

## FY 2015 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Title/Evaluator/ Public Access	Scope or Key Questions	Findings	Recommendations and EPA Response
1	<b>Enhanced EPA Oversight Needed to Address Risks From Declining Clean Air Act Title V Revenues</b>  Program or Policy Evaluated: Title V Program  Evaluator: Office of Inspector General (OIG)  Report No.: 15-P-0006 October 2014 <a href="http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/20141020-15-p-0006.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/20141020-15-p-0006.pdf</a>	OIG conducted this evaluation to determine whether EPA's oversight of state and local Clean Air Act Title V programs' fee revenue practices is effective in identifying and obtaining corrective actions for issues related to collecting, retaining, and allocating fee revenues.	<p>OIG found weaknesses in the EPA's oversight of state and local Title V programs' fee revenue practices. While some EPA regions had worked to resolve issues, OIG found annual Title V program expenses often exceeded Title V revenues, and both had generally been declining over the 5-year period reviewed (2008–2012).</p> <p>The Agency's weaknesses in identifying and obtaining corrective actions for Title V revenue sufficiency and accounting practices, coupled with declining resources for some permitting authorities, jeopardizes state and local Title V program implementation.</p>	<p>OIG recommended that the EPA assess, update and re-issue its 1993 Title V fee guidance as appropriate; establish a fee oversight strategy to ensure consistent and timely actions to identify and address violations of 40 CFR Part 70; emphasize and require periodic reviews of Title V fee revenue and accounting practices in Title V program evaluations; address shortfalls in staff expertise as regions update their workforce plans; and pursue corrective actions, as necessary.</p> <p>The Agency agreed with all recommendations and provided corrective action plans that meet the intent of the recommendations.</p>
2	<b>Ocean Acidification; Federal Response Under Way, but Actions Needed to Understand and Address Potential Impacts</b>	1) What are the existing and expected impacts of ocean acidification on ecosystems and coastal communities? 2) What steps has the federal government taken	Ocean acidification could have a variety of potentially significant effects on marine species, ecosystems, and coastal communities, according to six summary reports that GAO reviewed. Further action could be	GAO recommends that the appropriate entities within the Executive Office of the President take steps to improve the federal response to ocean acidification, including estimating the funding that would be needed to implement the research and monitoring plan and

	<p>Program or Policy Evaluated: Executive Office of the President/The Interagency Working Group on Ocean Acidification (IWG-OA)</p> <p>Evaluator: GAO</p> <p>Report No. GAO-14-736, September 2014  <a href="http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-14-736">http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-14-736</a></p>	<p>to implement the Federal Ocean Acidification Research and Monitoring Act of 2009?</p> <p>3) What challenges does the federal government face in responding to the effects of ocean acidification?</p>	<p>taken to advance the federal response to ocean acidification.</p>	<p>designating the entity responsible for coordinating the next steps in the federal response.</p> <p>The Interagency Working Group on Ocean Acidification (IWG-OA) has prepared an estimation of the funding needed to implement the strategic plan for research and monitoring. The IWG-OA will use the estimate to help implement the Strategic Plan for Federal Research and Monitoring for Ocean Acidification.</p>
2	<p><b>State Revolving Funds, Improved Financial Indicators Could Strengthen EPA Oversight</b></p> <p>Program or Policy Evaluated: Drinking Water and Clean Water State Revolving Funds</p> <p>Evaluator: GAO</p> <p>Report No. GAO-15-567, August 2015  <a href="http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-15-567">http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-15-567</a></p>	<p>1) What authorities (laws, regulations, or guidance) address the sustainability of state revolving funds (SRF) and the federal appropriations that are contributed to them?</p> <p>2) What is known about the financial sustainability of the Clean Water and Drinking Water state revolving funds?</p> <p>3) What actions could make the state revolving funds more sustainable?</p>	<p>EPA has identified financial measures in its guidance for states that show states' overall financial management of SRF funds and the growth of those funds. However, they are not part of the EPA's financial indicators for regional offices to use when reviewing state SRF funds' financial performance.</p>	<p>GAO recommends that EPA update its financial indicators guidance to include one or more financial measures and develop projections of state SRF programs' future lending capacity.</p> <p>EPA agreed with the recommendations. At a state-EPA meeting in Tampa, FL during the week of November 1, 2015, EPA called for volunteers for a workgroup to update SRF financial performance indicators. The workgroup will convene in January 2016 and take action on the indicators during FY 2016.</p>
2	<p><b>Great Lakes Restoration Initiative: Improved Data Collection and Reporting Would Enhance Oversight</b></p>	<p>1) How many projects have Task Force agencies and nonfederal stakeholders implemented, and what characteristics do these projects have (type of work, costs, etc.)?</p>	<p>GAO found that the Task Force has made some information about GLRI project activities and results available to Congress and the public in three accomplishment reports. The Great Lakes Accountability</p>	<p>In its draft report, GAO recommended that EPA determine whether to continue using GLAS or acquire a different system and ensure that it develops guidance for entering data and establishes data quality control activities. EPA agreed and took action to address these</p>

