blueprint that outlines the plans and components required to establish a national network for exchange of environmental information and defines how it will operate. The components include data standards, data exchange templates, trading partner

agreements, a central data exchange infrastructure, a Facility Registry System, and other data registries. EPA is also working to expand implementation of its Integrated Error Correction Process, developed in July 2000. Since that time, 195 errors have been reported, of which 78 have been resolved. (Almost 100 data points reported as errors have been investigated and found to be correct.) EPA is also developing a Data Quality Strategic Plan to improve the quality and reliability of environmental data, as well as an Agency-wide Enterprise Architecture that will guide the creation and revision of EPA's programmatic and regional information systems. The Agency anticipates that all corrective actions will be completed by the end of FY 2002.

Results-Based Information Technology Project Management

EPA and its partners need to plan strategically for implementing a common data architecture, data standards, geospatial information, and one-stop electronic reporting in order to share environmental information with their diverse partners and stakeholders to facilitate environmental protection efforts. In addition, the Agency needs to ensure that information technology projects are timely, cost-effective, and results-based. OIG identified results-based information technology project management as a major management challenge in FY 2001, citing concerns with the current structure of EPA's investment process and the Agency's ability to track information technology development and implementation effectively.

EPA has already begun to address the systemic issues of information technology project planning and management. For example, EPA's environmental information integration effort provides a new approach to state-data relationships and new technologies. Over the next few years, EPA plans to develop a more robust and rigorous program to meet the architectural and investment management requirements of the Clinger-Cohen Act. As part of this effort, EPA plans to expand its project management review criteria for projects with annual costs greater than \$1 million or system life cycle costs of more than \$5 million to ensure greater accountability and capability to produce results.

Laboratory Quality System Practices

Many of the Agency's programmatic and enforcement decisions are based on environmental data produced by EPA and contract research and analytical laboratories. Having data that are timely and of the appropriate quality is critical to understanding environmental processes and to making decisions that will support the protection of human health and the environment. Through internal reviews and OIG investigations, the Agency has found management control weaknesses and some cases of misconduct in laboratories concerning data quality that could impact environmental and enforcement decisions. OIG identified lab data quality as a major management challenge in FY 1999 and 2000, and the Agency declared it as an internal Agency weakness in FY 2000.

In FY 2000 the Agency completed independent technical reviews of its regional laboratories to assess EPA's ability to produce data of known and documented quality. The Agency will complete reviews of the remaining laboratories by the end of FY 2001. Ongoing actions include assembling a

workgroup consisting of both EPA and non-EPA members that will (1) identify weaknesses in laboratory quality systems that produce analytical data used for Agency decision making; (2) establish methods to detect and deter misconduct in labs; and (3) promote best practices in laboratory performance, documentation, and implementation. In addition, each EPA office and region will be responsible for establishing management controls to ensure that environmental measurement data supplied by laboratories is of known and documented quality. This effort includes monitoring and oversight of the development and implementation of Agency-approved quality systems by third parties. Completion of corrective actions is expected by December 2003.

Backlog of Title VI (Civil Rights Act of 1964) Discrimination Complaints

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin by any entity that receives federal financial assistance. EPA's program to investigate Title VI complaints has been hindered by language from the FY 1999 Appropriations Subcommittee (October 1998) and similar language in subsequent years. As a result, the number of Title VI administrative complaints that require an investigation or a jurisdictional determination by EPA is 61 and growing. EPA self-identified this problem and declared it as a material weakness in FY 2000.

The Agency is undertaking several actions to improve its ability to manage discrimination complaints under Title VI by focusing on preparatory work prior to actual adjudication. EPA is temporarily assigning additional case managers to expedite processing and reduce the current backlog of administrative complaints that require either an investigation or a jurisdictional determination. In addition, the Agency is working to improve the long-term efficiency of the program by developing needed guidance on processing complaints; issuing standardized procedures on preparing complaints for the investigation process; drafting protocols for conducting adverse impact analyses and statistical demographic analyses; and reducing the processing time for sending letters on acceptance, rejection, or referral of complaints. Corrective actions will be completed by the end of FY 2001.

Deficiencies in Internal Employment Discrimination Complaints Resolution Process under Title VII (Civil Rights Act of 1964)

Title VII requires that EPA implement and manage an effective federal discrimination complaints process that provides employees and applicants for employment an opportunity to seek redress. Difficulty in managing the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) process in a timely manner is attributable to several factors, including (1) inadequately trained counselors; (2) lack of accurate and timely data in the tracking system; (3) late, incomplete, and/or missing discussion of allegations in counselors' reports; (4) an inability to utilize the automated data tracking system effectively; (5) insufficient contractor support to manage the investigations process; and (6) a lack of staff to handle the current inventory of 269 complaints. EPA self-identified this problem and declared it as a material weakness in FY 2000.

Corrective actions currently underway include using attorneys from EPA's Civil Rights Law Office to review and provide advice on final Agency decisions, providing regions with monthly status reports on

their inventory of complaints and overdue reports and with feedback on their inadequate submissions, and devoting more attention to each area of the process currently needing improvement. Completion of corrective actions is expected by September 2001.

National Pollutants Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits

The Agency is responsible for establishing controls on pollutants discharged from point sources into waters of the United States. The NPDES program (which includes NPDES permits for municipal and industrial discharges, urban wet weather, concentrated animal feeding operations, pretreatment of non-domestic wastewater discharges into municipal sanitary sewers, and biosolids management controls) is a key element of the Agency's effort to achieve its goal of clean and safe water. OIG audits in 1998 identified significant delays in issuing permits and a substantial backlog in the permitting process for pollutant dischargers into surface waters. The backlog is a threat to the environment because expired NPDES permits might not reflect the most recent applicable effluent limitation guidelines, water quality standards, or Total Maximum Daily Loads. The NPDES permit universe will be expanding to cover additional storm water discharges and concentrated animal feeding operations. OIG identified the NPDES permit backlog as a major management challenge in FY 1998-2000. EPA declared it as a material weakness in its FY 1998 Integrity Act Report and began to implement an extensive corrective action plan.

EPA put in place an aggressive strategy to reduce the backlog of NPDES permits in regions and states. This strategy included four ongoing initiatives to better define the backlog, examine permitting efficiencies and facilitate programmatic and technical streamlining opportunities, provide funding and technical support for regions and states, and encourage regions and states to share technical expertise and permitting tools. At the request of EPA's Deputy Administrator, EPA Regional Administrators submitted a backlog reduction plan for every state and territory in their region, committing to a goal of eliminating the backlog for major permits in 2001. The backlog reduction strategies developed by the regions reaffirm the commitments of the states and regions to meet the Agency's backlog reduction targets. During FY 2000 the backlog of EPA-issued major NPDES permits was reduced from 46 percent to 30 percent. Some states are leading the way, eleven states are already below the 10 percent backlog target and a total of 18 states are on track to meet the target by December 31, 2001. EPA expects to reduce the backlog of major and minor permits to 10 percent by FY 2005.

Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS)

SDWIS, an "exceptions" database, focuses exclusively on public water systems' noncompliance with drinking water regulations (health-based and program). States implement drinking water regulations with the support of the Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) grant program. States with primacy determine whether public water systems have violated maximum contaminant levels (MCL), treatment technique requirements, consumer notification requirements, or monitoring-and-reporting requirements, and report those violations through SDWIS. In 1998 EPA supported a series of data verification audits, the results of which pointed out serious data quality and reliability issues. OMB identified SDWIS as a

management challenge for the Agency in FY 1999 and EPA declared it as an internal Agency weakness. Completion of corrective actions is expected during FY 2001.

Two important steps completed by the end of 1999 included (1) an industry survey analysis in which water utilities examined and compared data in SDWIS with their own data; and (2) a study of the variety of ways that states are organized to carry out their drinking water program responsibilities and the effects of these organizations on the way in which data are collected. During FY 2000 the Agency developed and implemented state-specific training for data entry into SDWIS, conducted data verification audits in 12 states, and developed a new transaction processing and tracking report.

In partnership with the states and major stakeholders, EPA developed a long-term information strategy to address drinking water data collection and data management issues over the next 5 to 10 years. First, EPA will continue to work with states to implement the Data Reliability Action Plan (DRAP), a multi-step approach to improve the quality and reliability of data in SDWIS. Second, more states will be using SDWIS-STATE, a software information system jointly designed by states and EPA. Third, EPA is modifying SDWIS-FED to streamline and minimize data entry. And finally, EPA, in partnership with the states, is developing information modules on other drinking water programs, e.g., source water protection, underground injection control, and the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund.

Permit Compliance System (PCS)

OMB reported in its September 17, 1999, letter to EPA's Chief Financial Officer (CFO) that because of missing data and data quality problems, PCS is not a reliable source of information for the management and oversight of the Clean Water Act NPDES program. EPA and state permitting and enforcement programs all rely on this system. EPA uses the information in PCS for NPDES program management and oversight purposes, including assisting in targeting enforcement activity to the areas experiencing compliance and enforcement problems. In FY 1999 OMB identified PCS as a management challenge, while EPA declared it as an internal Agency weakness and implemented a corrective action strategy.

EPA has been aware of problems with PCS and, over the past few years, has worked with the states to identify problems and define the systems revisions needed for effective NPDES program management and oversight. In conjunction with the states, EPA has three major initiatives underway that will be continued in FY 2002 and are intended to improve the usefulness of the system as a management tool. These initiatives include PCS modernization, an interim data exchange format, and electronic reporting. EPA is monitoring progress carefully and will gauge success by the level of state participation, improvements in the quality and comprehensiveness of the data, and reliability of the analyses generated. Completion of corrective actions is expected by FY 2003.

EPA Relationships with States

GAO's January 1999 Report, "Major Management Challenges and Program Risks: Environmental Protection Agency," and its January 2001 update identified EPA-state relationships as a major management challenge. OIG also identified EPA's relationships with states as a management challenge in FY 2000. GAO's and OIG's concerns centered around fundamental disagreements between EPA and the states over their respective roles, priorities among state environmental programs, and the appropriate degree of federal oversight.

Under the National Environmental Performance Partnership System (NEPPS), the Agency committed to long-term collaboration with state agencies to improve EPA/state management of national environmental programs. A national EPA/state workshop in FY 2000 reviewed evaluations and developed the following recommendations for strengthening NEPPS: (1) recommit to the fundamental principles of NEPPS; (2) coordinate and integrate systems/programs; and (3) improve performance measures. Actions taken in response to these recommendations include (1) reaffirming EPA's commitment to NEPPS; (2) designating "NEPPS Leaders" at the senior management, mid-management, and staff levels; (3) producing a crosswalk of GPRA annual performance measures and NEPPS core performance measures; (4) completing an internal training survey to help strengthen the skills of NEPPS practitioners; and (5) implementing a workplan that commits to developing better tools for NEPPS practitioners. Both GAO and OIG believe that the positive steps the Agency has taken and the increased emphasis placed on this issue have improved cooperation with the states and will result in more effective and efficient environmental protection.

