

## FY 2016 Program Evaluations

Title and Evaluator	Purpose and Brief Description	Results and Conclusions	Recommendations, Response, and/or Significance
<p>EPA Can Strengthen Its Reviews of Small Particle Monitoring in Region 6 to Better Ensure Effectiveness of Air Monitoring Network (OIG Report No. 16-P-0079)</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Inspector General</p> <p>Publication Date: December 2015</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-can-strengthen-its-reviews-small-particle-monitoring-region-6">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-can-strengthen-its-reviews-small-particle-monitoring-region-6</a></p>	<p>OIG conducted a review to determine whether the agency has used annual air monitoring network reviews and assessments to provide reasonable assurance that Region 6’s fine particulate matter (PM2.5) air monitoring network is achieving its objectives.</p>	<p>EPA agreed with all six provided proposed corrective actions for each recommendation in the OIG’s report. All report recommendations are resolved.</p>	<p>OIG recommended that OAR clarify what constitutes sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with monitoring and operational requirements when developing annual plans; develop a process to update analytic tools for future assessments; and emphasize the importance of network assessments. OIG also recommended that EPA Region 6 address state-specific deficiencies in monitoring plans and assessments and strengthen its network assessment review process.</p>
<p>EPA’s Tracking and Reporting of Its Conference Costs Need Improvement</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Inspector General</p> <p>Publication Date: January 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epas-tracking-and-reporting-its-conference-costs-need-improvement">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epas-tracking-and-reporting-its-conference-costs-need-improvement</a></p>	<p>On May 11, 2012, the Office of Management and Budget issued Memorandum M-12-12, <i>Promoting Efficient Spending to Support Agency Operations</i>. It calls for agencies to ensure that conference expenses are appropriate, necessary and managed in a manner that minimizes expenses to taxpayers. M-12-12 and Public Law 113-76, <i>Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014</i>, set forth oversight and reporting</p>	<p>The EPA established internal controls to report conferences both publicly and to the OIG as required by M-12-12 and Public Law 113-76. However, OIG found improvements are needed to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OIG found \$6,916 of inappropriate expenses attributed to two conferences out of the \$985,851 of expenses reviewed for eight conferences.</li> </ul>	<p>OIG recommend that the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) provide additional guidance or training on how to identify unallowable conference costs, use correct conference project codes, identify all conference costs in the financial system, report all conference costs paid with EPA funds, and classify conferences properly. OIG also</p>

FY 2016 Annual Performance Report  
Environmental Protection Agency

	<p>requirements for agencies with conferences that cost over \$100,000.</p> <p>In light of this scrutiny over conference spending, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), sought to determine whether the EPA’s internal controls and conference oversight ensure that conference expenses are appropriate and reported accurately.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EPA required the use of conference project codes to track and monitor conference spending, but this did not always occur.</li> <li>• Conference costs were underreported.</li> <li>• Two conferences totaling \$350,782 were in the EPA conference spending tool but were not reported publicly as required.</li> <li>• Sixty-four percent of the 227 fiscal year 2014 conferences were reported late or not reported to the OIG as required. Two of the eight conferences sampled were not reported to the OIG at all.</li> </ul>	<p>recommend that OCFO work with program offices to identify EPA Form 5170A cost reporting issues and revise the form as needed. The OCFO agreed with all recommendations and provided planned corrective actions with milestone dates. When implemented, the corrective actions should address the recommendations.</p>
<p>Positioning EPA for the Digital Age Requires New Mindsets Toward Printing</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Inspector General</p> <p>Publication Date: March 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-positioning-epa-digital-age-requires-new-mindsets-toward-printing">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-positioning-epa-digital-age-requires-new-mindsets-toward-printing</a></p>	<p>The Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducted this audit to determine whether EPA printing and publications operations are efficient and effective, and comply with applicable federal guidance.</p> <p>Executive Order 13589 on printing encourages agencies to limit the publication and printing of hard copy documents, and presumes that information will be provided in an electronic format whenever practicable. Proper stewardship of federal</p>	<p>The EPA’s main authoritative guidance for printing operations (Printing Management Manual) is over 20 years old and outdated. The Agency Printing Officer stated that the agency hopes to update its manual once federal regulations are updated. As a result, the manual currently does not provide effective guidance for accountability or oversight.</p> <p>EPA’s current mindset leads the agency to amass large quantities of printed material. EPA staff believe it is cheaper to print in bulk and then store the material. The potential</p>	<p>OIG recommend that the Assistant Administrator for Administration and Resources Management update the Printing Management Manual to include authorization for decentralized operations within the regions, and issue guidance to reiterate roles and responsibilities. In addition, OIG recommended that the agency establish achievable milestones to address the recommendations in OIG’s prior report. The EPA concurred with all of the recommendations, and</p>

