



U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Catalyst for Improving the Environment

Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations as of March 31, 2010

Report No. 10-N-0114

April 28, 2010

Abbreviations

BOSC	Board of Scientific Counselors
CCSP	Climate Change Science Program
CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System
CMM	Contracts Management Manual
COR	Contracting Officer Representative
CSO	Combined Sewer Overflows
CWS	Community Water Systems
EAS	Enterprise Architecture Strategic
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPAAR	Environmental Protection Agency Acquisition Regulation
FCID	Food Commodity Intake Database
FMFIA	Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act
GAO	Government Accountability Office
GCRP	Global Change Research Program
ICR	Information Collection Rule
MATS	Management Audit Tracking System
NHANES	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey
OA	Office of the Administrator
OAM	Office of Acquisition Management
OAR	Office of Air and Radiation
OARM	Office of Administration and Resources Management
OCFO	Office of the Chief Financial Officer
OECA	Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance
OIG	Office of Inspector General
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPP	Office of Pesticide Programs
OPPTS	Office of Prevention, Pesticides, and Toxic Substances
ORD	Office of Research and Development
OSWER	Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response
OW	Office of Water
QAP	Quality Assessment Plans
POTW	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
RCT	Research Coordination Team
RSL	Regional Science Liaison
SAB	Science Advisory Board
SNC	Significant Non-Compliance
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
WA	Work Assignments



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

April 28, 2010

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations as of March 31, 2010
Report No. 10-N-0114

TO: Deputy Administrator
Assistant Administrators
Regional Administrators
General Counsel
Chief Financial Officer
Associate Administrators

Attached is the semiannual Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations as of March 31, 2010, prepared by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This Compendium fulfills the requirement of the Inspector General Act, as amended, to identify reports containing significant recommendations described in previous Semiannual Reports to Congress on which corrective actions have not been completed.

This Compendium, issued in conjunction with the Semiannual Report to Congress and as a separate document to EPA leadership, is part of the OIG's follow-up strategy to promote robust internal controls. Follow-up is done in collaboration with the EPA Office of the Chief Financial Officer and EPA Audit Follow-up Coordinators. The goal is to improve overall audit management by helping EPA managers gain a greater awareness of outstanding agreed-to commitments for action on OIG report recommendations. Implementing these recommendations will correct weaknesses, reduce vulnerabilities to risk, and leverage opportunities for improved performance.

The significance of audit follow-up, as described by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-50, is enhanced by the public's expectation for greater transparency and a heightened interest by Congress in realizing potential opportunities for improvement in the Federal Government. The OIG's previous Compendium reports appear to be having the intended effect of increasing Agency awareness and action on unimplemented OIG recommendations.

We selected the unimplemented recommendations listed in this Compendium based on their significance and their status in EPA's Management Audit Tracking System. In addition, some unimplemented recommendations were identified through review by the OIG. Exclusion from the Compendium does not indicate the OIG determined the corrective action to be complete for a recommendation. However, it is a goal of the OIG to verify as many significant recommendations reported as being complete as possible, through other reviews.

According to OMB Circular A-50, audit follow-up is a shared responsibility between the Agency and the OIG. We will continue to identify unimplemented recommendations for attention and action, as well as remove the listing of recommendations as unimplemented when appropriate information of completion is provided. We hope that you find this tool useful in identifying ways to further improve Agency operations.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill A. Roderick", written over a horizontal line.

Bill A. Roderick
Acting Inspector General

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Unimplemented Recommendations.....	4
<i>OIG Report Number</i>	
09-P-0242	4
09-P-0232	6
09-P-0229	7
09-P-0223	8
09-P-0203	9
09-P-0197	10
09-P-0089	12
08-P-0266	15
08-P-0141	16
08-1-0032	17
2007-P-00036	18
2007-P-00027	20
2006-P-00013	21
2006-P-00009	22
2006-P-00007	23
2005-P-00010	24
2004-P-00030	26
2002-P-00012	27
Appendix A: OIG Reports with Unimplemented Recommendations by Program Office	28
Appendix B: Unimplemented Recommendations: 10/28/09 Compendium Compared to Current Compendium	30

Introduction

Purpose

The purpose of this Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations is to highlight for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) management significant recommendations that remain unimplemented past the due date agreed to by EPA and the Office of Inspector General (OIG). The Compendium satisfies part of Section 5(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, which requires each Inspector General to issue semiannual reports to Congress and include “an identification of each significant recommendation described in previous semiannual reports on which corrective action has not been completed.” This Compendium is being issued in conjunction with the *OIG Semiannual Report to Congress for the reporting period October 1, 2009, through March 31, 2010*. The OIG intends to issue this Compendium each semiannual reporting period. The Compendium will keep Agency management informed about EPA’s outstanding commitments and its progress in taking agreed-upon corrective actions on OIG recommendations to improve programs and operations.

Background

EPA’s OIG issues recommendations to improve the economy, efficiency, effectiveness, or integrity of EPA programs and operations. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-50, *Audit Followup*, affirms that corrective action taken by management on resolved findings and recommendations is essential to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of government operations, and that audit follow-up is a shared responsibility of agency management officials and auditors.

OMB Circular A-50 requires each agency to establish systems to ensure the prompt and proper resolution and implementation of audit recommendations. EPA Order 2750, based on OMB Circular A-50, details EPA’s policy and procedures on audit follow-up. The Chief Financial Officer is the Agency Audit Follow-up Official and has responsibility for Agency-wide audit resolution, ensuring Action Officials implement corrective actions. EPA uses the Management Audit Tracking System (MATS) to track information on Agency implementation of OIG recommendations. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer maintains and operates MATS. MATS receives report data, such as the report title and issue date, from the Inspector General Enterprise Management System.

The Audit Management Official in the Office of the Administrator, the Office of General Counsel, and each Assistant Administrator or Regional Administrator office designates an Audit Follow-up Coordinator for that office. Audit Follow-up Coordinators are responsible for quality assurance and analysis of tracking system data. When corrective actions in response to recommendations in an audit report are completed and certified, the Agency should inactivate that report’s MATS file. The Audit Follow-up Coordinator then no longer has to track the report. The Agency self-certifies that corrective actions are completed. The Agency is also responsible under the Inspector General Act for reporting on audit reports for which final

corrective action has not been taken 1 year or more after the Agency's management decision on corrective actions to be taken in response to findings and recommendations.

This is the fourth edition of the Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations. It identifies 34 unimplemented recommendations from 18 reports compared to 44 unimplemented recommendations from 26 reports identified in the third edition for the period ending September 30, 2009. Of the 34 unimplemented recommendations currently reported, 10 from 7 reports are continuing, and 24 from 11 reports are newly identified. Also, we removed 34 unimplemented recommendations from 20 reports that were included in the previous Compendium. Please note that removal of an unimplemented recommendation does not imply that it was verified as implemented, but rather, it was reported as being completed or that the target completion date has been revised with OIG approval.