Reinventing Environmental Regulation

In its January 1999 report, *Major Management Challenges and Program Risks: Environmental Protection Agency*, GAO reported that EPA's current regulatory system is costly and occasionally inflexible and that the Agency faces challenges in making changes to the current system. These challenges include helping employees understand and support changes and reaching consensus among stakeholders on objectives and approaches for addressing important reinvention issues and policies.

Efforts are underway to achieve better environmental results with less burden through the use of innovative and flexible approaches. Actions taken to date include the following:

- Implementing a reorganization that unites the Agency's policy and reinvention staff into one organization in order to strengthen and increase EPA's ability to achieve appropriate changes within Agency regulatory and non-regulatory processes.
- Finalizing over 50 XL (eXcellence and Leadership) projects and moving to implementation phase of the Metal Finisher's sectors project, all designed to explore ways to achieve better results with less burden.

- Directing personnel and extramural resources to help build Agency capacity for evaluating innovative and core programs.
- Incorporating lessons from the pilots under Project XL and the EPA/Environmental Council Of States (ECOS) innovations agreement into Agency core programs, such as plantwide applicability limits tested under XL being incorporated into Agency decisions on air permitting reform.
- Establishing the Performance Track Program and awarding grants to states to support recognition of high performance companies.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action Program

EPA and other stakeholders, including GAO, have identified several factors impeding timely and cost-effective cleanups under RCRA. To address the problem, GAO recommended that EPA devise a strategy for ensuring that cleanup managers in EPA's regions and states have a consistent understanding of new approaches outlined in guidance or regulation and that EPA oversee program implementation to determine whether cleanup managers are using the new approaches appropriately.

EPA has already undertaken a number of regulatory, guidance, and oversight initiatives consistent with GAO's suggestions. For example, to meet more effectively the challenging 2005 GPRA goals and speed up the pace of cleanups in general, EPA introduced a first round of RCRA Cleanup Reforms in July 1999 and a second round of reforms in January 2001. The 1999 reforms have successfully moved the program toward faster, focused, and more flexible cleanups, resulting in an increase from 47 to 504 facilities that have already achieved the 2005 goals. The 2001 reforms reflect the ideas heard from program implementors and stakeholders and introduce new initiatives designed to reinforce and build upon the 1999 reforms. Specifically, the 2001 reforms are designed to pilot innovative approaches, accelerate changes in culture, connect communities to cleanups, and capitalize on redevelopment potential. Completion of corrective actions associated with the 1999 reforms is expected by FY 2001. Completion of corrective action associated with the 2001 reforms is expected in FY 2001-2002.

Accountability

OIG identified accountability as a management challenge for the Agency in FY 1999-2000, stating that EPA needs to take further action to develop accountability systems that tie performance to EPA's organizational goals. OIG believes that greater accountability can be achieved through clearly defined goals, performance measures, and areas of responsibility; better tracking of how employees spend their time while in the workplace; and greater commitment by responsible officials to achieving national goals.

EPA has made significant progress over the past few years in strengthening results-based management, including development of a goal-based budget and planning and accountability functions to support it. In FY 2000 EPA issued its revised Strategic Plan for FY 2000–2005 that includes lessons learned about performance measurement and Agency priorities for protecting human health and the environment, some improved performance measures to reflect better programmatic and environmental outcomes, and strengthened cost accounting to try to better link Agency budgetary resources with the achievement of environmental results.

Agency Process for Preparing Financial Statements

OIG identified EPA's process for preparing financial statements as a management challenge in FY 1999-2000. The preparation of the Agency's FY 1998 financial statements was substantially more challenging than in prior years due to changes in FASEB requirements and additional statements that were required, resulting in the Agency missing the statutory submission date. OIG believed the Agency needed to improve its financial statement preparation process to enable the Agency to submit audited financial statements by March 1 of each year. The Agency declared this issue as an internal Agency weakness in FY 1999; completion of corrective actions is expected in FY 2001.

As a result of numerous improvements to its financial statement preparation process in FY 2000 and early FY 2001, EPA's FY 2000 financial statements were issued on time and received an unqualified audit opinion. Additional improvement efforts are ongoing and are expected to culminate with the implementation of an automated tool for use in preparing the Agency's FY 2001 financial statements. The issuance of timely financial statements with clean audit opinions continues to be a top priority of the Agency.

Managerial Cost Accounting

EPA's OIG believes that the Agency needs to improve its cost accounting systems and processes to provide Agency managers with timely and reliable information on the cost of carrying out EPA's programs and administrative activities. In the Agency's FY 1999 financial statement audit, OIG reported that EPA did not comply with the Managerial Cost Accounting Standard requirements to: (1) determine the full cost of its activities; (2) accumulate and report the cost of activities on a regular basis for management information and other stakeholder purposes; and (3) use appropriate costing methodologies to accumulate and assign costs to outputs. OIG identified managerial accounting as a major management challenge in FY 2000.

The Agency believes it substantially complies with the Managerial Cost Accounting Standards and is working closely with OIG to resolve the few differences that remain. EPA has established a cost accounting approach that supports two different types of needs. This includes cost accounting under the Agency GPRA goal structure and costing program-specific outputs, e.g., site-specific costs, interagency agreements, working capital fund, user fees, etc. Procedures for assigning and reporting direct and indirect costs for both categories vary depending on the specific purpose and management need for cost information.

Since FY 1999, all new obligational authority has been budgeted and accounted for in the Agency's GPRA 10-goal structure using a Program Results Code (PRC). The PRC provides the structure whereby all the costs related to the activities in a particular goal and objective, regardless of national program manager or program office, are accumulated to show the cost of the Agency's outputs. EPA also has an established process for allocating some indirect costs to the appropriate PRC. Obligations made before FY 1999 are accounted for in the Agency's previous structure, i.e., program element. Cost information in both accounting structures is available for use by managers to review how resources are spent to achieve expected results and to help them make future budgeting decisions.

EPA has taken a number of actions and will continue to refine its cost accounting, both for the GPRA accounting and other more specific localized needs for cost accounting. These actions include:

- Beginning in FY 1999, the Agency established the PRC (described above) to link resources in the Annual Plan and Budget with the GPRA goal structure.
- Issued policy and guidance and providing training on budget restructuring and cost accounting.
- Issued Superfund indirect cost rates that comply with the Managerial Cost Accounting Standards.
- Issued the FY 2000 Statement of Net Costs by goal in the Agency's Annual Financial Statements.

The Agency's OCFO currently is working on the following specific areas of cost accounting:

- Developing reports on outputs that combine both the former program element and new PRC structure.
- Working with individual program offices to address specific accounting needs. Examples include:
 - Enforcement activities across media lines
 - RCRA oversight
 - Combined Sewer Overflow in the Water Program
- Developing indirect cost rates for the Mobile Sources Program's Compliance Fees and for Human Health Assessment fees to allow the Office of Research and Development to make their Human Studies Facility in Chapel Hill, NC, available to scientists throughout the world for the conduct of environmental health research.

In summary, cost accounting is a process that will continue to change because improvements and enhancements, like those listed above, are ongoing.

Improved Management of Assistance Agreements

Several years ago OIG audits found that project officers and grants specialists did not thoroughly review grant applications, perform site visits, or perform other reviews to ensure the Agency received quality and timely products and services. The Agency declared grants closeout and management of assistance agreements a material weakness in FY 1996 and implemented a detailed corrective action strategy. The Agency substantially completed its corrective actions, strengthened the overall management of EPA's assistance program, and redesignated grants closeout and oversight of assistance agreements as an internal Agency weakness in FY 1999. OIG identified assistance agreements as a management challenge again in FY 2000 based on indications from recent audits that EPA needs to validate the effectiveness of its strategy for ensuring effective management of its assistance agreements.

The Agency completed corrective actions associated with the grants closeout portion of the weakness in FY 2000, reporting that all but 26 grants of the estimated backlog of 19,000 reported to Congress in July 1996 were closed. Twenty-four of the remaining 26 grants will be closed out as the Agency resolves an outstanding indirect cost rate issue. The remaining two grants will be closed out as the Agency completes the audit resolution process. To manage grant closeouts more efficiently, EPA has established interim closeout goals for each year and each Grants Management Office submitted its FY 2000 grants closeout strategy as required. In addition, the Agency developed and implemented policies to ensure effective post-award management of EPA assistance agreements.

During FY 2001 EPA is assessing whether the Agency administratively and programmatically manages its assistance agreements appropriately. Actions currently underway include (1) examining quarterly reports and information from the Grantee Compliance Assistance Database; (2) conducting evaluations of Management Effectiveness Reviews, post-award plans, and the Grantee Compliance Assistance Initiative; and (3) consulting with Senior Resource Officials in conducting the assessments and OIG in validating corrective actions. The validation study will be completed by the end of FY 2001.

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
Acid Rain -CASTNet	S&T	\$4,000.0	\$4,000.0	\$3,991.2	\$3,991.2
Acid Rain -Program Implementation	EPM	\$10,309.4	\$10,606.3	\$12,248.7	\$12,581.3
Administrative Law	EPM	\$2,324.3	\$2,471.3	\$2,566.3	\$2,828.3
Administrative Services	EPM	\$10,471.9	\$94,886.4	\$106,125.6	\$108,322.9
Administrative Services	LUST	\$35.4	\$406.3	\$334.0	\$350.1
Administrative Services	Oil Spill	\$0.0	\$3.4	\$0.0	\$2.2
Administrative Services	Superfund	\$5,859.2	\$28,858.7	\$30,709.2	\$32,564.6
<i>Administrative Services</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$16,366.5</i>	<i>\$124,154.8</i>	<i>\$137,168.8</i>	<i>\$141,239.8</i>
Air Toxics Research	S&T	\$19,507.0	\$18,121.7	\$22,238.7	\$18,924.4
Air,State,Local and Tribal Assistance Grants: Other Air Grants	STAG	\$214,759.8	\$217,916.8	\$227,724.5	\$227,724.5
Assessments	Superfund	\$87,712.3	\$83,857.7	\$82,701.5	\$77,651.3
Assistance Agreement Audits	IG	\$3,428.7	\$3,947.5	\$2,984.9	\$1,500.0
Assistance Agreement Audits	Superfund	\$3,401.8	\$3,401.8	\$2,367.2	\$500.0
<i>Assistance Agreement Audits</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$6,830.5</i>	<i>\$7,349.3</i>	<i>\$5,352.1</i>	<i>\$2,000.0</i>
Assistance Agreement Investigations	IG	\$2,650.4	\$2,762.8	\$2,765.0	\$1,885.0
Assistance Agreement Investigations	Superfund	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1,015.0
<i>Assistance Agreement Investigations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$2,650.4</i>	<i>\$2,762.8</i>	<i>\$2,765.0</i>	<i>\$2,900.0</i>
ATSDR Superfund Support	Superfund	\$76,000.0	\$70,000.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
BEACH Grants	STAG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$2,000.0
Brownfields	EPM	\$1,269.9	\$1,196.3	\$2,636.6	\$2,674.2
Brownfields	Superfund	\$91,333.3	\$91,018.8	\$89,972.0	\$94,977.4
<i>Brownfields</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$92,603.2</i>	<i>\$92,215.1</i>	<i>\$92,608.6</i>	<i>\$97,651.6</i>
Carbon Monoxide	EPM	\$3,270.5	\$3,937.6	\$3,879.8	\$3,940.7
Carbon Monoxide	S&T	\$113.2	\$129.9	\$182.5	\$188.1
<i>Carbon Monoxide</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$3,383.7</i>	<i>\$4,067.5</i>	<i>\$4,062.3</i>	<i>\$4,128.8</i>
Center for Environmental Statistics (CEIS)	EPM	\$3,965.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Chesapeake Bay	EPM	\$20,361.5	\$20,308.9	\$20,728.1	\$18,818.7
Children's Indoor Environments	EPM	\$3,746.8	\$15,161.7	\$14,714.1	\$13,624.1
Civil Enforcement	EPM	\$82,397.6	\$81,799.7	\$94,752.3	\$92,071.9