FY 2016 Annual Performance Report  
Environmental Protection Agency

	<p>resources is an essential responsibility of agency managers and staff.</p>	<p>for waste is high, as evidenced by the nearly 8 million items recycled at the National Service Center for Environmental Publications between June 2013 and March 2015.</p> <p>Further, the EPA has yet to implement all corrective actions identified in response to a 2014 OIG report on strategic sourcing. The OIG recommended, and the agency agreed, to develop by December 2014 a plan of action to strategically source print management. The EPA has extended its deadlines more than once and still has not established realistic milestones to implement all corrective actions. As a result, the EPA still cannot effectively control print management functions.</p>	<p>the OIG agrees with the agency's proposed actions. When implemented, the corrective actions will meet the intent of OIG's recommendations.</p>
<p>No Intent to Underestimate Costs Was Found, but Supporting Documentation for EPA's Final Rule Limiting Sulfur in Gasoline Was Incomplete or Inaccurate in Several Instances</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Inspector General</p> <p>Publication Date: March 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-no-intent-underestimate-costs-was-found-supporting-documentation">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-no-intent-underestimate-costs-was-found-supporting-documentation</a></p>	<p>The Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducted this review in response to a hotline complaint about how the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimated costs to the petroleum refining industry to meet new sulfur content standards for gasoline under the 2014 Tier 3 Motor Vehicle Emission and Fuel Standards (i.e., Tier 3 rule). The Tier 3 rule requires new emission limits for motor vehicles, as well as reduced limits on the amount of sulfur in gasoline. The</p>	<p>OIG found no evidence to substantiate the hotline allegations that EPA staff or managers purposefully underestimated costs to refineries or intentionally misrepresented information about its modeling analyses in public rulemaking documents related to the Tier 3 rule. However, during the review OIG identified several instances where descriptions of certain aspects of the EPA's modeling analyses were inaccurate or incomplete in the Tier 3 rule's final regulatory impact analysis (RIA). Based on this assessment, some of these</p>	<p>OIG recommends that the Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation direct the Office of Transportation and Air Quality to develop a process to provide for an enhanced quality assurance review of future RIA documents when the analysis used to support the rulemaking is influential scientific information and/or cannot be made public. The agency agreed with this recommendation and proposed an acceptable corrective action.</p>

	<p>primary allegations were that the EPA purposefully underestimated the costs to refineries and misrepresented information in the public record about how the agency modeled these costs. OIG's objective was to determine whether the EPA adhered to relevant statutes, regulations, policies, procedures and guidance in estimating and reporting expected costs to refineries to comply with the Tier 3 sulfur standards.</p>	<p>instances occurred because EPA staff did not update information about their analyses in the final RIA from the earlier version that was developed for the proposed rule. In addition, staffing and time constraints hampered the quality assurance review of the final RIA. The inaccurate and incomplete documentation identified did not impact the EPA's estimate of costs to the refining industry.</p> <p>RIAs are intended to be comprehensive, detailed documents that describe to the public how the EPA conducted its analyses in support of rulemakings. They help promote accountability and transparency in government actions. Inaccurate and incomplete information in any final RIA could prevent a third party from obtaining a full and accurate understanding of how the EPA arrived at its overall cost estimate, and could undermine public trust in the integrity of the regulatory process. This is especially true when EPA's analyses are identified as influential scientific information and/or cannot be publicly released due to the inclusion of sensitive or proprietary information, as was the case with the EPA's Tier 3 cost model. In these instances, extra vigilance is needed by the agency to ensure that the information</p>	
--	---	---	--