Scope and Methodology

Due to our limited scope and purpose, we did not conduct our work in accordance with all generally accepted government auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Specifically, we did not evaluate management controls, determine compliance with laws and regulations, or develop findings and recommendations. Further, we did not thoroughly assess the validity and reliability of data obtained from the Agency's MATS. Although MATS was our primary source for identifying unimplemented recommendations, we did perform additional steps to search for unimplemented recommendations that may not have been identified in MATS.

We reviewed selected audit and evaluation reports issued by the EPA OIG from October 1, 1997, through September 30, 2009, to identify significant unimplemented recommendations for inclusion in the Compendium. However, we did not identify any significant unimplemented recommendations from Fiscal Years 1998 through 2001. We did not review recommendations from reports without an OIG agreement on the Agency's corrective action plan (Management Decision). A list of these reports can be found in Appendix 2 of the OIG Semiannual Report to Congress.

We excluded recommendations with future milestone dates for action. Some unimplemented recommendations that were excluded from this Compendium may, upon further review, be included in the next Compendium. A recommendation's exclusion from the Compendium does not indicate our determination that the recommendation has been implemented. We limited the unimplemented recommendations to those we believe are significant because they could have a material impact on the economy, efficiency, effectiveness, or integrity of EPA programs and operations. For this purpose, we define significant recommendations in the following terms:

- **Economy:** Opportunity to save, prevent loss, or recover at least \$500,000 in monetary costs or value.
- **Efficiency:** Improvement in the process, capacity, accessibility, or delivery of program objectives and the elimination of unnecessary or unproductive actions or expenses.
- **Effectiveness:** Improvement in the quality of, or reduction in the risk to, public health and the environment.
- **Integrity:** Improvement in operational accountability, enforcement of and compliance with laws and regulations, and security of resources for public confidence.

Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations as of March 31, 2010
(Report No. 10-N-0114)

The following EPA offices have unimplemented recommendations listed in this Compendium:

Office of Administration and Resources Management (OARM)
Office of Air and Radiation (OAR)
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA)
Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances (OPPTS)
Office of Research and Development (ORD)
Office of the Administrator (OA)
Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)
Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER)
Office of Water (OW)

We anticipate that the Agency will provide updates in MATS on the status of each unimplemented recommendation, including a description of progress and an explanation of the delay in completing an agreed-to action, in response to this Compendium.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Action Office: OARM
Report Title: Contractor Invoice Internal Controls Need Improvement
Report No.: 09-P-0242
Date Issued: 09/23/2009

Report Summary

In 2008, EPA paid contractors \$1.3 billion. To safeguard EPA funds, invoices must be reviewed to determine whether the submitted costs are allowable, allocable, and reasonable. The OIG conducted this review to determine whether EPA controls ensure that invoiced contractor costs are properly supported and allowable in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation. During our review, we found (1) invoice reviews were not always documented as required by the Contracts Management Manual (CMM), (2) Project Officer reviews were based on incomplete information, (3) monthly progress reports did not always contain the information needed to evaluate invoices, and (4) Agency staff did not perform required rate verifications and math checks. Some responsible for invoice reviews were unaware of the guidance and checklists in the CMM, did not understand the level of documentation needed to review invoices, or did not adhere to the guidance.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Recommendation 2-1: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OARM modify the CMM to require use of the checklist for invoice reviews the contracting officer representatives (CORs) perform, and to ensure CORs receive invoices and supporting documentation to assist their reviews.

Status: OARM agreed that the CMM needs to be modified to better define documentation needs at two levels: first, the supporting documentation that needs to be supplied by the contractor to assist the COR in invoice reviews; and second, the documentation that the COR needs to prepare to prove that a sufficient invoice review has been performed. OARM planned to encourage CORs to use the checklist if it is applicable to their specific contract. For cases where it does not apply, OARM planned to define the specific documentation that the COR needs to prepare to properly document that an invoice review has been performed. OARM planned to promulgate the new documentation definitions via an Interim Policy Notice. The agreed-to completion date was December 31, 2009.

Recommendation 2-2: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OARM, where the progress report and invoice did not cover the same period, require the contractors identified during this review to revise their progress reports to match the time period of the invoice.

Status: OARM agreed that EPA's contracting officers (COs) would notify their contractors of this requirement via a written letter. OARM planned that in cases where the contracts do not contain the requirement that progress report and invoice periods match, the contracts would be modified. The agreed-to completion date was December 31, 2009.

Recommendation 2-4: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OARM require that the COs, as part of the annual invoice review, perform periodic reviews to make certain that project officers and CORs are: (a) implementing changes to the CMM made in response to the audit report; and (b) requiring contractors to submit invoices and progress reports with matching periods of performance.

Status: OARM agreed that the reviews would be carried out in each CO's annual review of invoices as required by their Division's or Region's Quality Assessment Plan (QAP). OARM planned that the QAP policy would be modified accordingly in EPA's Acquisition Handbook. The agreed-to completion date was December 31, 2009.

Recommendation 3-1: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OARM analyze financial monitoring reviews to identify findings that are recurring on multiple contracts.

Status: OARM agreed to complete the analysis by November 30, 2009.

Recommendation 3-2: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OARM develop a corrective action for addressing the common findings identified in financial monitoring reviews.

Status: OARM agreed to develop the corrective action plan by December 31, 2009.

Action Office: ORD
Report Title: EPA's Office of Research and Development Could Better Use the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act to Improve Operations
Report No.: 09-P-0232
Date Issued: 09/15/2009

Report Summary

ORD's management integrity program is inconsistent with Agency Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) guidance. ORD approaches FMFIA as an administrative reporting activity rather than an opportunity to evaluate and report on research program performance. As a result, ORD has not:

- Conducted a comprehensive risk assessment.
- Included National Program Directors in the FMFIA process.
- Developed and implemented a strategy to establish and evaluate the effectiveness of internal controls over research programs.
- Provided FMFIA training to managers and staff.
- Included relevant risk and program performance information in assurance letters.

Applying FMFIA as intended would help EPA achieve its mission and program results through improved accountability. ORD has initiated actions that we believe will address our findings, such as developing a draft multiyear review strategy. In developing its new strategy, ORD should include programmatic elements, a training plan, pertinent results from peer reviews, and best practices to ensure more effective FMFIA implementation.

Unimplemented Recommendation

Recommendation 2-3: We recommend the Assistant Administrator for ORD revise the Management Integrity Policy to include programmatic operations. The policy should include a role for National Program Directors, integrate performance measures, reference current FMFIA guidance, and include a training plan. The program should incorporate public sector best practices and a two-track approach to address administrative and programmatic elements.

Status: ORD planned to revise the ORD Management Integrity Policy to include programmatic operations, a definition of the National Program Directors' role in the process, and integration of performance measures and outcomes. The agreed-to completion date was January 31, 2010.