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp.	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
Civil Enforcement	S&T	\$589.9	\$299.6	\$2,979.4	\$2,946.9
Civil Enforcement	Oil Spill	\$1,225.3	\$1,298.5	\$1,264.7	\$1,363.8
Civil Enforcement	Superfund	\$736.6	\$251.6	\$4,085.3	\$4,210.8
<i>Civil Enforcement</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$84,949.4</i>	<i>\$83,649.4</i>	<i>\$103,081.7</i>	<i>\$100,593.4</i>
Civil Enforcement CWA - CWAP/AFOs	EPM	\$0.0	\$935.6	\$977.3	\$0.0
Civil Rights/Title VI Compliance	EPM	\$1,637.1	\$1,430.9	\$9,140.1	\$11,898.3
Clean Water Exposure Research	S&T	\$1,406.0	\$7,087.5	\$7,089.3	\$7,264.4
Climate Change Research	S&T	\$15,970.6	\$20,592.2	\$22,550.4	\$21,951.7
Climate Protection Program: Transportation	EPM	\$4,799.5	\$2,604.8	\$2,494.5	\$5,500.0
Climate Protection Program: Transportation	S&T	\$26,950.5	\$27,000.0	\$26,940.6	\$26,940.8
<i>Climate Protection Program: Transportation</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$31,750.0</i>	<i>\$29,604.8</i>	<i>\$29,435.1</i>	<i>\$32,440.8</i>
Climate Protection Program: Buildings	EPM	\$38,800.0	\$42,640.9	\$52,535.0	\$52,730.9
Climate Protection Program: Carbon Removal	EPM	\$0.0	\$1,000.0	\$997.8	\$1,700.0
Climate Protection Program: Industry	EPM	\$22,086.1	\$21,991.7	\$31,929.6	\$27,295.2
Climate Protection Program: International Capacity Building	EPM	\$4,322.9	\$5,594.4	\$5,501.7	\$6,315.1
Climate Protection Program: RESEARCH	S&T	\$10,000.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Climate Protection Program: State and Local Climate Change Program	EPM	\$2,500.0	\$2,508.0	\$2,494.5	\$2,500.0
Coastal Environmental Monitoring	S&T	\$0.0	\$6,954.0	\$7,467.5	\$7,607.6
Commission for Environmental Cooperation - CEC	EPM	\$3,084.0	\$3,222.5	\$3,269.0	\$3,403.6
Common Sense Initiative	EPM	\$9,018.4	\$5,035.9	\$2,166.3	\$1,921.6
Common Sense Initiative	S&T	\$867.0	\$630.4	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Common Sense Initiative</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$9,885.4</i>	<i>\$5,666.3</i>	<i>\$2,166.3</i>	<i>\$1,921.6</i>
Community Right to Know (Title III)	EPM	\$4,544.7	\$4,797.5	\$5,207.8	\$5,136.8
Compliance Assistance and Centers	EPM	\$18,920.1	\$22,954.8	\$25,097.8	\$26,560.0
Compliance Assistance and Centers	Oil Spill	\$274.9	\$353.4	\$267.9	\$266.3

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp.	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
Compliance Assistance and Centers	Superfund	\$101.3	\$109.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Compliance Assistance and Centers</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$19,296.3</i>	<i>\$23,417.2</i>	<i>\$25,365.7</i>	<i>\$26,826.3</i>
Compliance Incentives	EPM	\$5,129.1	\$4,975.1	\$10,093.3	\$9,883.0
Compliance Incentives	Superfund	\$213.6	\$220.6	\$340.2	\$292.8
<i>Compliance Incentives</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$5,342.7</i>	<i>\$5,195.7</i>	<i>\$10,433.5</i>	<i>\$10,175.8</i>
Compliance Monitoring	EPM	\$49,095.2	\$48,500.0	\$54,166.5	\$47,425.5
Compliance Monitoring	S&T	\$4,568.4	\$4,516.2	\$2,614.7	\$2,701.5
Compliance Monitoring	Superfund	\$3,798.4	\$3,388.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Compliance Monitoring</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$57,462.0</i>	<i>\$56,404.2</i>	<i>\$56,781.2</i>	<i>\$50,127.0</i>
Congressional/Legislative Analysis	EPM	\$4,878.4	\$3,992.2	\$4,350.5	\$4,787.6
Congressional/Legislative Analysis	Superfund	\$243.1	\$172.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Congressional/Legislative Analysis</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$5,121.5</i>	<i>\$4,164.2</i>	<i>\$4,350.5</i>	<i>\$4,787.6</i>
Congressional Projects	EPM	\$0.0	\$1,968.5	\$1,917.1	\$2,029.4
Contract and Procurement Investigations	IG	\$1,844.1	\$1,936.2	\$2,010.1	\$2,325.0
Contract and Procurement Investigations	Superfund	\$1,068.9	\$1,068.9	\$969.6	\$775.0
<i>Contract and Procurement Investigations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$2,913.0</i>	<i>\$3,005.1</i>	<i>\$2,979.7</i>	<i>\$3,100.0</i>
Contract Audits	IG	\$4,245.1	\$4,731.0	\$4,431.2	\$3,900.0
Contract Audits	Superfund	\$705.5	\$708.5	\$915.0	\$1,300.0
<i>Contract Audits</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$4,950.6</i>	<i>\$5,439.5</i>	<i>\$5,346.2</i>	<i>\$5,200.0</i>
Contracts Management	EPM	\$16,232.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Contracts Management	LUST	\$69.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Contracts Management	Superfund	\$8,683.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Contracts Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$24,986.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Criminal Enforcement	EPM	\$24,319.8	\$23,699.9	\$25,669.0	\$26,743.4
Criminal Enforcement	S&T	\$3,327.7	\$4,436.3	\$5,095.8	\$5,266.3
Criminal Enforcement	Superfund	\$6,789.0	\$8,992.6	\$10,075.3	\$9,857.3
<i>Criminal Enforcement</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$34,436.5</i>	<i>\$37,128.8</i>	<i>\$40,840.1</i>	<i>\$41,867.0</i>
Data Collection	EPM	\$0.0	\$955.3	\$2,096.6	\$1,571.6
Data Standards	EPM	\$0.0	\$4,333.0	\$3,364.6	\$3,081.3

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp.	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
Data Standards	S&T	\$0.0	\$3,070.7	\$3,032.9	\$3,404.1
Data Standards	Superfund	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$647.8	\$336.5
<i>Data Standards</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$7,403.7</i>	<i>\$7,045.3</i>	<i>\$6,821.9</i>
Design for the Environment	EPM	\$4,724.9	\$4,741.9	\$4,976.8	\$4,979.0
Direct Public Information and Assistance	EPM	\$3,929.2	\$3,720.9	\$4,331.2	\$11,097.8
Direct Public Information and Assistance	Superfund	\$562.8	\$475.1	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Direct Public Information and Assistance</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$4,492.0</i>	<i>\$4,196.0</i>	<i>\$4,331.2</i>	<i>\$11,097.8</i>
Drinking Water Consumer Awareness	EPM	\$1,622.9	\$1,537.2	\$1,462.6	\$2,463.2
Drinking Water Implementation	EPM	\$28,134.2	\$29,668.5	\$32,149.1	\$35,200.6
Drinking Water Regulations	EPM	\$31,807.8	\$30,772.4	\$31,725.9	\$27,726.5
Drinking Water Regulations	S&T	\$2,118.9	\$2,458.1	\$2,595.5	\$2,672.1
<i>Drinking Water Regulations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$33,926.7</i>	<i>\$33,230.5</i>	<i>\$34,321.4</i>	<i>\$30,398.6</i>
Effluent Guidelines	EPM	\$22,372.2	\$21,116.9	\$21,782.4	\$21,492.3
EMPACT	EPM	\$7,889.2	\$6,777.8	\$7,782.8	\$0.0
EMPACT	S&T	\$6,313.7	\$2,260.8	\$5,986.8	\$0.0
<i>EMPACT</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$14,202.9</i>	<i>\$9,038.6</i>	<i>\$13,769.6</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Employee Integrity Investigations	IG	\$953.4	\$991.8	\$921.2	\$750.0
Employee Integrity Investigations	Superfund	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$250.0
<i>Employee Integrity Investigations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$953.4</i>	<i>\$991.8</i>	<i>\$921.2</i>	<i>\$1,000.0</i>
Endocrine Disruptor Research	S&T	\$12,098.4	\$8,038.0	\$12,849.4	\$11,321.4
Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program	EPM	\$4,258.0	\$12,553.8	\$10,083.6	\$8,952.5
Enforcement Training	EPM	\$3,142.9	\$4,750.0	\$4,236.7	\$3,580.6
Enforcement Training	Superfund	\$661.1	\$955.4	\$1,041.0	\$732.0
<i>Enforcement Training</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$3,804.0</i>	<i>\$5,705.4</i>	<i>\$5,277.7</i>	<i>\$4,312.6</i>
Environment and Trade	EPM	\$389.0	\$518.0	\$1,614.7	\$1,672.5
Environmental Appeals Boards	EPM	\$1,570.9	\$1,789.5	\$1,548.8	\$1,711.6
Environmental Appeals Boards	Superfund	\$89.4	\$91.3	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Environmental Appeals Boards</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$1,660.3</i>	<i>\$1,880.8</i>	<i>\$1,548.8</i>	<i>\$1,711.6</i>
Environmental Education Division	EPM	\$7,398.3	\$5,970.3	\$9,578.1	\$8,518.3