	<p>Program or Policy Evaluated: Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI)</p> <p>Evaluator: GAO</p> <p>Report No. GAO-15-526, July 2015  <a href="http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-15-526">http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-15-526</a></p>	<p>2) How are GLRI funds used by federal and nonfederal recipients, including the proportion of funds used for administrative and planning activities, as compared to on-the-ground restoration and post-project monitoring?</p> <p>3) What methods do the Task Force agencies use to identify Great Lakes restoration work, solicit GLRI project proposals, and select projects?</p> <p>4) What methods do the Task Force agencies have in place to ensure that nonfederal stakeholders are complying with the terms of their GLRI agreements and with federal laws about the use of GLRI funds?</p>	<p>System (GLAS) was created to monitor and report GLRI progress, but some GLAS data is inaccurate, in part because EPA did not provide clear guidance on entering certain information and GLAS did not have data quality controls.</p>	<p>recommendations as GAO completed its work. GAO reviewed the actions taken and determined that the recommendations had been addressed. As a result, GAO's report contained no recommendations for EPA.</p> <p>EPA has implemented the information system that has replaced GLAS.</p>
2	<p><b>EPA Needs to Demonstrate Public Health Benefits of Drinking Water State Revolving Funds Projects</b></p> <p>Program or Policy Evaluated: Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF)</p> <p>Evaluator: OIG</p>	<p>1) How have the EPA and states demonstrated that completed DWSRF projects met project and program goals and contributed to improved drinking water quality and public health.</p>	<p>OIG found that EPA does not obtain all required DWSRF project data from states, despite capitalization grants that require states to input key project information into EPA databases. EPA does not always use annual reviews of state DWSRF programs to assess project outcomes.</p>	<p>OIG recommended that the Office of Water (OW) enforce grant requirements that states input all necessary data in the project-level tracking database and review data completeness as part of the EPA's annual review of state performance. OIG also recommended that the EPA enhance coordination between DWSRF and Public Water</p>

	<p>Report No. 15-P0032, December 5, 2014  <a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2014/20141205-15-P-0032.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2014/20141205-15-P-0032.pdf</a></p>			<p>System Supervision programs and periodically evaluate program results.</p> <p>EPA has been providing QA tools to the regional program offices for key fields in the Drinking Water Project Benefits Reporting System (PBR) to help assess completeness and ensure fields are filled in properly. This tool has been provided on a quarterly basis since Q2 of FY 2015.</p>
2	<p><b>EPA Complied With Improper Payment Legislation, But Opportunities for Improvement Exist</b></p> <p>Program or Policy Evaluated: Office of Water</p> <p>Evaluator: OIG</p> <p>Report No. 15-P0152, May 1, 2015  <a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2015/20150501-15-P-0152.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2015/20150501-15-P-0152.pdf</a></p>	<p>Evaluate FY 2014 reporting of improper payments at EPA for accuracy and completeness and the agency's performance in reducing and recapturing improper payments.</p>	<p>OIG found areas in which EPA could improve its process for identifying and reporting improper payments. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) EPA did not consider an internal control assessment of its payroll and travel payment streams—neither one created by the EPA itself, nor an OIG report on the EPA's purchase card program—when preparing its qualitative risk assessments. Both reports highlighted areas where compliance with existing controls needed improvement.</li> <li>2) In its estimate of improper payments, EPA did not include improper payments made to a former EPA employee who pleaded guilty to theft of government property.</li> <li>3) EPA regional staff did not always complete required fields in</li> </ul>	<p>OIG recommended that OW provide feedback to regional offices on improving the program evaluation reports and transaction testing worksheets.</p> <p>EPA's OW provided ongoing feedback to regional offices through the year on improving the program evaluation reports and provided SRF training for regions. EPA has convened a working group to determine how to collect improper payment information stemming from criminal investigations to supplement statistical transaction testing. Additionally, EPA held a training session for regional staff at its national program managers meeting on the use of the transaction testing forms. During the training, common questions and concerns pertaining to the program evaluation reports were addressed. EPA HQ staff have also discussed issues with regional staff as forms are submitted.</p>