		<p>in the public rulemaking documents is accurate and complete.</p>	
<p>Management Alert: Significant Data Quality Deficiencies Impede EPA’s Ability to Ensure Companies Can Pay for Cleanups</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Inspector General</p> <p>Publication Date: March 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-significant-data-quality-deficiencies-impede-epas-ability-ensure">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-significant-data-quality-deficiencies-impede-epas-ability-ensure</a></p>	<p>In the process of evaluating the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) progress in reducing taxpayer liabilities through the use of financial assurance instruments for cleanup sites, OIG became aware of significant data gaps and invalid financial assurance instruments that pose a risk to the EPA and taxpayers. OIG is issuing this management alert now because OIG believes that the EPA cannot provide reasonable assurance of proper controls over its programs and operations that protect the public from environmental harm and safeguard federal funds.</p> <p>Companies with facilities regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) are required to provide financial assurance that they have sufficient financial assets to cover closure and post-closure costs. Hazardous waste sites regulated under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), or Superfund, are required to obtain financial assurance for the estimated cost of cleanup.</p>	<p>Data quality deficiencies and a lack of internal controls prevent the EPA from properly overseeing and managing its financial assurance program for RCRA and CERCLA. For these programs, EPA data for corporate self-insurance show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The estimated total cost is \$9.1 billion.</li> <li>• An estimated \$577 million is expired.</li> <li>• More than \$6 billion is insufficient or not documented as being provided to the EPA.</li> </ul> <p>The EPA is aware of the poor quality of its data and the resulting vulnerabilities. The EPA can take steps to mitigate risk to human health and the environment if a responsible company declares bankruptcy or abandons a facility. However, if the EPA cannot determine if it has secured valid and sufficient financial assurance instruments from those private parties, taxpayers are at risk for paying significant amounts of those parties’ financial obligations. In addition, public health protections may be delayed or deferred. Despite the EPA’s awareness of this risk, it has not taken meaningful steps to address the problem. Furthermore, the EPA has not</p>	<p>The EPA’s data deficiencies, coupled with a lack of controls over billions of dollars in financial assurance instruments, significantly impair and threaten the management of the EPA’s RCRA and Superfund programs, which present environmental and significant financial risks to the EPA. The agency disagreed with the estimated cost of invalid financial assurance instruments, and OIG’s portrayal of human health and financial risk. However, the EPA could not provide any other data on financial assurance to support its disagreement. OIG recommends that the EPA develop and take corrective actions to address the vulnerabilities. In addition, OIG recommends that the EPA include the significant vulnerabilities and exposure related to the RCRA and CERCLA financial assurance data gaps and noncompliance as a material weakness in its Federal Managers’ Financial Integrity Act reporting. The agency disagreed that the issue should rise to the material</p>

FY 2016 Annual Performance Report  
Environmental Protection Agency

		disclosed this area of vulnerability in its Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act report in the past 5 years.	weakness level; thus, OIG's recommendations are unresolved as both parties work toward a resolution.
<p>Clean Air Act Facility Evaluations Are Conducted, but Inaccurate Data Hinder EPA Oversight and Public Awareness</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Inspector General</p> <p>Publication Date: May 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-clean-air-act-facility-evaluations-are-conducted-inaccurate-data">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-clean-air-act-facility-evaluations-are-conducted-inaccurate-data</a></p>	<p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) performed this review to determine whether U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) management controls reasonably assure the agency conducts compliance assurance activities for major Clean Air Act (CAA) facilities in accordance with the Compliance Monitoring Strategy (CMS). According to the CMS, delegated agencies should submit a plan that outlines full compliance evaluation (FCE) frequencies. Periodic evaluations are essential to ensure companies' compliance with EPA laws and regulations.</p> <p>Using the Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO) website, which pulls information from EPA compliance databases, OIG identified a universe of facilities that had not received FCEs in 5 years. OIG then selected 65 facilities from EPA Regions 6, 8 and 9 to review.</p>	<p>Information obtained through the EPA's ECHO website indicated that many major facilities had not received FCEs in 5 years, although the CMS recommends an FCE every 2 years. However, OIG found the data were inaccurate and that most facilities in the review had received an FCE or were no longer a major facility.</p> <p>The errors went undetected because of limited data quality oversight performed in EPA Regions 6, 8 and 9. Oversight was needed to verify data entered into the Air Facility System (AFS) and migrated into the Integrated Compliance Information System-Air (ICIS-Air) database, from which the ECHO website pulls its data. Inaccurate data hinder EPA oversight and reduce assurance that delegated compliance programs comply with the agency's CMS guidance. Further, unreported or inaccurate data presented on the publicly available ECHO website could misinform the public about the status of facilities.</p> <p>While FCEs were generally conducted in the three regions, Region 9's</p>	<p>The six recommendations made to the EPA include establishing a process to conduct regular data quality checks, correcting identified inaccuracies in ICIS-Air, adding recordkeeping requirements to the agency's CMS guidance, providing guidance to California's local air districts pertaining to CMS plans, and consulting with states and local agencies regarding sampled facilities that are overdue for an FCE. The EPA agreed with all of the recommendations in the report and provided acceptable corrective actions with projected timeframes for completion.</p>