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp.	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
Environmental Finance Center Grants (EFC)	EPM	\$1,065.0	\$1,250.0	\$1,249.0	\$1,249.0
Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program, EMAP	S&T	\$33,153.5	\$30,543.5	\$29,613.7	\$33,133.7
Environmental Technology Verification (ETV)	S&T	\$6,908.5	\$6,392.6	\$6,294.0	\$3,619.6
Existing Chemical Data, Screening, Testing and Management	EPM	\$14,225.3	\$20,394.5	\$24,429.6	\$25,423.4
Exploratory Grants Program	S&T	\$12,038.0	\$10,803.5	\$10,368.5	\$10,290.0
Facility Operations: Agency Rental/ Direct Lease	EPM	\$133,357.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Facility Operations: Agency Rental/ Direct Lease	LUST	\$723.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Facility Operations: Agency Rental/ Direct Lease	Oil Spill	\$511.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Facility Operations: Agency Rental/ Direct Lease	IG	\$3,236.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Facility Operations: Agency Rental/ Direct Lease	Superfund	\$32,743.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Facility Operations: Agency Rental/ Direct Lease</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$170,571.8</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Facility Operations: Agency Utilities	EPM	\$9,985.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Facility Operations: Agency Utilities	Superfund	\$29.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Facility Operations: Agency Utilities</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$10,015.2</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Facility Operations: Repairs and Improvements	B&F	\$15,428.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Facility Operations: Security	EPM	\$12,219.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Facility Operations: Security	Superfund	\$742.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Facility Operations: Security</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$12,962.2</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Federal Facilities	Superfund	\$29,368.2	\$27,750.6	\$30,624.6	\$30,795.2
Federal Preparedness	Superfund	\$11,307.5	\$11,028.2	\$12,859.3	\$12,963.4
Financial Statement Audits	IG	\$3,300.6	\$3,447.4	\$3,423.4	\$3,000.0
Financial Statement Audits	Superfund	\$886.9	\$886.9	\$823.9	\$1,000.0

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp.	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
<i>Financial Statement Audits</i>	<i>Total</i>	\$4,187.5	\$4,334.3	\$4,247.3	\$4,000.0
Geospatial	EPM	\$0.0	\$630.2	\$522.3	\$512.3
Global Toxics	EPM	\$315.3	\$535.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
GLOBE	EPM	\$0.0	\$1,000.0	\$997.8	\$0.0
Grants Management	EPM	\$7,331.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Grants Management	LUST	\$211.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Grants Management	Superfund	\$1,026.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Grants Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	\$8,568.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Grants to States for Lead Risk Reduction	STAG	\$13,712.2	\$0.0	\$12,472.4	\$13,682.0
Grants to States for Lead Risk Reduction	STAG Carryover	\$0.0	\$13,712.2	\$0.0	\$0.0
Great Lakes	EPM	\$5,395.3	\$3,263.7	\$3,114.4	\$3,027.0
Great Lakes National Program Office	EPM	\$14,783.8	\$15,077.6	\$15,207.5	\$14,962.4
Gulf of Mexico	EPM	\$3,798.9	\$4,196.0	\$4,341.2	\$4,276.7
Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs) and Related Research	S&T	\$2,234.5	\$3,634.1	\$5,436.9	\$5,441.6
Hazardous Air Pollutants	EPM	\$43,469.9	\$38,751.1	\$48,161.8	\$46,899.7
Hazardous Air Pollutants	S&T	\$1,786.1	\$4,054.2	\$3,882.4	\$3,886.8
<i>Hazardous Air Pollutants</i>	<i>Total</i>	\$45,256.0	\$42,805.3	\$52,044.2	\$50,786.5
Hazardous Substance Research Centers	S&T	\$4,529.8	\$2,504.7	\$2,282.6	\$0.0
Hazardous Substance Research Centers	Superfund	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$2,245.1	\$4,606.0
<i>Hazardous Substance Research Centers</i>	<i>Total</i>	\$4,529.8	\$2,504.7	\$4,527.7	\$4,606.0
Hazardous Substance Research:Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE)	S&T	\$7,695.9	\$7,017.3	\$6,554.0	\$0.0
Hazardous Substance Research:Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE)	Superfund	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$6,636.9
Hazardous Waste Research	S&T	\$6,167.9	\$5,379.8	\$6,990.0	\$8,994.1
Human Health Research	S&T	\$49,652.2	\$48,883.9	\$50,940.4	\$50,807.2
Human Resources Management	EPM	\$19,486.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Human Resources Management	S&T	\$326.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Human Resources Management	LUST	\$36.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp.	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
Human Resources Management	Superfund	\$2,083.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Human Resources Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$21,932.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
Immediate Office of the Administrator	EPM	\$2,791.3	\$2,505.6	\$3,300.0	\$4,294.2
Indoor Air Research	S&T	\$2,818.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Indoor Environments	EPM	\$5,684.2	\$7,183.9	\$7,146.9	\$7,246.9
Indoor Environments	S&T	\$811.8	\$1,253.7	\$322.5	\$329.4
<i>Indoor Environments</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$6,496.0</i>	<i>\$8,437.6</i>	<i>\$7,469.4</i>	<i>\$7,576.3</i>
Information Exchange Network	STAG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$25,000.0
Information Integration	EPM	\$0.0	\$890.0	\$5,860.2	\$5,900.0
Information Technology Management	EPM	\$22,135.7	\$24,940.9	\$25,297.8	\$22,283.5
Information Technology Management	EPM Y2K	\$0.0	\$977.8	\$0.0	\$0.0
Information Technology Management	S&T	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$137.5
Information Technology Management	Superfund	\$4,074.2	\$553.5	\$3,250.4	\$2,854.4
<i>Information Technology Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$26,209.9</i>	<i>\$26,472.2</i>	<i>\$28,548.2</i>	<i>\$25,275.4</i>
Innovative Community Partnership Program	EPM	\$4,725.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
International Safe Drinking Water	EPM	\$684.0	\$793.0	\$384.4	\$301.8
Lake Champlain	EPM	\$2,000.0	\$2,187.3	\$1,995.6	\$954.8
Lead	EPM	\$326.3	\$357.7	\$329.5	\$339.9
Lead Risk Reduction Program	EPM	\$18,214.4	\$13,833.9	\$14,248.6	\$14,519.4
Long Island Sound	EPM	\$900.0	\$975.0	\$4,989.0	\$477.4
LUST (LUST)Cooperative Agreements	LUST	\$58,990.0	\$56,466.8	\$58,341.3	\$58,269.3
Marine Pollution	EPM	\$7,420.4	\$7,580.0	\$7,797.9	\$7,820.2
Multilateral Fund	EPM	\$11,362.0	\$12,000.0	\$10,975.8	\$10,975.8
NACEPT Support	EPM	\$2,490.0	\$1,655.7	\$1,556.2	\$1,654.6
NAFTA Implementation	EPM	\$537.0	\$674.6	\$402.2	\$427.6
National Association Liaison	EPM	\$224.6	\$254.9	\$235.2	\$258.7
National Estuaries Program/Coastal Watersheds	EPM	\$16,528.3	\$18,029.2	\$18,192.5	\$17,053.2
National Nonpoint Source Program	EPM	\$16,033.7	\$15,401.1	\$16,170.7	\$16,342.4

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp.	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
Implementation					
National Program chemicals: PCBs, Asbestos, Fibers, and Dioxin	EPM	\$3,268.3	\$5,753.6	\$6,115.1	\$6,388.9
NEPA Implementation	EPM	\$9,269.5	\$9,901.4	\$11,081.4	\$11,670.9
New Chemical Review	EPM	\$14,659.5	\$13,261.4	\$14,147.4	\$14,622.7
New Construction: New Headquarters Project	EPM	\$7,255.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
New Construction: New Headquarters Project	B&F	\$5,520.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
New Construction: New Headquarters Project	Superfund	\$2,058.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>New Construction: New Headquarters Project</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$14,833.4</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>
New Construction :RTP New Building Project	B&F	\$36,000.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
NIEHS Superfund Support	Superfund	\$60,000.0	\$60,000.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Nitrogen Oxides	EPM	\$956.9	\$2,407.1	\$1,379.4	\$1,323.1
NPDES Program	EPM	\$30,862.6	\$36,274.9	\$39,405.2	\$40,249.6
Oil Spills Preparedness, Prevention and Response	Oil Spill	\$11,851.9	\$11,820.4	\$11,948.9	\$11,943.5
Other Federal Agency Superfund Support	Superfund	\$10,000.0	\$10,000.0	\$10,676.5	\$10,676.5
Ozone	EPM	\$37,459.9	\$29,708.0	\$32,322.5	\$33,391.8
Ozone	S&T	\$31,832.6	\$28,971.8	\$35,659.1	\$36,223.3
<i>Ozone</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$69,292.5</i>	<i>\$58,679.8</i>	<i>\$67,981.6</i>	<i>\$69,615.1</i>
Pacific Northwest	EPM	\$1,022.5	\$1,043.2	\$1,078.6	\$1,103.8
Particulate Matter	EPM	\$25,754.1	\$26,489.2	\$32,466.9	\$31,160.3
Particulate Matter	S&T	\$39,815.7	\$27,629.5	\$23,150.4	\$23,532.7
<i>Particulate Matter</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$65,569.8</i>	<i>\$54,118.7</i>	<i>\$55,617.3</i>	<i>\$54,693.0</i>
Particulate Matter Research	S&T	\$55,842.9	\$62,300.5	\$68,765.0	\$65,743.3
Partnership with Industrial and Other Countries	EPM	\$6,267.8	\$6,855.6	\$0.0	\$0.0
Performance Track	EPM	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1,995.6	\$1,843.6