			transaction testing worksheets, nor identify some required information in program evaluation reports.	
2	<p><b>Enhanced EPA Oversight and Action Can Further Protect Water Resources From the Potential Impacts of Hydraulic Fracturing</b></p> <p>Program or Policy Evaluated: Office of Groundwater and Drinking Water</p> <p>Evaluator: OIG</p> <p>Report No. 15-P0204, July 16, 2015  <a href="http://www.epa.gov/oit/reports/2015/20150716-15-P-0204.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oit/reports/2015/20150716-15-P-0204.pdf</a></p>	<p>1) Evaluate how EPA and states have used existing authorities to regulate hydraulic fracturing impacts to water resources.</p> <p>2) What regulatory authority is available to the EPA and states, identify potential threats to water resources from hydraulic fracturing and evaluate the EPA's and states' responses to them.</p>	<p>OIG found that EPA needs to improve oversight of permit issuance for hydraulic fracturing using diesel fuels and address any related compliance issues.</p> <p>Evidence shows that companies have used diesel fuels during hydraulic fracturing without EPA or primacy state underground injection control Class II permits. The EPA has also not determined whether primacy states and tribes are following the agency's interpretive memorandum for issuing permits for hydraulic fracturing using diesel fuels. Enhanced EPA oversight can increase assurance that risks associated with diesel fuel hydraulic fracturing are being adequately addressed</p>	<p>OIG recommended that OW determine whether primacy states and tribes issue permits for the use of diesel fuels as required.</p> <p>As part of the EPA UIC Program's regular oversight activities with states and through direct implementation of the UIC Program, the agency will continue to communicate requirements and responsibilities regarding the use of diesel fuels during hydraulic fracturing.</p> <p>Through these oversight activities, EPA will determine whether diesel fuels are used; and, if so, whether the EPA, states and tribes are issuing permits in accordance with the SDWA and UIC regulations.</p> <p>OW will compile results of regional and primacy program permitting activities regarding the use of diesel fuels in hydraulic fracturing and post those results on its public website.</p>
2	<p><b>EPA Needs to Improve the Recognition and Administration of Cloud Services for the Office of</b></p>	<p>Evaluate the adoption of cloud computing for OW's Permit Management Oversight System (PMOS). OIG also reviewed an</p>	<p>OIG found that EPA is not fully aware of the extent of its use of cloud services, and thereby is missing an opportunity to help make the most efficient use of its</p>	<p>OIG recommended that the Assistant Administrator for Water, the Assistant Administrator for Administration and Resources Management, and the Chief Information Officer undertake seven</p>