Action Office: OARM
Report Title: EPA Should Stop Providing Estimates of Total Labor Hours to Contractors
Report No.: 09-P-0229
Date Issued: 09/09/2009

Report Summary

For 6 of the 22 contracts we reviewed, EPA provided the contractor with the government's estimate for total labor hours prior to receiving the contractor's proposal. The Federal Acquisition Regulation provides that the government may use various cost analysis techniques to ensure a fair and reasonable price, including comparing proposed prices with IGCEs. Since EPA is providing total labor hours to the contractor prior to receiving the proposal, EPA may be diminishing its ability to obtain a fair and reasonable price.

Office of Acquisition Management managers pointed out that EPA's Acquisition Regulation (EPAAR) requires that estimated labor hours be provided to contractors for contracts in which work is ordered through work assignments. Yet, an Office of Acquisition Management guide states that information from the IGCE should not be provided to the contractor. When EPA provides its estimate of total labor hours before receiving the proposal, the contractor does not have an incentive to seek a more efficient or innovative approach to meet the government's requirement.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Recommendation 1: We recommend the Assistant Administrator for OARM revise the EPAAR (48 CFR, Section 1552.211-74(b)) to eliminate the requirement that EPA include total estimated labor hours in work assignments or identify specific circumstances in which the requirement should apply.

Status: EPA agreed that the EPAAR clause on work assignments (WAs) should be modified to provide better guidance to contracting officers (COs) on issuing WAs. The new guidance will clarify the discretion COs have in revealing estimated labor hours to the contractor, depending on the circumstances of the individual contracting situation. EPA planned to issue interim guidance while the revised EPAAR clause is promulgated. The agreed-to completion date was November 1, 2009.

Recommendation 2: We recommend the Assistant Administrator for OARM communicate to contract management and program staff who prepare and use IGCEs that estimates of total labor hours, or any other cost-related estimates, should not be provided to contractors prior to receiving the contractor's proposal.

Status: EPA agreed with the recommendation and planned to communicate the new interim WA guidance, as described above, to all affected parties that prepare and use IGCEs. The agreed-to completion date was November 1, 2009.

Action Office: OW
Report Title: EPA Needs to Accelerate Adoption of Numeric Nutrient Water Quality Standards
Report No.: 09-P-0223
Date Issued: 08/26/2009

Report Summary

EPA's 1998 National Strategy and Plan to promote State adoption of nutrient water quality standards (which better protect aquatic life and human health) has been ineffective. In 1998, EPA stated that a critical need existed for improved water quality standards, given the number of water bodies impaired from nutrients. In the 11 years since EPA issued its strategy, half the States still had no numeric nutrient standards. States have not been motivated to create these standards because implementing them is costly and often unpopular with various constituencies. EPA has not held the States accountable to committed milestones. The current approach does not assure that States will develop standards that provide adequate protection for downstream waters. Until recently, EPA has not used its Clean Water Act authority to promulgate water quality standards for States.

EPA cannot rely on the States alone to ensure that numeric nutrient standards are established. EPA should prioritize States/waters significantly impacted by excess nutrients and determine whether it should set the standards. EPA also needs to establish effective monitoring and measures so that accurate program progress is reported. These progress reports will assist EPA management in program decision making.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Recommendation 2-3: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OW establish EPA and State accountability for meeting milestones for adopting numeric nutrient water quality standards for those waters in the rest of the Nation that require them. EPA should do this by:

- (a) Requiring States to develop milestones based on resources available.
- (b) Reviewing those milestones and approving them as appropriate

Recommendation 2-4: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OW establish metrics to gauge the actual progress made by States in adopting numeric nutrient water quality standards.

Recommendation 2-5: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OW ensure that the regions annually validate Water Quality Standards Actions Tracking Applications data.

Status: OW agreed to utilize the next available opportunity to revise internal program activity reports to better gauge cumulative State progress. This corrective action is associated with the three recommendations above. The agreed-to completion date was February 28, 2010.

Action Office: OCFO
Report Title: EPA Should Use FMFIA to Improve Programmatic Operations
Report No.: 09-P-0203
Date Issued: 08/06/2009

Report Summary

EPA has not implemented and used FMFIA to improve program operations, as intended by federal and Agency guidance. Although EPA offices rely on annual guidance that OCFO issues:

- EPA offices have not developed internal control review strategies that include elements such as the Government Performance and Results Act.
- OCFO's guidance and training have not provided staff and managers with adequate awareness of the U.S. Government Accountability Office's (GAO's) internal control standards.
- OCFO's guidance, until recently, has not required offices to report on compliance with all GAO standards.
- OCFO did not devote needed resources to validate assurance letters.

Per Agency guidance, OCFO is responsible for ensuring and implementing a strategy for validating EPA's compliance with FMFIA. However, OCFO relies on Assistant and Regional Administrators to verify letters' program elements before certifying them. EPA offices view FMFIA reporting as an administrative task, rather than an opportunity to achieve goals by assessing program results and identifying risks. As a result, when signing EPA letters, the Administrator has little assurance that offices reviewed program operations. Additional emphasis on FMFIA's importance could result in more certain, documented assurance in the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report that EPA programs annually evaluate internal controls to comply with GAO's standards and deter fraud, waste, and mismanagement.

Unimplemented Recommendation

Recommendation 3: We recommend that the Chief Financial Officer revise the internal checklist that OCFO uses as part of its strategy for validating Agency-wide FMFIA compliance to confirm that EPA offices addressed each of the five GAO standards in evaluating their internal controls and identifying weaknesses. Describe, in its annual Agency guidance, OCFO's strategy for assessing offices' assurance letters for compliance.

Status: OCFO agreed to include a description of how OCFO will review and assess offices' assurance letters in FY 2010 management integrity guidance. OCFO anticipated issuing its FY 2010 management integrity guidance on December 31, 2009. However, for FY 2010, OCFO revised its approach and issued separate financial and programmatic guidance on February 18, 2010, and March 10, 2010, respectively. OCFO will issue guidance for preparing and submitting assurance letters including a description of how OCFO will assess Assistant Administrators and Regional Administrators' (AA/RAs) assurance letters, in April or May 2010. The original agreed-to completion date was December 31, 2009.

Action Office: OARM
Report Title: EPA Should Delay Deploying Its New Acquisition System until Testing Is Completed
Report No.: 09-P-0197
Date Issued: 07/20/09

Report Summary

Office of Acquisition Management (OAM) did not comply with EPA's System Life Cycle Management policy and procedure while developing the new EPA Acquisition System (EAS). OAM did not fully develop the system's requirements documents during the requirements phase and requirements were incomplete. Test scripts were not developed to prove that the system fulfilled all requirements and ensure that the system would function as required. Although the EAS Project Manager developed a Draft Master Test Plan that contained testing procedures, OAM management never approved, implemented, and enforced this plan.

OAM management did not provide the oversight, authority, and support necessary to ensure the EAS development project complied with EPA's System Life Cycle Management policy and procedure. Because OAM had not completed the steps needed to reasonably ensure that EAS would meet EPA's business needs if implemented by June 29, 2009, as planned, OAM does not have a sound basis for deploying EAS as scheduled. More management emphasis is needed to ensure the system development control environment achieves the desired results and the end product meets EPA's needs.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Recommendation 1: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OARM identify and document all system requirements, including functional, technical, security, and EPA-specific requirements, in the EAS Requirements Document(s).