		<p>management controls could be improved. For example, one California local air district could not locate compliance monitoring reports for several facilities, despite having a records-retention policy that requires the district to keep records for 7 years or up to 2018. In addition, 89 percent of the 35 local air districts in California had outdated CMS plans, and four of the five local air districts reviewed had CMS plans that expired in 2011. Due to these conditions, the EPA has less assurance that local agencies in California are conducting adequate compliance activities, which increases the risk that excess emissions could impact human health and the environment.</p>	
<p>EPA Region 9 needs to Improve Oversight of San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund Grants</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Inspector General</p> <p>Publication Date: August 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-region-9-needs-improve-oversight-san-francisco-bay-water-quality">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-region-9-needs-improve-oversight-san-francisco-bay-water-quality</a></p>	<p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), conducted this audit to determine whether the EPA: 1) Ensures that grantees are effectively administering San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund grants through the life of the grant; and 2) Monitors project progress and collects data and/or indicators to determine if proposed project outputs and outcomes are achieved.</p> <p>The EPA has competitively awarded 33 grants totaling \$40.9 million to 18 different recipients with project</p>	<p>EPA Region 9 did not consistently administer grants and monitor project progress to determine whether proposed outputs, outcomes and milestones were being achieved. Specifically, grant specialist and project officers did not complete baseline monitoring accurately, were sometimes not timely, and did not consistently verify that grantees submitted required documents or reports throughout the life of the grant.</p> <p>Project officers did not consistently collect progress reports, or review and document monitoring and oversight activities (e.g.,</p>	<p>OIG recommends that the Regional Administrator, Region 9, issue a memorandum (or memoranda) and provide training to grant specialists, project officers and managers associated with the San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund grants. The memorandum (or memoranda) and training should cover important topics, such as conducting accurate and timely baseline monitoring; verifying that required documents are received throughout the life of the grant; holding staff accountable for grant</p>

FY 2016 Annual Performance Report  
 Environmental Protection Agency

	<p>periods beginning in fiscal year 2009. The purpose of the program is to protect and restore the San Francisco Bay.</p>	<p>review progress reports, document communication, and document site visits). OIG also found that progress reports submitted by grantees did not consistently include sufficient information to determine project progress toward completing outputs, outcomes, milestones and deliverables as identified in agreed-upon work plans and timelines.</p>	<p>management; providing evidence of follow-up and documenting all monitoring activities; obtaining performance reports as required; verifying that performance reports address required outputs, outcomes and corrective action for delayed milestones; and placing required documents in the official grant file. OIG also recommends that Region 9 develop a mechanism or quality review process to verify effective oversight.</p> <p>Region 9 agreed with the recommendations and provided completed and proposed corrective actions with milestone dates. The corrective actions will apply to Region 9's entire grants program and not be limited to the San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund grants program. Region 9 also reported that baseline training was provided to all grant specialists on May 2, 2016. The completed and proposed corrective actions meet the intent of the recommendations. All recommendations are open with agreed-to</p>
--	---	---	--