<p><b>Water's Permit Management Oversight System</b></p> <p>Program or Policy Evaluated: OW's Permit Management Oversight System</p> <p>Evaluator: OIG</p> <p>Report No. 15-P-0295, September 24, 2015  <a href="http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/20150924-15-p-0295.pdf">http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/20150924-15-p-0295.pdf</a></p>	<p>executed contract between the agency and a cloud service provider for compliance with applicable standards.</p>	<p>limited resources regarding cloud-based acquisitions. OW did not follow EPA procedures when implementing PMOS, and the office did not know whether it was in the agency's best interest to establish the system. Additionally, inadequate oversight of OW's PMOS contractor resulted in inadequate controls over EPA data. In particular, EPA failed to establish adequate requirements for the hosting of PMOS, resulting in PMOS being hosted in a cloud service provider's environment that did not comply with federal security requirements. There was also no assurance that the EPA has access to the service provider's cloud environment for audit and investigative purposes. In addition, the service provider's terms of service were not compliant with the Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program. Furthermore, the PMOS jeopardized government transparency by being hosted on an Internet domain registered to a prior contractor, and by allowing the service provider to host PMOS-provided email services that may not be</p>	<p>corrective actions to address deficiencies in the EPA's cloud computing initiatives, three of which are specific to OW. OIG recommends that EPA take steps to develop and implement an approved PMOS system authorization package, determine the cost effectiveness for operating PMOS, and search the PMOS hosting environment for potential EPA records.</p> <p>OW responded to the final OIG report on December 17, 2015, and OIG accepted OW's corrective action plan on January 4, 2016 and will close the report. The accepted corrective actions include one completed and two ongoing activities. In response to the recommendation regarding email services, OW confirmed that email services are not currently used in PMOS and that the contractor managing PMOS has and will make all email communications regarding PMOS available to the EPA COR for a period of up to five years from the time they were sent or received. This action is considered complete. The actions to resolve the recommendations regarding the PMOS Security Plan and Alternatives Analysis are ongoing. OW maintains that the PMOS security controls as covered by NCC's security plan are adequate given existing policies, but agreed to work with OEI to consider any deficient security</p>
---	--	--	---

			considered when responding to Freedom of Information Act requests.	controls if explicitly identified by OIG. OW continues to work on an Alternatives Analysis for PMOS to compare costs of keeping the current system versus using ICIS or creating a new database. This report is expected to be completed by February 2016. OW must continue to track progress on these ongoing actions in the Management Audit Tracking System until the actions have been completed.
3	<b>Impacts of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 Inspection Frequency Requirement on Compliance at Underground Storage Tanks</b> Office of Land and Emergency Management (OLEM) Internal analysis <a href="http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/oswer-accomplishment-reports-and-benefits">http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/oswer-accomplishment-reports-and-benefits</a>	OLEM conducted this internal analysis to identify the effect that changing to a 3-year inspection cycle has had on compliance at underground storage tanks (USTs).	Preliminary results suggest that increasing inspection frequency to every 3 years as required under the Energy Policy Act of 2005 has improved UST compliance in Louisiana.	Recommendations include finalizing the Louisiana analysis and publishing a peer-reviewed paper on the study, while at the same time expanding the study with data from additional states.
3	<b>Superfund Leverages Economic Benefits</b> OLEM Internal Analysis <a href="http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/oswer-accomplishment-reports-and-benefits">http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/oswer-accomplishment-reports-and-benefits</a>	OLEM assessed various sources of data to better understand the economic benefits communities can leverage from money spent on Superfund cleanup.	As of the end of FY 2014, EPA had spent a cumulative total of \$8.2 billion (inflation adjusted) in appropriated funds, funds obtained from PRP settlements, and state cost-share contributions, toward cleanup at 450 out of 850 Superfund sites where reuse is occurring. In 2014 alone, these sites supported	Recommendations include updating and expanding this analysis on a yearly basis while using the information to explain the benefits of cleanup to communities and other stakeholders.

			3,400 businesses that generated \$31 billion in sales – almost four times the amount spent by EPA.	
3	<b>Understanding the Communities OSWER Serves</b> OLEM Internal Analysis <a href="http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/oswer-accomplishment-reports-and-benefits">http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/oswer-accomplishment-reports-and-benefits</a>	To help understand the communities in which it works, OLEM updated its data on the population within three miles of its Superfund, RCRA CA, and Brownfields sites with the latest American Community Survey data (2009-2013).	Approximately 166 million people live within three miles of these sites; this is roughly 53% of the U.S. population, including approximately 55% of all children in the U.S. under age 5. While there is no single way to characterize communities located near the sites, OLEM found that as with its 2011 data, the population within three miles of the sites is more minority, low income, and linguistically isolated, and less likely to have a high school education than the U.S. population as a whole.	Because this population may have fewer resources with which to address health and environment concerns, OLEM will continue to use this information in improving the way it works with communities surrounding Superfund, RCRA CA, and Brownfields sites.
3	<b>People Protected by Superfund Remedial and RCRA CA Site Cleanup</b> OLEM Internal Analysis <a href="http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/oswer-accomplishment-reports-and-benefits">http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/oswer-accomplishment-reports-and-benefits</a>	In FY 2015 OLEM collected data to illustrate the progress EPA is making in protecting people who live near contaminated sites by assuring that unacceptable human exposures to contaminants are eliminated or controlled as soon as possible in advance of the cleanup process.	By looking at 2009-2013 American Community Service census data, OLEM found that approximately 30 million people live within a mile of a Superfund Remedial or RCRA Corrective Action (CA) site where human exposure to contamination has been controlled, including 10% of all children in the U.S. under the age of 18.	OLEM plans to update this information every two years and use it to help the public understand the human health benefits of site cleanup.