Status: EPA planned to:

- a. Identify new and detailed requirements using minutes of meetings between EAS Developer and EPA Stakeholders. The agreed-to completion date was October 16, 2009.
- b. Update Requirements Baseline with approved new and detailed requirements. The agreed-to completion date was October 21, 2009.
- c. Update the Requirements Traceability Matrix with new detailed requirements from updated Requirements Baseline. The agreed-to completion date was October 21, 2009.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OARM update, review, and implement formal testing policies and procedures that would enforce:

- a. the review and approval of all system requirements prior to testing,
- b. the completion of Requirement Traceability Matrices mapping each system requirement to a test script,
- c. the independent validation of vendor-supplied test scripts prior to testing, and
- d. the review and approval of testing results at the end of each round of testing.

Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations as of March 31, 2010
(Report No. 10-N-0114)

Status: EPA planned to conduct 12 different actions in response to this recommendation, e.g., verifying the accuracy and completeness of new and detailed requirements, reviewing and approving all system requirements prior to testing, conducting an Integrated Baseline Review of the Performance Measurement Baseline, etc. The latest agreed-to completion date for all of the actions was March 26, 2010.

Recommendation 3: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OARM delay EAS implementation until OAM has successfully tested all of the system requirements.

Status: EPA planned to conduct system tests. The agreed-to completion date was August 9, 2009.

Recommendation 4: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OARM update the EAS Project Schedule to communicate the current status of and future plans for EAS project activities.

Status: EPA planned to update the EAS Project Schedule with approved schedule changes following the Interim Baseline Requirements and distribute project schedule to EAS Integrated Project Team. The agreed-to completion date was November 13, 2009.

Action Office: OA, ORD
Report Title: EPA Needs a Comprehensive Research Plan and Policies to Fulfill its Emerging Climate Change Role
Report No.: 09-P-0089
Date Issued: 02/02/2009

Report Summary

EPA does not have an overall plan to ensure developing consistent, compatible climate change strategies across the Agency. We surveyed EPA regions and offices and found they need more information on a variety of climate change topics. They need technical climate change research and tools as well as other climate change policy guidance and direction. We learned that EPA's OW and several regional offices have developed or are developing their own individual climate change strategies and plans. The lack of an overall climate change policy can result in duplication, inconsistent approaches, and wasted resources among EPA's regions and offices. EPA has not issued interim guidance to give its major components consistent direction to ensure that a compatible national policy – when it emerges – will not result in wasted efforts.

EPA's latest plan for future climate change research does not address the full range of emerging information needs. Specifically, the projected time of completion or the scope of some research projects do not match the timing or the scope of regions' needs. ORD does not have a central repository of its climate change research for its internal users, nor does it effectively communicate the results of its climate change research to EPA's internal users. While ORD collects research requirements from regions and program offices, the selection criteria for research topics are not transparent to the regions. Finally, ORD does not have a system to track research requests through completion, or a formal mechanism to obtain feedback from its users.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Recommendation 3-1: We recommend that the Deputy Administrator establish guidance to programs and regional offices for regularly entering their climate change scientific information in the Science Inventory.

Status: ORD planned to continue to provide the Science Inventory (and the Environmental Science Connector) as depositories for EPA's scientific information. On an annual basis, the Administrator or Deputy Administrator planned to continue to issue guidance to program and regional offices for entering their scientific information into the Science Inventory, including climate science information. The agreed-to completion date was October 2009.

Each program and regional office will have the responsibility of entering and maintaining its own scientific information in the Science Inventory on an ongoing basis. ORD planned to provide the Administrator with annual reports on the number of entries related to climate change by each program and regional office in the Science Inventory. The agreed-to completion date was January 2010.

Recommendation 3-3: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for ORD establish a formal, transparent research requirements determination process that includes well-defined procedures for identifying a unified set of priority climate change research needs.

Status: ORD stated that its Global Change Research Program (GCRP) already has an effective process in place to determine the highest-priority research requirements of EPA's Programs and Regions and of the U.S. Climate Change Science Program (CCSP). GCRP's prioritization process includes the Research Coordination Team (RCT), Regional Science Liaisons (RSLs), Regional Office Climate Coordinators, input from the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC), input from the Science Advisory Board (SAB), priorities set by the CCSP, and other formal and informal mechanisms. Several of these processes (e.g., the RCT) include representatives from ORD, program offices, and regional offices.

To make ORD's and the GCRP's research prioritization processes more transparent to the program and regional offices, the National Program Director for the GCRP planned to issue a memorandum describing how GCRP priorities are set on an annual basis. This memorandum will include a discussion of how the GCRP must consider the individual requests of programs and regions, as well its interagency responsibilities under the CCSP, when determining priorities. The agreed-to completion date was January 31, 2010.

Recommendation 3-4: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for ORD establish a formal mechanism to track regional research needs from research project selection to completion, and to requestor.

Status: ORD stated that GCRP already has an effective process in place to determine the highest-priority research requirements of EPA's programs and regions, and of the CCSP. GCRP's prioritization process includes RCT, RSLs, Regional Office Climate Coordinators, input from BOSC, input from SAB, priorities set by the CCSP, and other formal and informal mechanisms. Several of these processes (e.g., the RCT) include representatives from ORD, program offices, and regional offices.

To make ORD's and the GCRP's research prioritization processes more transparent to the program and regional offices, the National Program Director for the GCRP planned to issue a memorandum describing how GCRP priorities are set on an annual basis. This memorandum will include a discussion of how the GCRP must consider the individual requests of programs and regions, as well its interagency responsibilities under the CCSP, when determining priorities. The agreed-to completion date was January 31, 2010.

Recommendation 3-5: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for ORD establish a formal method for coordinating GCRP's research work with regions and program offices, communicating research results, and collecting feedback on research products. The feedback requested should include the accessibility, usability, value, and awareness of updates to the Science Inventory and the Environmental Science Connector.

Status: ORD/GCRP stated that it already uses several mechanisms to coordinate, communicate, and collect feedback. The Environmental Science Connector's "Global Change Resource Center" and GCRP's new public Website are two tools used by ORD to coordinate and communicate its global change research. In addition, GCRP's National Program Director uses biweekly Global Conference Calls to obtain feedback from all program and regional offices.

Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations as of March 31, 2010
(Report No. 10-N-0114)

To further formalize its ongoing efforts, the National Program Director for the GCRP planned to issue a memorandum summarizing the mechanisms that ORD has already put in place to communicate and coordinate GCRP's work with the program and regional offices. This memorandum will be sent to partners across the Agency to improve their awareness of GCRP's resources. This memorandum will be updated whenever new mechanisms are developed. The agreed-to completion date was January 31, 2010.