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
Pesticide Applicator Certification and Training	EPM	\$10,438.0	\$9,391.2	\$10,022.5	\$10,349.1
Pesticide Registration	EPM	\$30,886.0	\$34,323.6	\$38,974.8	\$38,998.1
Pesticide Registration	S&T	\$2,612.4	\$2,168.3	\$2,240.9	\$2,263.2
<i>Pesticide Registration</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$33,498.4</i>	<i>\$36,491.9</i>	<i>\$41,215.7</i>	<i>\$41,261.3</i>
Pesticide Reregistration	EPM	\$35,243.2	\$31,472.5	\$33,968.9	\$43,940.8
Pesticide Reregistration	S&T	\$2,856.6	\$2,379.5	\$2,287.3	\$2,403.5
<i>Pesticide Reregistration</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$38,099.8</i>	<i>\$33,852.0</i>	<i>\$36,256.2</i>	<i>\$46,344.3</i>
Pesticide Residue Tolerance Reassessments	EPM	\$9,970.3	\$11,446.4	\$14,647.8	\$5,846.0
Pesticide Residue Tolerance Reassessments	S&T	\$127.8	\$151.4	\$153.8	\$0.0
<i>Pesticide Residue Tolerance Reassessments</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$10,098.1</i>	<i>\$11,597.8</i>	<i>\$14,801.6</i>	<i>\$5,846.0</i>
Pesticides Program Implementation Grant	STAG	\$13,114.6	\$13,114.6	\$13,085.5	\$13,085.5
Pfiesteria	EPM	\$2,500.0	\$100.0	\$99.8	\$95.5
Planning, Analysis, and Results - IG	IG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1,299.3	\$1,200.0
Planning, Analysis, and Results - IG	Superfund	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$312.9	\$400.0
<i>Planning, Analysis, and Results - IG</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$1,612.2</i>	<i>\$1,600.0</i>
Planning and Resource Management	EPM	\$31,675.4	\$31,012.2	\$34,630.0	\$34,213.7
Planning and Resource Management	LUST	\$661.6	\$820.4	\$907.0	\$942.6
Planning and Resource Management	Superfund	\$19,560.1	\$12,247.3	\$12,056.5	\$12,116.9
<i>Planning and Resource Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$51,897.1</i>	<i>\$44,079.9</i>	<i>\$47,593.5</i>	<i>\$47,273.2</i>
Pollution Prevention Incentive Grants to States	STAG	\$5,999.5	\$5,999.5	\$5,986.3	\$5,986.3
Pollution Prevention Program	EPM	\$9,449.5	\$8,333.2	\$8,608.9	\$8,871.5
Pollution Prevention Tools and Technologies	S&T	\$30,509.5	\$27,442.0	\$24,386.7	\$21,890.0
Program Audits	IG	\$7,283.3	\$8,044.5	\$8,872.1	\$3,675.0
Program Audits	Superfund	\$2,981.1	\$2,981.1	\$3,891.3	\$1,225.0
<i>Program Audits</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$10,264.4</i>	<i>\$11,025.6</i>	<i>\$12,763.4</i>	<i>\$4,900.0</i>

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp.	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
Program Evaluation - IG	IG	\$0.0	\$1,389.4	\$2,597.1	\$11,250.0
Program Evaluation - IG	Superfund	\$0.0	\$246.9	\$244.9	\$3,750.0
<i>Program Evaluation - IG</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$1,636.3</i>	<i>\$2,842.0</i>	<i>\$15,000.0</i>
Program Integrity Investigations	IG	\$439.8	\$1,000.0	\$1,103.9	\$1,125.0
Program Integrity Investigations	Superfund	\$471.7	\$471.7	\$379.2	\$375.0
<i>Program Integrity Investigations</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$911.5</i>	<i>\$1,471.7</i>	<i>\$1,483.1</i>	<i>\$1,500.0</i>
Project XL	EPM	\$7,911.0	\$6,428.8	\$3,286.8	\$3,234.8
Public Access	EPM	\$0.0	\$27,930.0	\$12,223.1	\$17,798.7
Public Access	EPM - Reim	\$0.0	\$269.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Public Access	S&T	\$0.0	\$1,899.9	\$2,573.5	\$419.0
Public Access	Superfund	\$0.0	\$138.8	\$1,085.0	\$1,533.5
<i>Public Access</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$30,237.7</i>	<i>\$15,881.6</i>	<i>\$19,751.2</i>
Radon	EPM	\$4,253.2	\$3,793.9	\$4,945.7	\$5,095.7
Radon	S&T	\$982.2	\$438.2	\$1,617.0	\$1,637.3
<i>Radon</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$5,235.4</i>	<i>\$4,232.1</i>	<i>\$6,562.7</i>	<i>\$6,733.0</i>
RCRA Corrective Action	EPM	\$31,059.9	\$36,610.5	\$40,622.3	\$41,183.2
RCRA Permitting	EPM	\$13,325.0	\$15,724.4	\$14,309.0	\$16,889.0
RCRA State Grants	STAG	\$98,598.2	\$98,598.2	\$106,363.6	\$106,363.6
Recycling	EPM	\$4,232.9	\$3,639.3	\$3,351.1	\$3,712.7
Regional and Global Environmental Policy Development	EPM	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$2,188.4	\$2,279.4
Regional Geographic Program	EPM	\$8,358.3	\$8,352.7	\$8,192.3	\$7,421.3
Regional Haze	EPM	\$12,254.9	\$1,851.5	\$2,305.9	\$2,352.1
Regional Management	EPM	\$0.0	\$23,077.5	\$33,575.1	\$53,581.2
Regional Management	LUST	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$103.9
Regional Management	Oil Spill	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$23.8
Regional Management	Superfund	\$0.0	\$9,849.0	\$11,964.5	\$19,094.9
<i>Regional Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$32,926.5</i>	<i>\$45,539.6</i>	<i>\$72,803.8</i>
Regional Operations and Liaison	EPM	\$408.5	\$467.3	\$427.6	\$470.6

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
Regional Program Infrastructure	EPM	\$38,923.4	\$0.0	\$20,626.0	\$4,604.6
Regional Program Infrastructure	LUST	\$396.3	\$0.0	\$144.4	\$0.0
Regional Program Infrastructure	Oil Spill	\$148.4	\$0.0	\$26.2	\$0.0
Regional Program Infrastructure	IG	\$582.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Regional Program Infrastructure	Superfund	\$20,083.0	\$0.0	\$7,873.8	\$1,427.5
<i>Regional Program Infrastructure</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$60,133.6</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$28,670.4</i>	<i>\$6,032.1</i>
Regional Science and Technology	EPM	\$3,599.1	\$2,823.2	\$3,850.3	\$3,594.1
Regional Science and Technology	Superfund	\$3,097.9	\$4,512.7	\$4,362.9	\$0.0
<i>Regional Science and Technology</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$6,697.0</i>	<i>\$7,335.9</i>	<i>\$8,213.2</i>	<i>\$3,594.1</i>
Reinventing Environmental Information (REI)	EPM	\$15,054.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Reinvention Programs, Development and Coordination	EPM	\$16,308.4	\$16,795.2	\$18,546.3	\$19,896.4
Rent, Utilities and Security	EPM	\$0.0	\$176,659.7	\$189,927.2	\$202,218.7
Rent, Utilities and Security	LUST	\$0.0	\$845.6	\$717.0	\$717.0
Rent, Utilities and Security	Oil Spill	\$0.0	\$508.3	\$507.2	\$454.1
Rent, Utilities and Security	Superfund	\$0.0	\$40,562.7	\$43,995.2	\$47,175.2
<i>Rent, Utilities and Security</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$218,576.3</i>	<i>\$235,146.6</i>	<i>\$250,565.0</i>
Risk Management Plans	EPM	\$7,254.9	\$7,242.8	\$8,041.8	\$7,643.9
Rural Water Technical Assistance	EPM	\$13,050.0	\$13,987.4	\$15,154.6	\$656.9
Safe Drinking Water Research	S&T	\$45,734.6	\$47,367.6	\$51,501.6	\$46,994.7
SBREFA	EPM	\$760.3	\$777.3	\$570.6	\$603.6
Science Advisory Board	EPM	\$2,486.7	\$2,861.7	\$2,763.3	\$3,012.8
Small Business Ombudsman	EPM	\$1,110.3	\$1,120.3	\$3,000.9	\$3,106.6
Small, Minority, Women-Owned Business Assistance	EPM	\$2,064.4	\$2,188.8	\$2,040.8	\$2,152.8
Source Reduction	EPM	\$2,299.0	\$1,950.9	\$1,883.3	\$2,052.7
Source Water Protection	EPM	\$10,741.3	\$10,302.3	\$10,689.8	\$10,337.2
South Florida/Everglades	EPM	\$2,869.3	\$2,923.0	\$2,942.0	\$2,855.0
STAR Fellowships Program	S&T	\$8,941.0	\$8,952.6	\$9,704.3	\$9,708.4

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
State Multimedia Enforcement Grants	STAG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$25,000.0
State Nonpoint Source Grants	STAG	\$200,000.0	\$200,000.0	\$237,476.8	\$237,476.8
State Pesticides Enforcement Grants	STAG	\$19,511.7	\$19,911.6	\$19,867.8	\$19,867.8
State Pollution Control Grants (Section 106)	STAG	\$115,529.3	\$115,529.3	\$171,883.3	\$169,883.3
State PWSS Grants	STAG	\$93,780.5	\$93,305.5	\$93,100.2	\$93,100.2
State Toxics Enforcement Grants	STAG	\$7,364.2	\$7,364.2	\$7,348.2	\$7,348.2
State Underground Injection Control Grants	STAG	\$10,500.0	\$10,975.0	\$10,950.9	\$10,950.9
State Water Quality Cooperative Agreements	STAG	\$19,000.0	\$19,000.0	\$18,958.2	\$18,958.2
State Wetlands Program Grants	STAG	\$15,000.0	\$15,000.0	\$14,967.0	\$14,967.0
Sulfur Dioxide	EPM	\$9,993.1	\$9,863.7	\$12,158.1	\$12,495.2
Superfund - Cost Recovery	Superfund	\$30,580.6	\$30,269.1	\$29,495.5	\$28,121.1
Superfund - Justice Support	Superfund	\$29,000.0	\$28,663.5	\$28,437.3	\$28,150.0
Superfund - Maximize PRP Involvement (including reforms)	Superfund	\$88,857.0	\$82,009.6	\$81,473.8	\$78,355.7
Superfund Remedial Actions	Superfund	\$585,181.4	\$499,799.0	\$492,045.7	\$492,408.2
Superfund Removal Actions	Superfund	\$199,216.8	\$200,860.3	\$198,638.1	\$202,618.8
System Modernization	EPM	\$0.0	\$5,979.5	\$12,183.9	\$12,210.0
System Modernization	Superfund	\$0.0	\$761.0	\$1,290.3	\$1,480.0
<i>System Modernization</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	<i>\$6,740.5</i>	<i>\$13,474.2</i>	<i>\$13,690.0</i>
Technical Cooperation with Industrial and Developing Countries	EPM	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$4,162.2	\$4,125.9
Toxic Release Inventory / Right-to-Know (RtK)	EPM	\$19,799.6	\$8,913.7	\$14,060.9	\$13,547.8
Tribal General Assistance Grants	STAG	\$42,585.4	\$42,628.4	\$52,469.7	\$52,469.7
Tropospheric Ozone Research	S&T	\$18,100.4	\$6,273.7	\$6,551.0	\$6,786.0
U.S. - Mexico Border	EPM	\$4,929.4	\$4,142.3	\$4,213.7	\$4,236.5
UIC Program	EPM	\$9,412.2	\$9,594.9	\$10,836.9	\$11,199.2
Underground Storage Tanks (UST)	EPM	\$6,378.3	\$6,203.9	\$7,043.4	\$7,190.2