3	<p><b>Impact of Brownfield Cleanups on Nearby Residential Property Tax Revenue</b></p> <p>OLEM Internal Analysis <a href="http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/oswer-accomplishment-reports-and-benefits">http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/oswer-accomplishment-reports-and-benefits</a></p>	<p>To better understand one of the benefits that accrue to local governments as a result of brownfield cleanup, OLEM compiled the data needed to estimate the increased residential property tax revenue attributed to brownfield cleanup at 48 brownfields remediated between 2004 and 2010 under EPA's Brownfields Cleanup Grants program.</p>	<p>Applying findings of a previous study by Haninger, Ma and Timmins (2014) showing that housing property values increased 5.0%-11.5% near brownfield sites when cleanup was completed, OLEM found an estimated \$29 to \$73 million in additional tax revenue for local governments in a single year after cleanup. This is two to six times more than the \$12.4 million EPA contributed to the cleanup of those brownfields.</p>	<p>This analysis did not contain recommendations. OLEM intends to use this information to show the benefits of brownfield cleanup to communities and local governments.</p>
4	<p><b>EPA's Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Awards Program Lacks Adequate Support and Transparency and Should be Assessed for Continuation</b></p> <p>Program or Policy Evaluated: Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Awards Program; Chemistry, Economics and Sustainable Strategies Division (CESSD); Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT); OCSPP</p> <p>Evaluator: OIG</p> <p>Report No. 15-P-0279 September 15, 2015</p>	<p>OIG conducted the review to ensure that all contributions reported by EPA's Green Chemistry Challenge Awards Program to the agency's pollution prevention performance measures are adequately supported and transparent. OIG asked: Are reported contributions from Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Awards to EPA P2 performance measures adequately supported and transparent? Does the Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Awards Program have an</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPA lacks a specific program design for the Green Chemistry Awards</li> <li>• EPA does not verify Green Chemistry Awards data</li> <li>• The Green Chemistry Awards Program is not transparent about the source of its results</li> <li>• There is no evidence of presidential recognition</li> </ul>	<p>OIG recommended that EPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discontinue use of Green Chemistry Awards data in EPA P2 performance metrics until controls over data quality are implemented</li> <li>• Assess the need for and value of the Green Chemistry Awards program for supporting pollution prevention or other EPA goals and measures. If EPA determines that the program is useful, should be continued and elects to use the data to support agency goals, EPA should pursue seven specific actions outlined by the OIG in its final report.</li> <li>• Obtain ongoing, current Presidential endorsement of the Green Chemistry Awards Program or rename the program.</li> </ul>

	<a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2015/20150915-15-P-0279.pdf">www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2015/20150915-15-P-0279.pdf</a>	adequate system of internal data controls?		EPA recognizes that the environmental benefits of technology innovations recognized by the Presidential Green Chemistry Program are not solely the results of this EPA program and will cease to use these results as part of EPA's P2 performance metrics. EPA also believes data associated with the program are adequately verified and characterized, with data controls in place to support continuing collection of and reporting on these data, and EPA will continue to collect and disseminate environmental benefits data as part of broader education and promotion of green chemistry. As EPA continues to administer the Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge program, additional efforts will commence to expand and integrate the green chemistry awards portion of the Pollution Prevention logic model. For the 2015 awards, congratulatory letters to each of the awardees were signed by the President, demonstrating ongoing Presidential endorsement for this program.
4	<b>A Review of the New Chemical Program under the Toxic Substances Control Act</b>  Program or policy evaluated: TSCA New Chemical Review Program, administered by the	OPPT conducted this evaluation to identify ways the New Chemical Review Program can be as effective and efficient as possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program has resulted in substantial health and environmental protection</li> <li>• No evidence of significant adverse effects on chemical innovation</li> </ul>	Recommendations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase staffing levels to address current shortages and impending retirements</li> <li>• Address proliferation of inadequate, poorly maintained information</li> </ul>