ORD stated that it has begun to survey EPA stakeholders about the timeliness and usefulness of products from its various programs to enhance research planning. The GCRP planned to issue such a survey that will include a request for feedback on the accessibility, usability, value, and awareness of updates to the Science Inventory and Environmental Science Connector. The agreed-to completion date was October 30, 2009.

Action Office: OW
Report Title: EPA Assisting Tribal Water Systems but Needs to Improve Oversight
Report No.: 08-P-0266
Date Issued: 09/16/2008

Report Summary

EPA, rather than the States, has the responsibility for protecting human health and the environment on tribal lands. Approximately 600 tribal community water systems (CWSs) serve an estimated 622,000 people. EPA staff members provide these systems with technical and other assistance so that tribal CWSs maintain compliance with Safe Drinking Water Act requirements. We conducted this evaluation to assess EPA's oversight and assistance of tribal CWSs, and to independently evaluate water quality at selected drinking water systems.

Tribal drinking water sample results in EPA files indicate that drinking water supplies consistently met regulatory requirements. Regional EPA staff also made correct compliance decisions with sample results that tribal CWSs provided. However, the OIG found internal control deficiencies in administering EPA's oversight of tribal CWSs in two of the five regions we reviewed. To varying degrees, tribal drinking water records in four of the five regions were incomplete due to a failure to maintain oversight of system operations and/or poor records management.

Unimplemented Recommendation

Recommendation 2-3: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OW direct regions to issue monitoring and reporting violations, take appropriate enforcement actions against tribal CWSs with health-based violations or who fail to monitor or submit monitoring reports, and enter violations into Safe Drinking Water Information System.

Status: OW planned to issue guidance regarding expectations of regions implementing the tribal drinking water program. The original agreed-to completion date was April 30, 2009.

Action Office: OECA
Report Title: EPA Needs to Track Compliance with Superfund Cleanup Requirements
Report No.: 08-P-0141
Date Issued: 04/28/2008

Report Summary

According to EPA's Superfund information system, there were 3,397 active Superfund enforcement instruments to ensure clean-ups at National Priorities List sites as of September 30, 2007. Yet, EPA does not nationally compile or track data on substantial noncompliance (SNC) with the terms or requirements of these instruments. Therefore, we were not able to fully determine whether the regions have resolved Superfund instrument violations consistent with criteria and authorities. In 2000, though, EPA recognized it needed to improve in this area. It issued an internal report recommending that the regions improve their data on the compliance status of Superfund enforcement instruments and responses to noncompliance. However, EPA has not implemented this recommendation. Consequently, the Agency lacks the internal controls necessary to monitor compliance with Superfund instruments nationally.

In a limited review of EPA regions' enforcement records, we found that two regions were consistent with EPA guidance and authorities when they took enforcement actions in 12 instances of SNC. While the regions took appropriate actions to address these 12 violations, Region 5 had not established necessary and enforceable requirements to address contamination from the Muskego Landfill Site, in Waukesha County, Wisconsin. The report was issued to OECA and Region 5. However, Region 5 has no past-due corrective actions recorded in MATS.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Recommendation 3: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OECA annually review the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) compliance data to monitor Agency status and progress in managing SNC by way of Superfund instruments.

Status: OECA stated that CERCLIS data will be pulled to establish a baseline for the status of compliance with Superfund enforcement instruments. This is based upon compliance monitoring data for FY 2008. This process will be repeated annually after November 2009. The agreed-to completion date was November 30, 2009.

Action Office: OCFO
Report Title: Audit of EPA's Fiscal 2007 and 2006 (Restated) Consolidated Financial Statements
Report No.: 08-1-0032
Date Issued: 11/15/2007

Report Summary

We rendered an unqualified, or clean, opinion on EPA's Consolidated Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 2007 and 2006 (restated), meaning that they were fairly presented and free of material misstatement. We noted one material weakness with EPA's Implementation of the "Currently Not Collectible" policy for accounts receivable that caused a Material Understatement of Asset Value and led to the restatement of the Fiscal Year 2006 financial statements. Further, we noted the following six significant deficiencies:

- EPA did not properly compute an allowance for doubtful accounts.
- EPA needs to improve internal controls in recording and accounting for accounts receivable.
- Key applications do not meet federal and EPA information security requirements.
- Access and security practices over critical information technology assets need improvement.
- EPA needs to improve controls over the Integrated Financial Management System Suspense Table.
- EPA did not maintain adequate documentation for obligating accounting adjustments.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Recommendation 18: We recommend that the Chief Financial Officer conduct and document an annual verification and validation of implemented procedures to ensure controls are implemented as intended and are effective.

Status: According to MATS, OARM incorporated the verification and validation process into their contract by November 11, 2007. However, during a follow-up review, OIG found that EPA had not completed the corrective actions associated with this recommendation. The OIG also found that EPA was not performing monthly server vulnerability scanning as stated in the OARM Server Scanning standard operating procedures.

Action Office: OW
Report Title: Total Maximum Daily Load Program Needs Better Data and Measures to Demonstrate Environmental Results
Report No.: 2007-P-00036
Date Issued: 09/19/2007

Report Summary

EPA does not have comprehensive information on the outcomes of the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) program nationwide, nor national data on TMDL implementation activities. EPA and States are responsible for implementing point source TMDLs; however, EPA cannot identify all of the permitted dischargers that should receive or have received wasteload allocations. Measuring nonpoint source TMDL implementation is difficult because EPA does not have statutory authority to regulate nonpoint sources and it is highly dependent on State and local stakeholders. EPA's lack of information prevents the Agency from determining the extent to which TMDLs are restoring impaired waters and whether TMDL implementation activities are occurring in a timely manner.

EPA has begun to take steps to measure program results and improve program data, sponsored several studies of TMDL implementation, and is studying additional TMDL results measures. Developing meaningful measures is challenging; however, EPA needs to provide more management direction to improve its ability to assess how well this critical program is functioning. The TMDL and performance measures we reviewed do not provide clear and complete metrics of the program's accomplishments.

Unimplemented Recommendation

Recommendation 1-2: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OW demonstrate that TMDLs are being implemented by annually reporting on the progress of TMDL implementation activities completed nationwide including the number of TMDLs:

- that have all wasteload allocations incorporated into NPDES permits,
- that have implemented load allocations through at least one best management practice funded through the Section 319 Program, and
- for which implementation data are not available to EPA.

Status: According to MATS, OW has:

- Reported on TMDL implementation rates, including point source permits and nonpoint source best management practices, through a statistical study covering EPA Region 5.
- Completed development of a national statistical study design to assess TMDL implementation rates.
- Queried EPA data systems and issued its first annual national report on the three metrics specified in 1-2.

OW has three corrective actions that have not been completed for this recommendation:

- Complete development of an information collection rule (ICR) that covers assessments of TMDL implementation.

Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations as of March 31, 2010
(Report No. 10-N-0114)

- Produce a synthesis paper covering the findings from multiple implementation-related studies.
- Initiate national sample-based assessment upon ICR approval.