			corrective actions scheduled to be completed by the end of fiscal year 2017.
<p>EPA Needs a Risk-Based Strategy to Assure Continued Effectiveness of Hospital-Level Disinfectants</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Inspector General</p> <p>Publication Date: September 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-needs-risk-based-strategy-assure-continued-effectiveness">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-needs-risk-based-strategy-assure-continued-effectiveness</a></p>	<p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducted this review of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) Antimicrobial Testing Program (ATP) to determine whether the program ensures the efficacy of EPA-registered hospital sterilants, disinfectants and tuberculocides (“hospital-level disinfectants”); and to evaluate options for improving the ATP.</p> <p>Antimicrobial pesticides are designed to destroy or suppress harmful bacteria, viruses and other microorganisms on inanimate objects and surfaces in hospitals and other settings. The EPA has a testing program—the ATP—whose purpose is to ensure that EPA-approved hospital disinfectants and tuberculocides in the marketplace continue to meet stringent efficacy standards.</p> <p>Products found to be effective are reported to the public on an EPA website, and those that do not meet the ATP efficacy standards need to be brought into compliance.</p>	<p>As currently designed and implemented, the EPA’s ATP does not assure that hospital-level disinfectant products continue to be effective after they are registered. Infrequent testing and reliance on voluntary manufacturer participation reduce program effectiveness. Specifically, OIG found: 1) Once the EPA tests a product and it passes, it is listed as <i>Agency Confirmed Efficacy</i> on the agency’s website and is typically not tested again; the long-term efficacy of the product cannot be assured; and 2) The EPA relies on manufacturers to voluntarily submit product samples for testing. In the last 3 years, out of the approximately 300 registered hospital disinfectant products that have not been tested, manufacturers submitted only 12 samples to EPA for ATP efficacy testing.</p>	<p>OIG recommends that the Assistant Administrator for Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention suspend administering the ATP until completion of the one-time re-registration process, and then develop and implement a risk-based testing strategy. At a minimum, the antimicrobial testing strategy should include a framework for periodic testing, define program scope, identify risk factors and methods for selecting products to test, and designate a date to commence risk-based post-registration testing. The EPA agreed with these recommendations and proposed acceptable corrective actions. All recommendations are resolved and open pending completion.</p>
<p>Clean Air Act Facility Evaluations Are Conducted, but Inaccurate Data Hinder</p>	<p>The EPA OIG conducted this evaluation to determine whether U.S. EPA management controls</p>	<p>The OIG found EPA’s ECHO website indicated that many major facilities have not received FCEs in 5 years,</p>	<p>The Agency agreed with all of the OIG’s recommendations to:</p>

<p>EPA Oversight and Public Awareness</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Inspector General</p> <p>Publication Date: May 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-clean-air-act-facility-evaluations-are-conducted-inaccurate-data">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-clean-air-act-facility-evaluations-are-conducted-inaccurate-data</a></p>	<p>reasonably assure the agency conducts compliance assurance activities for major Clean Air Act (CAA) facilities in accordance with the Compliance Monitoring Strategy (CMS). According to the CMS, delegated agencies should submit a plan that outlines full compliance evaluation (FCE) frequencies. Period evaluations are essential to ensure companies' compliance with EPA laws and regulations.</p>	<p>although the CMS recommends an FCE every 2 years. However, it found that the data were inaccurate and that most facilities in the review had received an FCE or were no longer a major facility. The errors went undetected because of limited data quality oversight.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a process to conduct regular data quality checks;</li> <li>• Correct identified inaccuracies in ICIS-Air;</li> <li>• Add recordkeeping requirement to the Agency's CMS guidance;</li> <li>• Provide guidance to California's local air districts pertaining to CMS plans, and Consult with states and local agencies regarding sampled facilities that are overdue for an FCE.</li> </ul>
<p>Drinking Water: EPA Needs to Take Additional Steps to Ensure Small Community Water Systems Designated as Serious Violators Achieve Compliance</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Inspector General</p> <p>Publication Date: March 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-drinking-water-epa-needs-to-take-additional-steps-ensure-small">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-drinking-water-epa-needs-to-take-additional-steps-ensure-small</a></p>	<p>The EPA OIG reviewed 10 small drinking water systems in three states/territories (Puerto Rico, Texas, and Kansas) to determine how the U.S. EPA helps states and territories ensure that small community water systems with serious violations come into compliance with health-based standards and Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) requirements.</p>	<p>Across the three Regions, the OIG found inconsistencies in adherence to the EPA's Enforcement Response Policy (ERR). Of the thirty systems reviewed, 10 of the systems never received a formal enforcement order, only three of 20 enforcement orders met the timeliness standard in the ERR, and few cases were escalated by the EPA or state when noncompliance persisted.</p> <p>Each system faced specific challenges that made compliance difficult. In many cases, the EPA and states applies enforcement and compliance tools at their disposal to help the systems. Four systems attained compliance and several others made progress. However, at systems where serious noncompliance persisted, the EPA and states</p>	<p>The agency agreed with all of the OIG's following recommendations to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate the multiple efforts underway in Puerto Rico to improve compliance at priority systems and track whether notice is distributed to customers;</li> <li>• Take steps to ensure compliance with the ERR;</li> <li>• Require Regions to provide annual justification for the lack of formal enforcement action; and</li> </ul> <p>Establish a coordinated Action Plan for achieving workgroup goals that draw on expertise and tools across the agency, including inviting other agencies.</p>