<p>Chemical Control Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT), OCSPP</p> <p>Evaluator: OPPT, Chemical Control Division, supported by a contract with Warren R. Muir, Ph.D., and John S. Young, Ph.D.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government costs low compared to new chemical oversight programs</li> <li>• Level of compliance unknown</li> <li>• Keys to program success identified</li> <li>• Accomplishments not widely known</li> <li>• Program infrastructure crumbling</li> <li>• Opportunities for improvement identified</li> </ul>	<p>systems and poorly maintained databases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and modify burdensome CBI handling policies and procedures</li> <li>• Develop management approach to clarify and assign staff responsibilities in post-reorganization structure</li> <li>• Improve review process by incorporating new science and adopting new policies and practices</li> <li>• Address life sciences revolution and growth of biotechnology business sector</li> </ul> <p>OPPT is actively addressing many key recommendations and will continue to treat them, and other report recommendations, as priority actions in FY 2016. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPPT is now recruiting 54 additional staff, many of whom will support the New Chemicals Program.</li> <li>• OPPT has begun developing a new system in CIS that will replace and exceed the capability of the current PMN Gold system and other databases. Completing the system is one of OPPT's Strategic Priorities for FY 2016.</li> <li>• In July 2015, in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Food and Drug Administration, EPA initiated a process to modernize the federal regulatory system for the</li> </ul>
---	--	---	--

				products of biotechnology and to establish mechanisms for periodic updates of that system.
4	<p><b>Risk Assessments</b></p> <p>Registration Review</p> <p>Internal assessment</p> <p><a href="http://www2.epa.gov/endangered-species">http://www2.epa.gov/endangered-species</a></p>	EPA and the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior and National Marine Fisheries, Department of Commerce (the Services) have been working collaboratively to reach agreement on the scientific methods to assess the risk of pesticides to listed endangered species.	National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report recommendations were released in 2013. After which inter-agency interim scientific approaches were developed collaboratively between the agencies and released during a one day public meeting. At a second stake holder meeting in 2014 industry and NGOs provided comments on the interim approaches. The evolution of this process has continued throughout 2015.	EPA and the Services have been working collaboratively to resolve litigation brought against EPA for failure to consult and against the Services for failure to complete consultations. EPA and the Services developed a strategy to resolve four cases that will allow the agencies to focus their ESA compliance resources over the next 3-4 years on completing NAS “compliant” nationwide Biological Evaluations and Biological opinions for five pesticides. EPA and the Services now have the opportunity to pilot and implement recommendations from the 2013 NAS report with identified milestones and timeliness for completing work products. Five chemicals are currently being piloted and it's anticipated that these pilots will consume significant resources over the coming years. The program will continue to assess and modify its approach as we learn more during the piloting process
4	<p><b>EPA Needs Accurate Data on Results of Pollution Prevention Grants to Maintain Program Integrity and Measure Effectiveness of Grants</b></p>	To determine how the EPA has ensured pollution prevention goals are achieved through P2 grants. Were P2 grants awarded for activities that were consistent with the	EPA's guidance and controls do not ensure consistent and accurate reporting of state P2 program results. Reported P2 grant results cannot be reconciled between regions and headquarters.	OIG recommended that EPA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement the P2 GrantsPlus database to begin the process for enhancing the reporting and recording of its P2 grants</li> </ul>