**Key Program Summary
(Dollars in thousands)**

Key Program	Approp.	1999 Enacted	2000 Enacted	2001 Enacted	2002 Request
UST State Grants	STAG	\$10,544.7	\$11,944.7	\$11,918.4	\$11,918.4
Waste Combustion	EPM	\$6,890.3	\$4,438.3	\$4,302.2	\$5,423.1
Waste Minimization	EPM	\$2,413.2	\$1,913.3	\$1,979.9	\$2,120.0
Water Infrastructure: Alaska Native Villages	STAG	\$30,000.0	\$30,000.0	\$34,923.0	\$34,923.0
Water Infrastructure: Boston Harbor	STAG	\$50,000.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Water Infrastructure: Bristol County	STAG	\$2,610.0	\$2,000.0	\$1,935.7	\$0.0
Water Infrastructure: Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CW-SRF)	STAG	\$1,350,000.0	\$1,345,421.3	\$1,347,030.0	\$850,000.0
Water Infrastructure: Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DW-SRF)	STAG	\$775,000.0	\$820,000.0	\$823,185.0	\$823,185.0
Water Infrastructure: Mexico Border	STAG	\$50,000.0	\$50,000.0	\$74,835.0	\$74,835.0
Water Infrastructure: New Orleans	STAG	\$6,525.0	\$3,800.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Water Infrastructure: Sewer Overflow Control Grants	STAG	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$450,000.0
Water Quality Criteria and Standards	EPM	\$19,110.9	\$18,545.1	\$18,380.6	\$18,787.5
Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment	EPM	\$11,446.8	\$9,762.6	\$11,166.9	\$11,309.2
Watershed Research	S&T	\$10,297.5	\$7,481.8	\$7,872.1	\$5,852.9
Wetlands	EPM	\$15,694.9	\$15,730.0	\$16,959.8	\$17,291.2

NON-APPROPRIATED FUNDS

Overview

Non-appropriated funds are monies which pay for discreet Agency activities supported by fees. These funds are available to the Agency and do not require an appropriation. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has one active account for such non-appropriated funds, as well as an inactive account. These are 1) the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund and 2) the Revolving Fund for Certification and Other Services (now inactive).

The 1988 amendments to FIFRA required the Agency to review and reregister all pesticides that were registered before November 1984. To supplement appropriated funding for the Pesticide Registration Program, two types of fees were established on the pesticide industry, Federal, state and local governments: (1) a Reregistration Fee and (2) an annual Maintenance Fee. Fee receipts are deposited into the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund and made available to EPA without annual appropriation. For this reason, EPA does not request dollars from this fund, commonly called the "FIFRA Fund", in the annual President's Budget. The Reregistration Fee expired in 1992, but Maintenance Fees will continue until September 30, 2001. From 1999 to 2000, \$16,000,000 in annual Maintenance Fees were collected and in 2001, \$14,000,000 will be collected. The Maintenance Fee expires at the end of FY 2001 and no fees will be collected in 2002. EPA will continue to fund the Pesticide Reregistration Program through its annual appropriations.

The Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) of 1963 requires EPA to establish tolerance levels and exemptions for pesticide residues on raw agricultural commodities. Under section 408 of FFDCA, the Agency is authorized to collect fees to recover the costs of processing petitions for these pesticide tolerances. The fees are paid by companies/registrants requesting establishment of a permanent or temporary pesticide tolerance at the time of the request and work is not begun until verification of the fees receipt is made. Fee receipts, until 1997, were deposited into the Revolving Fund for Certification and Other Services, commonly called the "Tolerance Fund" which are available to EPA without an annual appropriation.

With enactment of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, fee receipts are now deposited into the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund. FQPA also requires the reassessment of all pesticide tolerances established before FQPA enactment. This new task is to be supported in the aggregate by a restructured tolerance fee to be established through a rulemaking, which will cover both tolerance petitions and tolerance reassessments. Appropriations language has prohibited the Agency from finalizing the rule in FY 2000 and FY 2001. In 2002, the Agency expects to issue the final rule with an effective date no later than March 31, 2002, and to collect \$51,000,000 that year. EPA expects to use \$14,000,000 of those funds to support the tolerance reassessment and assessment programs for the second half of FY 2002. The first half of the year, the programs will be supported through appropriated funds.

Program and Activity Highlights

Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund

Beginning in 1997, this non-appropriated revolving fund included \$2,000,000 in new tolerance fees collected under the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996, plus the collection of the annual Pesticide Maintenance Fees. Pesticide Maintenance fees expire at the end of FY 2001, and in FY 2002, annual Maintenance fee collections will be \$0. In 2002, EPA will promulgate the needed rules to increase tolerance fees to ensure that the tolerance setting process will be as self-supporting as possible.

The Agency's emphasis on tolerance reassessments will continue in 2002 and is reflected in the appropriated budget request to complete an additional 26%, for a cumulative 66%, of the 9,721 tolerances that must be reassessed. In addition, the Agency continues to establish tolerances for pesticide residues in or on food for feed crops in the United States under The Food Quality Protection Act of 1996.

Revolving Fund for Certification and Other Services

The Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 requires new tolerance fees be deposited into the Registration and Expedited Processing Revolving (FIFRA) Fund. The Revolving Fund for Certification and Other Services has been closed out.

EPA USER FEE PROGRAM

In FY 2002, EPA will have four (4) user fee programs in operation. These user fee programs are as follows:

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

This fee is authorized by the Clean Air Act of 1990 and is managed by the Office of Air and Radiation. Fee collections began in August 1992. This fee is imposed on manufacturers of light-duty vehicles, light and heavy trucks, and motorcycles. It covers the cost of certifying new engines and vehicles and monitoring compliance of in-use engines and vehicles. In FY 2002, EPA expects to collect \$11.0 million from this fee.

- **Pesticide Tolerance Fee**

The Agency expects to issue a final tolerance fee rule on October 1, 2001 with an effective date of March 31, 2002. EPA anticipates collecting \$51,000,000 in fees in FY 2002. A tolerance is the maximum legal limit of a pesticide residue in and on food commodities and animal feed. In 1954, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) authorized the collection of fees for the establishment of tolerances on raw agricultural commodities and in food commodities. These fees supplement annual appropriated funds for EPA's Tolerance Program and are also deposited into the FIFRA Fund. Annually the fees are adjusted by the percentage change in the Federal employee General Schedule (GS) pay scale. In 2002, the Agency expects to replace this fee with a more comprehensive cost-recovery fee. The FFDCA, as amended by FQPA, mandates that EPA must require the payment of such fees as will, in the aggregate, be sufficient to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate service for establishing tolerances. A proposed Tolerance Fee Rule was published in 1999.

- **Pre-manufacturing Notification Fee**

Since 1989, this fee has been collected for the review and processing of new chemical Pre-Manufacturing Notifications (PMN) submitted to EPA by the chemical industry. They are paid at the time of submission of the PMN for review by EPA's Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances. PMN fees are authorized by the Toxic Substances Control Act and contain a cap on the amount the Agency may charge for a PMN review. EPA expects to collect \$3,000,000 in PMN fees in 2002 under the existing fee structure. The removal of the statutory fee cap is discussed below.

- **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 2002 and subsequent years.

User Fee Proposals

- **Pesticide Registration Fee**

The Agency will resume collecting the pesticide registration fee on October 1, 2001 and deposit the resources in the general fund. EPA will publish a notice in the Federal Register notifying registrants that these fees will resume and updating the fee rates to reflect the increase in the General Schedule pay rates since the rule was suspended. The Agency expects to collect \$25,000,000 in 2002 from the reinstatement of Pesticide Registration Fees that Congress had suspended through 2001. Through such fees, manufacturers of new pesticide products share the cost of ensuring that authorized uses of these products do not pose unreasonable risk to human health and the environment.

- **Removal of the Pre-manufacturing Notification Fee**

The Agency is proposing authorizing and appropriations language to remove the statutory cap on the existing Pre-Manufacturing Notification (PMN) fees to allow the Agency to cover the full cost of the PMN program. The authorizing language would remove the current statutory cap in the Toxic Substances Control Act on the total fee that EPA is allowed to charge. The fee change would be subject to an appropriations language trigger that would allow the fees to be counted as discretionary. Under the current fee structure, the Agency will collect \$3,000,000 in FY 2002. The increase in PMN fees will be deposited into a special fund in the U.S. Treasury, available to the Agency, subject to appropriation. In FY 2002 after the anticipated rulemaking, the Agency estimates collections of an additional \$4,000,000, an amount which will increase to \$8,000,000 in the following years, once fee collection is fully implemented.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

In FY 2002, the Agency begins its fifth year of operation of the Working Capital Fund (WCF). A WCF is a revolving fund authorized by law to finance a cycle of operations, where the costs of goods and services provided are charged to the users on a fee-for-service basis. The funds received are available without fiscal year limitation, to continue operations and to replace capital equipment. EPA's WCF was implemented under the authority of Section 403 of the Government Management Reform Act of 1994 and EPA's FY 1997 Appropriations Act. Permanent WCF authority was contained in the FY 1998 Appropriations Act.

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

Two Agency services, begun in FY 1997 will continue into FY 2002. These are the Agency's computer center and telecommunications operations, managed by the National Technology Services Division (NTSD), Research Triangle Park, North Carolina and Agency postage costs, managed by the Office of Administration, Washington, DC. The Agency's FY 2002 budget request includes resources for these two activities in each National Program Manager's submission, totaling approximately \$134 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.

THE CUSTOMER SERVICE PROGRAM

Background

EPA's Customer Service Program (CSP) was established in 1993, immediately after President Clinton signed Executive Order 12862, "Setting Customer Service Standards." The Customer Service staff is located in the Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation within the Office of the Administrator. CSP staff coordinate and support all aspects of the Program.. Directly or through contracts staff support EPA's Customer Service Steering Committee (CSSC), the group that sets CSP policy, its 11 work and process groups, and customer service coordinators across the Agency; coordinate an annual conference in partnership with a regional host and/or federal partner; develop and disseminate training and measurement support tools and techniques; and gather and share best practices and success stories to speed adoption of customer service improvements. By involving approximately 400 individuals from staff and management through CSSC work groups and office/region/laboratory Customer Service Councils, the CSP leverages its two person staff to implement the Agency's Customer Service Strategy.

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

What Improved Customer Service Will Achieve

During October 2000, the CSP received 22 office and regional plans for building world class customer service across the Agency. CSP staff will track progress and provide assistance to program offices and regions to fully implement their plans over the next several years. The main elements of the plans follow.