The agreed-to completion date for these actions was December 31, 2009. The OW indicated that they have not proposed rescheduled completion dates for -- developing the ICR and completing a national sample-based assessment -- because they plan to request modifications to these corrective actions with the OIG. OW feels that the relevance of the ICR to the TMDL implementation survey is questionable. If the ICR is no longer essential to the implementation survey as originally conceived, OW could potentially request that the ICR's development be withdrawn as a corrective action. OW also stated that the value-added worth of a national TMDL implementation survey, estimated to cost \$400,000 or more in 2007, is also questionable given improved knowledge about implementation and budgetary constraints. OW's position is that the survey would not be cost effective and should be withdrawn as a corrective action.

Action Office: OECA
Report Title: Overcoming Obstacles to Measuring Compliance: Practices in Selected Federal Agencies
Report No.: 2007-P-00027
Date Issued: 06/20/07

Report Summary

Federal regulatory agencies with missions and obstacles similar to EPA use statistical methods to generate compliance information. They use this information to monitor their enforcement and compliance programs and to demonstrate program results. These federal programs extensively use statistical methods to identify and analyze risk, set goals, develop strategies to manage the most significant risks, and report their accomplishments. We performed this review to collect successful practices from federal agencies similar to OECA that extensively use statistical methods, including random sampling, to measure and ensure compliance and to monitor regulatory programs. While the programs the OIG reviewed face similar obstacles as OECA, they use practical approaches to overcome these obstacles that OECA could potentially apply to its programs.

Unimplemented Recommendation

Recommendation 2-1: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OECA establish a plan of action with milestones to incorporate using statistical methods to demonstrate the results of EPA's enforcement and compliance strategies.

Status: OECA agreed to develop an action plan to expand the use of statistically valid compliance rates for specific noncompliance patterns focused on national priorities or other important problem areas. The agreed-to completion date for this corrective action was December 31, 2008.

Action Office: OSWER
Report Title: EPA Can Better Manage Superfund Resources
Report No.: 2006-P-00013
Date Issued: 02/28/2006

Report Summary

The Superfund Trust Fund has decreased over the years so that in Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005, all Superfund appropriations came from general tax revenue rather than the Trust Fund. Recent studies have reported shortages in funding needs for Superfund and have identified needed improvements in how the program is managed. We performed this review in response to a congressional request to evaluate Superfund expenditures at Headquarters and the regions.

EPA has been unable to allocate and manage Superfund resources for clean-up as efficiently and effectively as possible because of the way the Agency accounts for program resources, manages by functions, supplements the program with other funds, relies on an outdated workload model, and maintains unliquidated Superfund obligations and funds in special accounts. Close alignment of offices that support the Superfund program and production of program performance and cost data have been limited because EPA disperses the responsibility for allocating and managing program resources.

Unimplemented Recommendation

Recommendation 2-3 – Accounting Definitions: We recommend to the Assistant Administrator for OSWER that EPA should agree to define costs in a manner that supports management decision making and improve their accounting of such resources to maximize achieving program goals.

Status: OSWER reported in MATS that Recommendation 2-3 is partially implemented. Two planned corrective actions addressed this recommendation. To support management decision making, EPA modified Superfund E-Facts to reflect Superfund site cost data. The module is available for use by EPA staff. This action is considered completed. OCFO is determining if the Agency's new centralized financial management system will solve the accounting definition issue. If not, OCFO may consider having system adjustments made. The new centralized system is planned to be operational by October 1, 2010.

Action Office: OPPTS
Report Title: Opportunities to Improve Data Quality and Children's Health through the Food Quality Protection Act
Report No.: 2006-P-00009
Date Issued: 01/10/2006

Report Summary

We performed this review to examine the impact of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 on the EPA's need for scientific data and predictive tools, particularly in relation to children's health. This report is the second in a series of three reports on the Act's impact on EPA regarding children's health. We specifically sought in this review to determine:

- What data requirements were required by the Food Quality Protection Act
- Whether testing guidelines, requirements, and evaluation procedures allow EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) to determine the potential adverse effects of pesticide exposure on the developing nervous system
- What challenges OPP overcame and what opportunities exist for OPP to acquire better pesticide exposure data to aggregate risks
- What challenges exist and what opportunities are available for OPP to improve cumulative risk assessments
- What opportunities exist to better manage pesticide health risk for children

Unimplemented Recommendation

Recommendation 4-1: We recommend that the Acting Assistant Administrator for OPPTS update the dietary exposure databases used in probabilistic models for risk assessments as soon as the food consumption data from the 2003-2004 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) become available in 2006. EPA should also update the Food Commodity Intake Database (FCID) with the latest food consumption survey data, and if possible use data such as the Gerber Products Company's Feeding Infants and Toddlers Study.

Status: OPP has continued to collaborate with our partners in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center for Health Statistics and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to transition to the new consumption data. OPP met with USDA's Human Nutrition Survey in December 2007 regarding using this food consumption database to develop the requisite food commodity consumption database, FCID. In 2008, OPP began discussions on a variety of statistical issues with USDA's survey statisticians on the appropriate methods for combining NHANES survey cycles. At that time, OPP decided to adjust its pace in this area to allow us to obtain more years of data from the NHANES survey such that the resulting database includes more survey respondents and is more robust. In 2009, OPP met with personnel from USDA's Nutrient Data Laboratory and completed the majority of the recipe work. Also in 2009, OPP began working with ORD's National Center for Environmental Assessment and OW to incorporate the updated FCID into our exposure and risk assessment software. The agreed-to completion date was December 31, 2006. OPP anticipates completing the actions for this recommendation by summer 2010.

Action Office: OW
Report Title: More Information Is Needed on Toxaphene Degradation Products
Report No.: 2006-P-00007
Date Issued: 12/16/2005

Report Summary

Toxaphene in the environment changes, or degrades. The resulting degradation products are different from the original toxaphene in chemical composition and how they appear to testing instruments, so they could go unreported. The analytical methods EPA uses to identify and measure toxaphene are not designed to identify toxaphene degradation products. However, a new testing method used by others specifically tests for toxaphene degradation products. We believe EPA should validate, approve, and use this method. Certain toxaphene degradation products accumulate inside people. Although studies indicate that some of these degradation products may be harmful, more research is needed to determine how much of a risk these products pose to people. The report recommendations were reported to OA, OW, OSWER and ORD, OA and ORD have no past-due corrective actions recorded in MATS.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Recommendation 2: We recommend that the Administrator direct the Assistant Administrators for ORD, OW and OSWER to arrange for specific research into the dangers of tumors (i.e., cancer) and of harm to embryos posed principally by a mixture of toxaphene congeners and metabolites found in fish.

Status: OW anticipated completing the third Contaminant Candidate List by August 31, 2009.