		<p>need to engage in a long-term system-specific approach to bring about compliance.</p>	
<p>Integration of climate adaptation criteria into financial mechanisms <a href="http://www.epa.gov/arc-x">www.epa.gov/arc-x</a></p> <p>Evaluator: Office of the Administrator</p> <p>Completion Date: On-going Effort</p>	<p>Executive Order 13653 (“Preparing the United States for the Impacts of Climate Change”) calls for all Federal agencies to support climate-resilient investments across the nation. The President’s <i>Climate Action Plan</i> also committed EPA to integrated climate adaptation criteria into the Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Funds, and into the Brownfields Clean-up Grants.</p>	<p>EPA has a Strategic Performance Goal of having 240 state, tribal, and community partners incorporate climate change adaptation into the implementation of their environmental programs supported by major EPA financial mechanisms (grants, loans, contracts, and technical assistance agreements. EPA has made significant strides doing this. As already reported to OMB and CEQ during the mandatory 2016 Annual Climate Adaptation Performance Review, the Agency has (1) issued a memorandum encouraging programs to integrate climate adaptation into announcements of competitive funding opportunities; (2) successfully integrated climate adaptation criteria into major financial programs including the Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Funds, Brownfields Clean-up Grants, Great Lakes Restoration Initiative grants, Tribal Grants Assistance Program Grants, and Office of Environmental Justice (EJ) Small Grants; (3) established the new Water Infrastructure and Resiliency Finance Center; and (4) provided technical assistance</p>	<p>OA is collecting data as grants are awarded and technical assistance is provided. Also, in the mandatory Annual Progress Review meeting with OMB and CEQ, EPA identified as an FY 2017 priority the goal of working with OMB to develop a survey that assessed such usage rates.</p>

FY 2016 Annual Performance Report  
Environmental Protection Agency

		through the National Climate Estuaries Program.	
<p>Title V Permitting Program Reviews</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Air and Radiation</p> <p>Publication Date: September 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/title-v-operating-permits/epa-oversight-operating-permits-program">https://www.epa.gov/title-v-operating-permits/epa-oversight-operating-permits-program</a></p>	<p>EPA periodically audits state and local permitting programs as part of its responsibility to oversee delegated and approved air permitting programs.</p>	<p>Results vary and are specific to the program being reviewed.</p>	<p>The reviews evaluate the overall effectiveness of the planning, permitting, monitoring and compliance, and enforcement programs to identify good practices implemented by the state/tribal agency, areas needing improvement within the state/tribal program, and ways in which the EPA can improve oversight.</p>
<p>Process for State Implementation Plans (SIPs)</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Air and Radiation</p> <p>Completion Date: On-going Effort</p>	<p>In a February 2014 joint EPA/ECOS/NACAA commitment, EPA and states agreed to work toward eliminating, by the end of calendar year 2017, the backlog of SIPs that existed as of October 1, 2013 and to process new SIPs within CAA deadlines. OAR and the Regions continue to make the SIP process more efficient and effective while fulfilling Clean Air Act statutory responsibilities.</p>	<p>Process has resulted in improved communication and cooperation between EPA and states prior to SIP submittal and SIP development tools.</p>	<p>Data is used to better utilize resources, improve coordination, and support planning, and managing SIP processing backlog.</p>
<p>Strategic sourcing</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Administration &amp; Resource Management</p> <p>Completion Date: March 2016</p>	<p>Improve on EPA's buying power</p>	<p>In FY 2015 Office of Administration and Resource Management's (OARM) use of data and program evaluation tools enabled the agency to monitor specific, measurable data related to print services and cellular services with expected to avoided costs of \$1 million and \$1.4 million respectively in FY 2015.</p>	<p>OARM will apply this same data driven approach to evaluate lab supply and IT helpdesk support sourcing, remediation contracting, and equipment maintenance contracts in FY 2016.</p>