- VI. Vision/Leadership - Establish a clear vision of how providing outstanding customer service fits into the Agency's mission and a method to communicate this picture of the future throughout the organization.
- VII. Feedback/Measurement - Formally assess and document the satisfaction of key external and/or internal customers, make appropriate changes as a result, and develop objective measures to track progress.
- VIII. Sharing/Benchmarking - Investigate, discover and implement practices from the best public and private sector service leaders.

- IX. Accountability/Recognition. - Hold everyone responsible for providing service excellence and recognize outstanding efforts.
- X. Personal Development - Provide opportunities for as many people as possible to attend at least one customer service workshop.

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

1. Be helpful! Listen to your customers!
2. Respond to all phone calls by the end of the next business day.
3. Respond to all correspondence within 10 business days.
4. Make clear, timely, accurate information accessible.
5. Work collaboratively with partners to improve all products and services.
6. Seek and use customers' ideas and input!

The Customer Service Program Strategy adopted by the CSSC in the fall of 1998 focuses on:

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

Because customer feedback and satisfaction measurement are critical underpinnings to the overall program, in 1998 the CSP developed "Hearing the Voice of the Customer - Customer Feedback and Customer Satisfaction Measurement Guidelines." CSP sponsors workshops to train advisor/consultants to assist people across the Agency to use the Guidelines to obtain and use customer input. All feedback instruments will continue to be cleared through the OMB under the CSP generic Information Collection Request (ICR) for customer satisfaction surveys which is approved through March 2003. The CSP also

encourages organizations to establish systems to document complaints and comments, track responses, and make improvements.

The CSP also coordinated EPA's participation in the 1999 and 2000 Government-wide America Customer Satisfaction Index Survey and has performed follow-up surveys to clarify the findings. To examine the customer service aspects of the information provision part of its mission, EPA chose to focus on Internet users because web pages are representative of all EPA programs, Internet is becoming increasingly more accessible to the general public (in 1999, 50 % of the public; five years prior only 30%), and increasing public access to environmental information is a strategic goal of the Agency. EPA's customer segment, as a surrogate for the American people, is reference librarians in public libraries across the nation. The Agency continually makes changes to improve its websites.

Over 200 EPA staff are certified to facilitate training across the Agency. Many are involved in delivering Forging the Links (an EPA-specific workshop that ties service improvement to better mission performance) as well as customer skills courses. Through sharing benchmarking/best practices information and by convening the only government sponsored annual customer service conference, the CSP supplements training opportunities. The annual conferences bring outstanding speakers, best in class service deliverers, EPA, federal and state employees and managers together to share information and speed adoption of best practices.

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

Expected Results

In support of the Customer Service Executive Order and various Presidential memorandums, in FY 2002, the Agency will maintain leadership and coordination of the National CSP. The services and expected results follow.

- policy and guidance provision will better link customer service excellence with achieving EPA's mission;
- communication and liaison with Senior managers and other federal and state partners will assure consistent and rapid follow-up;
- best practices research and benchmarking assistance will lead to continued improvements in processes, products and services;
- direct CSP staff assistance and contractual support to work groups, program and regional offices will speed implementation of the 2000 customer service plans;
- customer service and related training opportunities will increase the customer focus of the Agency;
- continuous support for feedback and measurement activities will prevent duplicative surveys and speed survey clearances;

- a fifth National Customer Service Conference will enable EPA and its partners to meet, share, and learn from top performing agencies and companies how to apply their knowledge to improve customer service;
- increased access to CSP information via the Intra and Internet and a gateway to other customer service information will enable more people to understand the benefits of world class customer service; and
- service excellence will become a core value at EPA.

FTE: 3.1 Funding: \$150,000 (request)

COST AND BENEFITS OF ECONOMICALLY SIGNIFICANT RULES IN FY 2001 OR FY 2002

Goal 2: Clean and Safe Water

National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: The Ground Water Rule

The 1996 amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act require EPA to develop regulations that require disinfection of ground water systems ~~As necessary~~ to protect the public health (' 1412(b)(8)). EPA proposed the Ground Water Rule (GWR) on May 10, 2000. The Proposed GWR specifies conditions when corrective action (including disinfection) is necessary to protect consumers who receive water from ground water systems from microbial pathogens. Although ground water has historically been considered to be free of microbial contamination, recent research indicates that some ground water resources are a source of waterborne disease. Most cases of waterborne disease are characterized by gastrointestinal symptoms that rarely require medical treatment in healthy individuals. However, these same symptoms are much more serious and can be fatal for persons in sensitive subpopulations (such as, children, the elderly, and persons with compromised immune systems). The total estimated annual cost of the proposed GWR is \$183 million annually. The total estimated benefits of the proposed GWR are based upon avoiding 115,000 illnesses and 15 deaths annually and have a monetized value of \$205 million. EPA plans to promulgate the GWR in November 2001.

National Primary Drinking Water Regulation: Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment (LT2ESWT) Rule and Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts (DBP) Rule

The LT2ESWT rule is being developed in conjunction with the Stage 2 DBP rule. The Agency's work on these two rules will include an expanded focus on risk analysis to determine what are the most significant risks and the acceptable balance among competing risks. For instance, while disinfectants are effective in reducing microbial risk, they react with natural organic matter in the water to form DBPs. Several of the DBPs have been shown to cause adverse health effects in laboratory animals. The optimal balance will adequately control risks from pathogens, simultaneously control DBPs to acceptable levels, and ensure that costs of water treatment are commensurate with public health benefits. The cost-benefit analyses for these two rules are still under development at this time; however, preliminary estimates show that the cost of each of these rules may exceed the \$100 million benchmark for economic significance. Each will be a major rule. Proposal of these rules is expected in November 2001.

National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Radon

Pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), as amended in 1996, EPA is required to publish a Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG) and Final National Primary Drinking Water Regulation (NPDWR) for radon.

The unique framework for the regulations, outlined in the 1996 SDWA Amendments, recognizes that the public health problem from radon in indoor air typically far exceeds the health risks from radon in

drinking water and that targeting indoor radon exposures is the most cost-effective way for states to reduce radon health risks. The proposed new regulation will provide two options to states and water systems for reducing public health risks from radon. Under the first option, states can choose to implement a multimedia mitigation (MMM) program to address the health risks from indoor radon while water systems reduce radon levels in drinking water to the higher, alternative maximum contaminant level (AMCL) of 4,000 pCi/l (picoCuries per liter, a standard unit of radiation) or lower, ensuring protection from the highest risks from radon in drinking water. EPA is encouraging the states to adopt this approach as the most cost-effective way to achieve the greatest radon reduction. If a state does not elect this option, the second option would require water systems in that state to either reduce radon in drinking water levels to the MCL (300 pCi/l) or develop a local indoor radon program and reduce levels in drinking water to 4,000 pCi/l.

The total annual costs of compliance with the proposal MCL of 300 pCi/l for radon in drinking water are estimated at \$407 million in 1997 dollars. In complying with 300 pCi/l, an estimated 62.0 fatal and 3.6 non-fatal cancer cases are avoided each year. Because EPA anticipates that most states and systems will choose to comply with the AMCL of 4,000 pCi/l and implement a MMM program, EPA expects the total annual costs of compliance with the radon rule to be significantly less than \$407 million. If most states and systems comply with the AMCL and implement a MMM program, the total annual cost of compliance is an estimated \$80 million. The quantifiable benefits of the health risk reduction are estimated as \$362 million annually for either scenario. EPA expects compliance with the AMCL and implementation of a MMM program to achieve equal or greater risk reduction than is expected with strict compliance with the MCL. EPA plans to promulgate a final rule in 2001.

NPDES Requirements for Sanitary Sewers and SSOs

EPA will be proposing to clarify NPDES permit requirements for municipal sanitary sewer collection systems and sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs). The proposal would apply NPDES requirements to municipal satellite collection systems. In addition, the proposal would establish standard permit conditions for municipal sanitary sewer collection systems. The benefits include benefits associated with improvements in water quality and the benefits associated with improved management, operation, and maintenance. The benefits associated with water quality include: reduced human exposure to raw sewage leading to fewer cases of illness; increased opportunities for recreation, tourism, and fishing; and less property damage due to basement backups. Benefits due to better management, operation, and maintenance are associated with using improved practices that will enhance day-to-day performance and extend the life of systems.

Goal 3: Safe Food

Pesticide Tolerance Reassessment Program (Proposed/Final - involves a series of individual chemical specific regulatory actions that will be issued over the next several years).

As required by the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA), EPA is reassessing all of the pesticide tolerances and tolerance exemptions for raw and processed foods established prior to August 3, 1996, to determine whether they meet the “reasonable certainty of no harm” standard of the Federal Food,

Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), as amended by the FQPA. FFDCA section 408(q) requires that EPA conduct this reassessment on a phased 10-year schedule. Based on its reassessments, EPA will take a series of individual chemical specific regulatory actions to modify or revoke those tolerance actions that do not meet the reasonable certainty of no harm standard.

Any analysis of potential cost impacts will be conducted as part of the individual regulatory action, but few, if any, of the individual actions are expected to be considered economically significant under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 because of the provision allowing for sale of existing stocks under FQPA. The FFDCA allows EPA to consider benefits only in a very limited manner in determining whether to retain or modify a pesticide tolerance. Actions taken as a result of the tolerance reassessment program will ensure that dietary exposures to pesticides will be safe, taking into account aggregate exposure from food, water and non-occupational sources, and considering the cumulative effects of substances have a common mode of toxicity.

Endocrine Disruptor Screening and Testing Program (Proposed Action, June 2002).

The FQPA requires EPA to screen pesticides for estrogenic effects on human health, and the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) authorizes EPA to screen chemicals found in drinking water sources in a similar manner. EPA anticipates issuing a final policy statement that would set forth EPA's Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program and the procedures to be followed by regulated entities and the Agency. In October 1996, EPA established the Endocrine Disruptor Screening and Testing Advisory Committee (EDSTAC) to provide advice and counsel to the Agency in implementing the screening and testing program. Comprised of 43 members representing industry, government, environmental and public health groups, labor academia, and other interested stakeholders, the EDSTAC held its final meeting in June 1998. The Committee considered human health and ecological effects; estrogenic, androgenic, anti-estrogenic, anti-androgenic and thyroid effects in its deliberations and extended its scope to include industrial chemicals, drinking water contaminants and important mixtures as well as pesticides. After considering the EDSTAC's final report, EPA published a proposed policy statement setting forth the Screening Program on December 28, 1998 (63 FR 71542). In the final policy statement, EPA will describe the screens and tests that it will require as part of the Program. It also will address certain issues related to implementing the Program. The major actions in 2001-2003 will be the standardization and validation of assays in the screening battery and the completion of the priority setting system.