Action Office: OAR
Report Title: Substantial Changes Needed in Implementation and Oversight of Title V Permits If Program Goals Are to Be Fully Realized
Report No.: 2005-P-00010
Date Issued: 03/09/2005

Report Summary

Title V of the Clean Air Act, designed to reduce violations and improve enforcing air pollution laws for the largest sources of air pollution, requires that all major stationary sources of air pollutants obtain a permit to operate. More than 17,000 sources are subject to Title V permit requirements. Our analysis identified concerns with five key aspects of Title V permits: (1) permit clarity, (2) statements of basis, (3) monitoring provisions, (4) annual compliance certifications, and (5) practical enforceability. One finding in particular relates to compliance certifications and wording on credible evidence. When EPA amended the rule on continuous or intermittent compliance,¹ a key clause on credible evidence was inadvertently left out. (Recommendation 2-2 addresses this issue.)

Collectively, these problems can hamper the ability of EPA, State and local regulators, and the public to understand what requirements sources are subject to, how they will be measured, and ultimately to hold sources accountable for meeting applicable air quality requirements. EPA's oversight and guidance of Title V activities have resulted in some improvements in Title V programs; however, areas needing further improvement remain.

Unimplemented Recommendations

Recommendation 2-1: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OAR develop and issue guidance or rulemaking on annual compliance certification content which requires responsible officials to certify compliance with all applicable terms and conditions of the permit, as appropriate.

Status: EPA stated in MATS that based on recommendations from the Clean Air Act Advisory Group Task Force on Title V Implementation, the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards has begun developing a guidance document that will include, among other topics, guidance on compliance certifications. However, EPA has not submitted a formal action plan stating how it plans to address this recommendation to the OIG for approval.

Recommendation 2-2: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OAR issue the draft rule regarding intermittent versus continuous monitoring as it relates to annual compliance certifications and including credible evidence.

Status: EPA did not concur with this recommendation, and it remains unresolved. The Agency met with the OIG in July 2009 and is providing additional information. The OIG believes this recommendation is key to knowing the basis of the permittee's reported compliance with the terms and conditions of its Title V permit that underlies its annual compliance certification.

¹ 40 Code of Federal Regulations 70.6 (c)(5)(iii)(B)

Recommendation 2-3: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OAR develop nationwide guidance or rulemaking, as appropriate, on the contents of statements of basis which includes discussions of monitoring, operational requirements, regulatory applicability determinations, explanations of any conditions from previously issued permits that are not being transferred to the Title V permit, discussions of streamlining requirements, and other factual information, where advisable, including a listing of prior Title V permits issued to the same applicant at the plant, attainment status, and construction, permitting, and compliance history of the plant.

Status: OAR plans to work with the regions to disseminate information about the positions EPA has taken on statements of basis in response to citizens programs and permit petitions. OAR also intends to develop a plan for identifying and sharing with permitting agencies those statements of basis that represent “best practices.” This effort is planned to be included in guidance documentation addressing Recommendation 2-1. However, EPA has not submitted a formal action plan stating how it plans to address this recommendation to the OIG for approval.

Recommendation 3-1: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OAR promulgate the draft order of sanctions rule which provides notice to State and local agencies, as well as the public, regarding the actions that will be taken when Notices of Deficiency are not timely resolved by State and local Title V permitting authorities.

Status: EPA did not concur with this recommendation, and it remains unresolved. The Agency met with the OIG in July 2009 and is providing additional information. The OIG believes this issue involves basic program criteria needed for EPA to oversee the Title V program.

Action Office: OW
Report Title: EPA Needs to Reinforce Its National Pretreatment Program
Report No: 2004-P-00030
Date Issued: 09/28/2004

Report Summary

The reductions in industrial waste discharges to the nation's sewer systems that characterized the early years of the National Pretreatment Program have not endured. Since the middle of the 1990s, there has been little change in the volume of a broad list of toxic pollutants transferred to Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) or in the index of risk associated with these pollutants. As a result, the performance of EPA's pretreatment program, which is responsible for controlling these discharges, is threatened, and progress toward achieving the Clean Water Act goal of eliminating toxic discharges that can harm water quality has stalled.

The curtailing of the early gains may be explained in part by two factors: (1) dischargers that developed systems in response to EPA's initial program requirements have not enhanced their pretreatment systems in recent years, and (2) the rate at which EPA has been issuing effluent guidelines dramatically declined since 1990. Without more visible leadership from Headquarters, improved programmatic information, and the adoption of results-based performance measures, EPA's pretreatment program is at risk of losing the gains it made in its early years.

Unimplemented Recommendation

Recommendation 4-1: We recommend that the Acting Assistant Administrator for OW direct staff to develop a long-term strategy to identify the data it needs for developing pretreatment results-based measurements; determine the resources necessary to carry out the strategy; and gain the support of other Agency, State, and POTW staff to carry out the strategy..

Status: OW agreed to request information on databases used by the EPA regions and States to store information regarding POTW pretreatment program performance. Through the Permitting for Results process, OW will compile information regarding current data systems used to store pretreatment data at the EPA regional and State level. OW intends to use this information to identify inaccurate data and target data correction in the Permit Compliance System. Both of these activities are crucial to facilitate migration and retention of data as we transition to the Integrated Compliance Information System. Once these efforts are complete, OW will be able to determine a long-term strategy based on data availability and resources, which should ultimately assist it in developing pretreatment results-based measurements. The agreed-to completion date for this corrective action was September 30, 2007.

Action Office: OW
Report Title: Wastewater Management: Controlling and Abating Combined Sewer Overflows
Report No: 2002-P-00012
Date Issued: 08/26/2002

Report Summary

Combined sewer overflows (CSOs) are the total discharges into waterbodies of untreated domestic, commercial, industrial waste, wastewater, and storm water runoff, which can adversely affect the health of humans, animals, and aquatic organisms, as well as cause beach closings and fishing and recreational restrictions. We found that many communities do not as yet have the data to determine the effect of CSO controls on water quality. Most communities were only monitoring the number, volume, and duration of CSO discharges, and did not have data on the effect CSO controls were having on the quality of receiving waters. This was because EPA does not require monitoring until completion of CSO projects. Consequently, it could not be determined until it was too late whether each CSO project being undertaken was a wise investment of taxpayers' dollars.

Unimplemented Recommendation

Recommendation 5-1: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OW work with CSO permitting authorities and communities to assure they negotiate and establish the proper level of interim monitoring of CSO efforts to determine the impact of the project on water quality.

Status: OW agreed to initiate an effort at EPA Headquarters to develop a compilation of the monitoring approaches that are or may be used in different situations. This compilation, which will be available in Fiscal Year 2009, will help permit writers develop appropriate monitoring expectations for those permittees that have completed construction of their planned CSO controls. In August 2008, EPA reached a settlement filed in U.S. District Court for the Central District of California that requires EPA to complete studies and develop new recreational water quality criteria by October 2012. The agreed-to completion date was September 30, 2009.