		<p><b>Regional Example:</b> In FY 2016, OARM and regional leaders worked together to design and develop a multi-region, \$45 million IT helpdesk strategic sourcing strategy. This included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Gaining CIO-and CFO approval and support of the effort, including formal approval under FITARA as well as WCF approval for new service;</li> <li>2) Gaining entry into the Working Capital Fund through extensive interactions with all ARAs and IRMBC in the agency, and most IMOs; and</li> </ol> <p>Securing first of its kind multi-region strategic sourcing activity.</p>	
<p>National FOIA Program Evaluation</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Environmental Information</p> <p>Completion Date: February 2016</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/foia/evaluation-epas-foia-program">https://www.epa.gov/foia/evaluation-epas-foia-program</a></p>	<p>Examine EPA’s current implementation of FOIA and identify opportunities to improve the program</p>	<p>Though the FOIA program is decentralized, there is little variation in the written FOIA procedures across offices/regions. However, actual implementation of the FOIA program differs across offices/regions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPA’s FOIA program has a strong reputation among federal agencies; however, EPA’s backlog has been growing since 2013.</li> <li>• Organizational changes and technology improvements have the potential to significantly improve EPA’s FOIA program; however, the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program improvements: The FOIA Program has taken several steps to increase and improve coordination among program offices and the regions. EPA holds monthly meetings with the Agency’s FOIA Coordinators, Regional FOIA Officers and Regional attorneys who provide guidance and updates on FOIA related matters. These monthly meetings provide key</li> </ul>

FY 2016 Annual Performance Report  
Environmental Protection Agency

		<p>potential benefits need to be weighed against the costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPA could adopt and/or expand its use of practices to ensure greater consistency in processing and responding to FOIA requests by enhancing the functionality of FOIAonline; improving records management; expanding use of standard templates; developing a list of technologies available to assist with FOIA requests; and exploring options to centralize the FOIA program.</li> </ul>	<p>FOIA personnel with ongoing training relevant to the performance of their duties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning and policy decision making: EPA is in the process of issuing new FOIA regulations as mandated by the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016. FOIA procedures will be updated once the new regulation is in place.</li> </ul>
<p>Field Testing of a Spectrometer Sensor for Water Quality</p> <p>Water Quality Monitoring Field Evaluation to determine the viability of new technology in detecting changes in nutrient concentrations between an upstream and a downstream location</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Enforcement &amp; Compliance Assurance</p> <p>Completion Date: July 2016</p>	<p>Standard water quality sampling methods (YSI data sondes and physical sampling/lab analysis) and data were compared to data collected by <i>in situ</i> ultraviolet-visual spectrometry sensors as a method of determining the viability of a spectrometry sensor as new technology for water quality evaluations.</p>	<p>Nitrate values measured by the spectro::lyser were most comparable to standard methods of analyzing for nitrate (EPA Method 353.2). The use of a spectro::lyser provides new information and data of nitrate levels over a continuous period.</p>	<p>The EPA is still determining the utility of spectrometry sensors as an alternative method to traditional sampling. Further study is required to determine the variance from standard methods.</p>
<p>Integrated Pest Management (IPM)</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Chemical Safety &amp; Pollution Prevention</p>	<p>An analysis of the IPM in schools grants process and the Centers for Excellence approach.</p>	<p>The review found that the internal processes in place insure effective oversight and management of the IPM in Schools grants. The review</p>	<p>The Center of Expertise contributes to the development and refinement of national program direction,</p>