It is too early to project the costs and benefits of this program accurately. However, as a rough estimate, the screening battery is estimated to cost \$200,000 per chemical. It is too early to determine how many chemicals will be screened in Tier 1 much less tested in Tier 2 (there are potentially 87,000 chemicals that could go through at least Tier 1, though some could be waived due to their chemical composition). It is also too early to tell the benefits-that is how many chemicals will be identified that are endocrine disruptors and their exposure reduced either by formal risks management or by voluntary exposure reduction or product substitution.

Goal 4: Preventing Pollution in Communities Homes and Workplaces

Lead-Based Paint Activities; Training and Certification for Renovation and Remodeling (Proposed Rule, August 2001).

Pursuant to TSCA section 402(c)(3), this rule would propose amendments to the regulations codified at 40 CFR 745 subpart L to apply the regulations to renovation and remodeling activities in target housing. Under TSCA section 402(c)(2), EPA must use the results of a study conducted that looked at the extent to which persons engaged in renovation and remodeling activities in target housing are exposed to lead in the conduct of such activities or disturb lead and create a lead-based paint hazard. EPA has consulted with interested parties as required to determine which categories of renovation and remodeling activities require training and certification, and the proposed rule would also include the required explanation of the basis for any determination that any renovation and remodeling category does not require certification.

Although the analysis is not yet complete, this rule is expected to be classified as “economically significant” under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866. Costs will be estimated in the draft economic impact analyses that will be prepared for the proposed rule. In addition, since benefits depend on private sector implementation of certain lead hazard abatement activities which are not mandated by any of these rules, benefits will be difficult to quantify. To the extent that they can be estimated, however, they will be included in the draft economic impact analyses that will be prepared for the proposed rule.

Lead-Based Paint Activities; Building and Structures; Amendments to the Training, Accreditation, and Certification Rule and Model State Plan Rule (Proposed rule, June 2002).

Pursuant to TSCA section 402, this rule would propose amendments to the regulations codified at 40 CFR 745 to ensure that individuals engaged in lead-based paint activities related to building and structures that create lead-based paint hazards are properly trained; that training programs are accredited; and that contractors engaged in such activities are certified. On August 29, 1996 when EPA finalized regulations for lead-based paint activities in target housing and child-occupied facilities, EPA indicated that it was delaying finalizing regulations for lead-based paint activities in buildings and structures (61 FR 45778). Based on comments received on the 1994 proposed rule, which had included requirements for target housing and buildings and structures, EPA determined that it needed time to gain additional information before completing the regulations for buildings and structures (59 FR 45672).

This regulation is currently under development and pre-option selection, so estimated costs and benefits have yet to be determined. Cost and benefits will be estimated in the draft economic impact analyses that will be prepared for any resulting proposed rule.

CHARGING ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT COSTS TO ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS

In response to Government Performance and Results Act and Managerial Cost Accounting requirements, the Agency has initiated an effort to accurately reflect all costs associated with implementing environmental goals where there is a reasonably clear benefit to that goal. Specifically, beginning in 1999, and increasing in 2000, the Agency has charged management and administrative costs to environmental goals to more accurately captures the costs of supporting environmental programs. The Agency believes that this will result in more reliable information for internal and external reporting.

In the FY 2001 Annual Plan/Congressional Justification, FY 2000 Enacted and FY 2001 requested levels reflect a realignment of resources from Agency Management to the agency's other strategic goals where there is a readily identifiable cost that clearly contributes to the achievement of those goals.

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

Dollars in Thousands	FY 2001	FY 2002
Rent, Utilities and Security	\$235,147	\$248,264
Administrative Services	\$137,169	\$141,240
Legal Services	\$39,526	\$42,114

**FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)**

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/ Objective
Air Resource Assistance	Clean Air Act, §103	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA	S/L monitoring and data collection activities in support of the establishment of a PM _{2.5} monitoring network and associated program costs.	\$42,500.0	\$42,500.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1
Air Resource Assistance	Clean Air Act, §103	Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states);	Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA; Supporting training for CAA section 302(b) air pollution control agency staff; Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to control interstate air pollution	\$7,982.2	\$5,000.0	Goal 1, Obj. 1

**FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)**

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/ Objective
Air Resource Assistance	Clean Air Act, Sections 103, 105, 106	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA; Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states); Interstate air quality control region designated pursuant to section 107 of the CAA or of implementing section 176A, or section 184 NOTE: only the Ozone Transport Commission is eligible as of 2/1/99	Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program support costs; Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA; Supporting training for CAA section 302(b) air pollution control agency staff; Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to control interstate air pollution	\$158,057.9	161,040.1	Goal 1, Obj. All

FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/Objective
Air Tribal Assistance	Clean Air Act, Sections 103 and 105; Tribal Cooperative Agreements (TCA) FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	Tribes; Intertribal Consortia; State/ Tribal college or university	Conducting air quality assessment activities to determine a tribe's need to develop a CAA program; Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program costs; Supporting training for CAA for federally recognized tribes	\$11,044.5	\$11,044.5	Goal 1, Obj. 1 Goal 1, Obj. 2
Radon	Toxic Substances Control Act, Sections 10 and 306; TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	State Agencies, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in the development and implementation of programs for the assessment and mitigation of radon	\$8,139.9	\$8,139.9	Goal 4, Obj. 4
Water Pollution Control Agency Resource Supplementation	FWPCA, as amended, §106; TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Tribes and Intertribal Consortia, and Interstate Agencies	Develop and carry out surface and ground water pollution control programs, including NPDES permits, TMDL's, WQ standards, monitoring, NPS control and UWA activities.	\$171,883.3	\$169,883.3	Goal 2, Obj. 2
Nonpoint Source (NPS)	FWPCA, as amended, § 319(h); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement EPA-approved State and Tribal nonpoint source management programs and fund priority projects as selected by the State.	\$237,476.8	\$237,476.8	Goal 2, Obj. 3

FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/ Objective
Wetlands Program Development	FWPCA, as amended, §104 (b)(3); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Interstate Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, and Non-Profit Organizations	To develop new wetland programs or enhance existing programs for the protection, management and restoration of wetland resources.	\$14,967.0	\$14,967.0	Goal 2, Obj. 2
Water Quality Cooperative Agreements	FWPCA, as amended, §104(b)(3); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Non-Profit Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, and Interstate Organizations	Creation of unique and innovative approaches to pollution control and prevention requirements associated with wet weather activities, AFOs, TMDLs, and source water protection.	\$18,958.2	\$18,958.2	Goal 2, Obj. 2
Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	Safe Drinking Water Act, §1443(a); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Tribes, and Intertribal Consortia	Assistance to implement and enforce National Primary Drinking Water Regulations to ensure the safety of the Nation's drinking water resources and to protect public health.	\$93,100.2	\$93,100.2	Goal 2, Obj.1
Underground Injection Control [UIC]	Safe Drinking Water Act, § 1443(b); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement and enforce regulations that protect underground sources of drinking water by controlling Class I-V underground injection wells.	\$10,950.9	\$10,950.9	Goal 2, Obj. 1

FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/ Objective
Beaches Grants	Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000; TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	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.	\$1,995.6 (part of Section 106 Grants)	\$2,000.0	Goal 2, Obj. 1
Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	Resource Conservation Recovery Act, § 3011; FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Development & Implementation of Hazardous Waste Programs	\$106,363.6	\$106,363.6	Goal 4, Obj. 5 Goal 5, Obj.1 & 2 Goal 9, Obj. 1
Underground Storage Tanks [UST]	Resource Conservation Recovery Act Sections 8001 and 2007(f) and FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	State, Tribes and Intertribal Consortia	Demonstration Grants, Surveys and Training; Develop & implement UST program	\$11,918.4	\$11,918.4	Goal 5, Obj.2

FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/ Objective
Pesticides Program Implementation	The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act § 20 & 23; the FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Tribes and Intertribal Consortia	Assist states and tribes to develop and implement pesticide programs, including programs that protect workers, ground-water, and endangered species from pesticide risks , and other pesticide management programs designated by the Administrator; develop and implement programs for certification and training of pesticide applicators; develop Integrated Pesticides Management (IPM) programs; support pesticides education, outreach, and sampling efforts for tribes.	\$13,085.5	\$13,085.5	Goal 4, Obj. 1
Lead	Toxic Substances Control Act, § 404 (g); TSCA 10; FY2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	To support and assist states and tribes to develop and carry out authorized state lead abatement certification, training and accreditation programs; and to assist tribes in development of lead programs.	\$13,682.0	\$13,682.0	Goal 4, Obj. 2

FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/ Objective
Toxic Substances Compliance Monitoring**	Toxic Substances Control Act, §28(a) and 404 (g); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in developing and implementing toxic substances enforcement programs for PCBs, asbestos, and lead-based paint	\$5,138.8	\$5,138.8	Goal 9, Obj. 1
Pesticide Enforcement	FIFRA § 23(a)(1); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in implementing cooperative pesticide enforcement programs	\$19,867.9	\$19,867.9	Goal 9, Obj. 1

FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/ Objective
Information Integration	As appropriate, Clean Air Act, Sec. 103; Clean Water Act, Sec. 104; Solid Waste Disposal Act, Sec. 8001; FIFRA, Sec 20; TSCA, Sec. 10 and 28; Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, Sec. 203; Safe Drinking Water Act, Sec. 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); Pollution Prevention Act, Sec. 6605; FY 2002 Appropriations Act.	Final determination still to be made, but may include 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.	N/A	\$25,000.0	Goal 7 Obj. 1

FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/ Objective
Pollution Prevention	Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, §6605; TSCA 10; FY2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	To assist state and tribal programs to promote the use of source reduction techniques by businesses and to promote other Pollution Prevention activities at the state and tribal levels.	\$5,986.3	\$5,986.3	Goal 4, Obj. 5

FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/ Objective
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 FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377)	State, Territories, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Multi-jurisdictional Organizations	Assist in developing innovative sector-based, multi-media, or single-media approaches to enforcement and compliance assurance	\$2,209.3	\$2,209.3	Goal 9, Obj.2

FY 2002 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients*	Eligible Uses	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	FY2002 Goal/ Objective
Multi-media Enforcement State Grants	FY 2002 Appropriations Act.	States, Tribes, and other entities to be determined.	Media-specific and multi-media funding to states and tribes for compliance assurance activities including compliance assistance and incentives, inspections, and enforcement actions.	N/A	\$25,000.0	Goal 9, Obj. 1
Indian General Assistance Program	Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; TCA FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-377).	Tribal Governments and Intertribal Consortia	Plan, develop and establish Tribal environmental protection programs.	\$52,469.7	\$52,469.7	Goal 4, Obj 7

* The Recipients listed in this column reflect assumptions in the FY 2002 Budget Request in terms of expected and/or anticipated eligible recipients.

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