	<p>Program or Policy Evaluated: EPA Pollution Prevention Grants Program, administered by the Chemicals, Economics and Sustainable Strategies Division (CESSD), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT)</p> <p>Evaluator: OIG</p> <p>Report No. 15-P-0276 September 4, 2015 <a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2015/20150904-15-P-0276.pdf">www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2015/20150904-15-P-0276.pdf</a></p>	<p>Pollution Prevention Act and aligned with P2 goals and regional priorities? How are reported grant results supported? What is the degree of transparency in reporting of P2 grants?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and implement controls to ensure accurate and consistent reporting of regional results to headquarters and documentation of revisions made by headquarters</li> </ul> <p>EPA's P2 Program is deploying its P2 GrantsPlus database to begin enhancing the reporting and recording of its P2 grants. By the end of CY 2015, the P2 program will distribute a tip sheet to regions on how to minimize data entry errors in reporting.</p> <p>The program requires grant applicants to state whether they plan to report facility-level results at the close of the grant and how this will be done. If an applicant anticipates limitations or barriers, an explanation of the burden or confidentiality issue of concern must be provided. Once a grant is awarded, the requirement to report facility-level results (or burden/confidentiality concerns) is formalized in the grant terms and conditions.</p> <p>Through its 2016-2017 National Program Guidance, the P2 Program has clarified that, under P2 grants, governmental results cannot be reported as P2 Program results.</p>	
5	<b>EPA Regions Have Considered Environmental Justice When Targeting</b>	Determine whether OECA and EPA regions have targeted facilities in	The OIG found that all 10 EPA regions have considered EJ when targeting facilities for air toxics	This evaluation did not provide recommendations because the OIG found that all EPA regions have satisfactorily

	<p><b>Facilities for Air Toxics Inspections</b></p> <p>Program or Policy Evaluated: EPA regions; Office of Compliance, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA); Office of Environmental Justice, OECA</p> <p>Evaluator: OIG</p> <p>Report No. 15-P-0101 February 26, 2015 <a href="http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-04/documents/20150225-15-p-0101.pdf">http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-04/documents/20150225-15-p-0101.pdf</a></p>	<p>overburdened communities or communities with disproportionate impacts for Clean Air Act inspections for air toxics.</p> <p>How is the agency meeting its responsibility to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies and activities on minority and low-income populations?</p>	<p>inspections, and EPA continues to update and advance important tools to support regional targeting efforts. Through the modifications made to EJSCREEN and the new GeoPlatform mapping tools being developed by OECA, the agency is taking important and proactive steps to enhance the ability of EPA regions to consider areas of EJ concern when targeting air toxics inspections. According to the OIG, the development of tools that integrate EJSCREEN data with GeoPlatform data layers is a promising practice that will help EPA regions more effectively identify areas of potential EJ concern, and help regions consider EJ and risks to communities during targeting efforts.</p>	<p>considered EJ in their targeting efforts for air toxics inspections of stationary sources.</p> <p>OECA plans to continue its use of the agency's GeoPlatform tool in conjunction with EJSCREEN data to produce better air toxics targeting tools for EPA regions.</p>
5	<p><b>EPA Needs to Track Whether Its Major Municipal Settlements for Combined Sewer Overflows Benefit Water Quality</b></p> <p>Program or Policy Evaluated: Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Programs, shared</p>	<p>Determine how selected municipalities are implementing actions, achieving milestones and achieving anticipated outcomes under EPA's National Enforcement Initiative to address CSOs. The OIG also sought ways</p>	<p>OIG found that some communities under CSO consent decrees are meeting project milestones, and there is evidence that combined sewer overflows have been reduced. However, the OIG also found that EPA is not tracking and assessing results from consent decrees or</p>	<p>The OIG recommended that OECA develop and report outcome-based goals and measures for the CSO consent decrees; develop a national consent decree tracking system for regional and headquarters use; develop an Annual Commitment System goal that establishes regional goals for monitoring and reporting outcomes associated with</p>