FY 2016 Annual Performance Report  
Environmental Protection Agency

<p>Completion Date: May 2016</p>		<p>also found that the Center of Expertise for School IPM is performing well in providing leadership and expertise to effect the goal of ensuring that millions of students in our nation’s schools benefit from IPM practices and verifiable IPM programs.</p>	<p>provides input and assistance to the Regions on regional strategies and projects to help achieve national school IPM goals, provide technical support to the regions and the school community. Center activities are aligned with the agency’s Strategic Plan for School IPM.</p>
<p>Synthesis Report of the US EPA Laboratory Evaluation – follow-up actions</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Research and Development</p> <p>Completion Date: March 2015</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/osa/synthesis-report-us-laboratory-enterprise-evaluation">https://www.epa.gov/osa/synthesis-report-us-laboratory-enterprise-evaluation</a></p>	<p>In March 2015, EPA published its Synthesis Report of the US EPA Laboratory Evaluation to describe actions EPA is taking to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of the agency’s lab enterprise.</p>	<p>The report indicated that there is potential to save money if we maximize the use of EPA’s owned lab spaces. The report also identified several facility consolidations that EPA is undertaking now, several that will begin in the next two years, and two potential opportunities that require further evaluation. As funds from the EPA building and facility (B&amp;F) appropriation become available to implement these facility consolidations, the result will be improved efficiency for the agency’s portfolio of lab facilities.</p>	<p>Following the publication of the EPA Synthesis Report, ORD collaborated with partners in OARM, OCFO, and Region 3 to prepare an analysis that illustrates the need for EPA to accelerate investments in physical infrastructure to improve the overall condition of the agency’s portfolio of lab facilities. ORD is taking steps to ensure that lab facilities operate optimally to ensure stakeholder confidence in the quality of the science that provides a strong foundation for EPA decisions. In FY 2016, 7 of 16 ORD lab facilities required significant repairs or renovation to improve facility condition. ORD will implement actions identified by EPA leadership. ORD will continue collaboration with OARM on improvements needed for lab facilities with low Facility Condition Index. The construction of the A wing at the Research</p>

FY 2016 Annual Performance Report  
Environmental Protection Agency

			<p>Triangle Park campus and modification of the existing laboratory facilities enabled employees in the Reproductive Toxicology Facility to be moved onto the main Research Triangle Park campus, saving approximately \$1.7 million annually in lease costs and \$1 million annually in utilities, security, and operating costs. Partial savings were realized in FY 2015 and full annual savings in FY 2016.</p>
<p>ORD’s contract consolidation efforts</p> <p>Evaluator: Office of Research and Development</p> <p>Completion Date: November 2015</p>	<p>Since the stand-up of the Office of Administration and Research Support’s Extramural Management Division in 2012, the group has been applying a systematic approach to examining its corporate portfolio of contracts and ensuring that contract solutions are implemented which meet the organization’s research needs while minimizing redundancies and reducing the total cost of ownership to the Government and taxpayers. In 2016, there were two significant efforts underway: 1) ORD evaluation of the extent to which the ORD National Student Services Contract achieved the goal of meaningful savings in personnel resources and faster, streamlined onboarding of student service contractors was</p>	<p>Analysis of performance results indicate ORD was successful in reducing the timelines for onboarding student contractors from approximately 8 months under the old procurement strategy to under 3 months using the National Student Services Contract vehicle. In addition, ORD saved an estimated \$150,000 in the first year when comparing expired funds lost under the old stand-alone procurements vs. the improved liquidation and financial management practices on the new vehicle. Finally, ORD was successful at reducing administrative burden across ORD, OAM and OCFO by an estimated four FTE and \$200,000 via the reduction in the number of contract actions being managed and invoices requiring processing. The team primarily responsible</p>	<p>In 2016, ORD also reached agreement with the Office of Water for the consolidation of peer review services requirements into one set of vehicles to be used by both entities. The resultant vehicles should reduce administrative costs commensurate with the elimination of agency vehicles providing similar contracted services, and the oversight functions for those excess vehicles, while also providing better transparency and information sharing regarding the peer review function. Award is anticipated in 2017, and actively supports the federal-government wide category management directives and goals. ORD will monitor implementation of the contract solutions to</p>

FY 2016 Annual Performance Report  
 Environmental Protection Agency

	<p>being achieved, and 2) examination of existing vehicles providing peer review services within ORD and Office of Water to determine whether an opportunity for consolidation existed. The extramural services webpage, including a listing of acting corporate vehicles, can be found at:  <a href="http://intranet.ord.epa.gov/p2/Extramural-Services/home">http://intranet.ord.epa.gov/p2/Extramural-Services/home</a></p>	<p>for formulation and implementation were recognized by the Agency 2016 Contract Management Award for their success. Based upon the success of the program, ORD leadership has mandated the use of the National Student Services Contract, unless an exception is approved by the Senior Resource Official.</p>	<p>ensure reduction of duplication and optimization of corporate vehicles.</p>
--	--	--	--