***OIG Reports with
Unimplemented Recommendations
by Program Office
as of March 31, 2010***

OA

09-P-0089, EPA Needs a Comprehensive Research Plan and Policies to Fulfill Its Emerging Climate Change Role

OAR

2005-P-00010, Substantial Changes Needed in Implementation and Oversight of Title V Permits If Program Goals Are to Be Fully Realized

OARM

09-P-0242, Contractor Invoice Internal Controls Need Improvement

09-P-0229, EPA Should Stop Providing Estimates of Total Labor Hours to Contractors

09-P-0197, EPA Should Delay Deploying Its New Acquisition System until Testing Is Completed

OCFO

09-P-0203, EPA Should Use FMFIA to Improve Programmatic Operations

08-1-0032, Audit of EPA's Fiscal 2007 and 2006 (Restated) Consolidated Financial Statements

OECA

08-P-0141, EPA Needs to Track Compliance with Superfund Cleanup Requirements

2007-P-00027, Overcoming Obstacles to Measuring Compliance: Practices in Selected Federal Agencies

OPPTS

2006-P-00009, Opportunities to Improve Data Quality and Children's Health through the Food Quality Protection Act

ORD

09-P-0232, EPA's Office of Research and Development Could Better Use the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act to Improve Operations

09-P-0089, EPA Needs a Comprehensive Research Plan and Policies to Fulfill Its Emerging Climate Change Role

OSWER

2006-P-00013, EPA Can Better Manage Superfund Resources

OW

09-P-0223, EPA Needs to Accelerate Adoption of Numeric Nutrient Water Quality

08-P-0266, EPA Assisting Tribal Water Systems but Needs to Improve Oversight

2007-P-00036, Total Maximum Daily Load Program Needs Better Data and Measures to Demonstrate Environmental Results

2006-P-00007, More Information Is Needed on Toxaphene Degradation Products

2004-P-00030, EPA Needs to Reinforce Its National Pretreatment Program

2002-P-00012, Wastewater Management: Controlling and Abating Combined Sewer Overflows

Unimplemented Recommendations 10/28/09 Compendium Compared to Current Compendium

Continuing Unimplemented Recommendations

08-P-0266, EPA Assisting Tribal Water Systems but Needs to Improve Oversight (**Recommendation 2-3**)

08-1-0032, Audit of EPA's Fiscal 2007 and 2006 (Restated) Consolidated Financial Statements (**Recommendation 18**)

2007-P-00027, Overcoming Obstacles to Measuring Compliance: Practices in Selected Federal Agencies (**Recommendation 2-1**)

2006-P-00009, Opportunities to Improve Data Quality and Children's Health through the Food Quality Protection Act (**Recommendation 4-1**)

2006-P-00007, More Information Is Needed on Toxaphene Degradation Products (**Recommendation 2**)

2005-P-00010, Substantial Changes Needed in Implementation and Oversight of Title V Permits If Program Goals Are to Be Fully Realized (**Recommendations 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 3-1**)

2004-P-00030, EPA Needs to Reinforce Its National Pretreatment Program (**Recommendation 4-1**)

New Unimplemented Recommendations

09-P-0242, Contractor Invoice Internal Controls Need Improvement (**Recommendations 2-1, 2-2, 2-4, 3-1, 3-2**)

09-P-0232, EPA's Office of Research and Development Could Better Use the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act to Improve Operations (**Recommendation 2-3**)

09-P-0229, EPA Should Stop Providing Estimates of Total Labor Hours to Contractors (**Recommendations 1, 2**)

09-P-0223, EPA Needs to Accelerate Adoption of Numeric Nutrient Water Quality (**Recommendations 2-3, 2-4, 2-5**)

09-P-0203, EPA Should Use FMFIA to Improve Programmatic Operations (**Recommendation 3**)

09-P-0197, EPA Should Delay Deploying Its New Acquisition System until Testing Is Completed (**Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4**)

09-P-0089, EPA Needs a Comprehensive Research Plan and Policies to Fulfill Its Emerging Climate Change Role (**Recommendations 3-1, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5**)

08-P-0141, EPA Needs to Track Compliance with Superfund Cleanup Requirements (**Recommendation 3**)

2007-P-00036, Total Maximum Daily Load Program Needs Better Data and Measures to Demonstrate Environmental Results (**Recommendation 1-2**)

2006-P-00013, EPA Can Better Manage Superfund Resources (**Recommendation 2-3**)

2002-P-00012, Wastewater Management: Controlling and Abating Combined Sewer Overflows (**Recommendation 5-1**)

Removed Unimplemented Recommendations

- 09-P-0129**, EPA Can Improve Managing of Working Capital Fund Overhead Costs (**Recommendations 1, 3**)
- 09-P-0119**, Improved Management of Superfund Special Accounts Will Make More Funds Available for Clean-ups (**Recommendation 4**)
- 09-P-0097**, Results of Technical Network Vulnerability Assessment: EPA Headquarters (**Recommendations 1, 2, 3**)
- 09-P-0055**, Results of Technical Network Vulnerability Assessment: EPA's Research Triangle Park Campus (**Recommendations 1, 2, 3**)
- 09-P-0029**, EPA's Safety Determination for Delatte Metals Superfund Site Was Unsupported (**Recommendations 2-2, 2-4**)
- 09-1-0026**, Audit of EPA's Fiscal 2008 and 2007 Consolidated Financial Statements (**Recommendation 27**)
- 08-P-0265**, EPA Should Continue Efforts to Reduce Unliquidated Obligations in Brownfields Pilot Grants (**Recommendation 3**)
- 08-P-0235**, EPA Decisions to Delete Superfund Sites Should Undergo Quality Assurance Review (**Recommendations 2-4, 2-5, 3-1**)
- 08-P-0199**, EPA Needs to Better Report Chesapeake Bay Challenges – A Summary Report (**Recommendation 1**)
- 08-P-0116**, EPA Can Recover More Federal Superfund Money (**Recommendation 2**)
- 08-P-0049**, Despite Progress, EPA Needs to Improve Oversight of Wastewater Upgrades in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed (**Recommendation 2-4**)
- 08-1-0032**, Audit of EPA's Fiscal 2007 and 2006 (Restated) Consolidated Financial Statements (**Recommendation 12**)
- 2007-P-00028**, ENERGY STAR Program Can Strengthen Controls Protecting the Integrity of the Label (**Recommendation 3-1**)
- 2007-P-00008**, EPA Could Improve Controls Over Mainframe System Software (**Recommendations 9, 17**)
- 2007-P-00007**, EPA Could Improve Processes for Managing Contractor Systems and Reporting Incidents (**Recommendation 2-1**)
- 2006-P-00038**, Existing Contracts Enabled EPA to Quickly Respond to Hurricane Katrina: Future Improvement Opportunities Exist (**Recommendation 4-1(bullet 5)**)
- 2006-P-00016**, EPA Can Better Implement Its Strategy for Managing Contaminated Sediments (**Recommendations 3-1, 3-2**)
- 2006-P-00013**, EPA Can Better Manage Superfund Resources (**Recommendation 2-3**)
- 2005-P-00011**, Security Configuration and Monitoring of EPA's Remote Access Methods Need Improvement (**Recommendations 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4**)
- 2004-P-00013**, EPA's Administration of Network Firewalls Needs Improvement (**Recommendations 2-1, 3-2**)