	<p>among OECA's Water Enforcement Division, OW's Office of Wastewater Management, and EPA regional offices.</p> <p>Evaluator: OIG</p> <p>Project No. 15-P-0280 September 16, 2015  <a href="http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/20150916-15-p-0280.pdf">http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/20150916-15-p-0280.pdf</a></p>	<p>the EPA could improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its consent decree tracking efforts for this program.</p> <p>How are selected municipalities implementing consent decrees issued under the EPA's enforcement initiative to keep raw sewage and contaminated stormwater out of the nation's waters, and are they achieving milestones and anticipated outcomes? What opportunities exist for the EPA to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of tracking the progress of CSO consent decree implementation and outcomes?</p>	<p>determining whether the consent decrees are leading to desired water quality improvements. The OIG also found that EPA lacks a national tracking system that consistently monitors CSO consent decree results and improves oversight of the agency's regional tracking activities.</p>	<p>CSO consent decrees; and provide a public website for CSO consent decree information.</p> <p>EPA agreed with the OIG on the need to better monitor and document implementation of consent decrees to reduce pollution from raw sewage and contaminated stormwater that threatens people's health and imperils our nation's waters. OECA expects the results of this evaluation to inform OECA actions on other media programs.</p> <p>OECA's corrective action plan to address OIG recommendations includes some the following commitments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● As a component of OECA's FY 2015 end-of-year reporting effort, update the CSO results portion of the Municipal Infrastructure National Enforcement Initiative (NEI) via the OECA National Enforcement Initiative website:  <a href="http://www2.epa.gov/enforcement/national-enforcement-initiative-keeping-raw-sewage-and-contaminated-stormwater-out-our">http://www2.epa.gov/enforcement/national-enforcement-initiative-keeping-raw-sewage-and-contaminated-stormwater-out-our</a></li> <li>● Supplement the CSO portion of the Municipal Infrastructure National Enforcement Initiative website by adding a link to a table of the CSO facilities with federal judicial consent</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>decrees presented on the National Enforcement Initiative website map (including facility name, location, addressed status, link to facility on the ECHO Website, link to the consent decree, date CD was entered, date region projected terms of CD will be completed, projected estimated environmental benefits (lbs and gallons), and projected estimated cost of compliance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As an interim measure, make available to the public the current data collected by OECA for the GPRA measure on the overall compliance status of CSO consent decrees. Publish this data in a public-friendly format, identifying EPA's determination of consent decree compliance status for each NEI CSO under a consent decree.</li> </ul>
5	<p><b>EPA's Oversight of State Pesticide Inspections Needs Improvement to Better Ensure Safeguards for Workers, Public and Environment Are Enforced</b></p> <p>Program or Policy Evaluated: State Pesticide Use Enforcement OECA and OCSPP</p> <p>Evaluator: OIG</p>	<p>To determine how EPA's oversight of state programs ensures the quality of state-performed Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) Worker Protection Standard (WPS) and certification inspections regarding pesticides. The study evaluated how the agency selects inspection reports for oversight,</p>	<p>The OIG found that the EPA needs procedures and training that provide specific direction to EPA oversight staff on selecting inspections, reporting, documenting, and retaining inspection review findings; documenting state consistency in enforcement cases; and communicating review findings to state partners. These actions should result in consistent and more effective regional oversight</p>	<p>Recommendation 1: OIG recommended that OECA, in coordination with OCSPP, revise the FIFRA Project Officer Manual to include specific guidance for reporting, documenting and retaining records from project officer inspection reviews; documenting how a state's enforcement actions are consistent with the state's enforcement policies and procedures; selecting inspection files for review; and documenting closeout meetings with states.</p>

	<p>Report No. 15-P-0156 May 15, 2015  <a href="http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/20150515-15-p-0156.pdf">http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/20150515-15-p-0156.pdf</a></p>	<p>documents its reviews, and conducts follow-up on oversight findings.</p>	<p>of state performance, which will lead to increased assurance that the EPA's oversight process will detect pesticide misuse and unnecessary risks to human health and the environment.</p>	<p>Recommendation 2: OIG recommended that OCSPP ensure that required FIFRA project officer training is conducted periodically and the above guidance is included in the training.</p> <p>The agency agreed with the OIG's recommendations. Regarding Recommendation 1, the agency provided a corrective action plan and estimated completion date. Regarding Recommendation 2, the OIG acknowledges that the agency conducted project officer training in March 2015, during which the OIG findings were discussed. The agency is developing plans for future trainings and will provide the plan as its corrective action.</p>
--	---	---	--	---