

FY 2018 Program Evaluations

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
Office of Air and Radiation			
<p>Title V Permitting Program Reviews</p> <p>Office of Air and Radiation (OAR)</p> <p>Completed: Throughout 2018</p> <p>https://www.epa.gov/title-v-operating-permits/epa-oversight-operating-permits-program</p>	<p>EPA periodically evaluates state and local permitting programs, including fees, under Title V of the Clean Air Act as part of its responsibility to oversee delegated and approved air permitting programs. In general, the purpose of these program evaluations is to identify good practices, document areas needing improvement, and learn how the EPA can help the permitting agencies improve their performance.</p>	<p>Results vary and are specific to the program being reviewed. For example, the Agency evaluated Arizona’s Pinal County Air Quality Control District (PCAQCD) Title V permitting program. EPA found that PCAQCD’s general practice is to conduct a sequential public and EPA review. PCAQCD commented that PCAQCD’s Code §3-1-065.A.2 does not allow for a concurrent review of Title V draft permits. In response to PCAQCD’s comment, EPA indicated availability to discuss options for concurrent review. The full report with findings and recommendations can be found at the following website: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/pinal_county_program_evaluation_report_final_with_attachments-2018-08-13.pdf.</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 EPA can improve oversight.</p>
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention			
<p>OIG Report: EPA Needs to Evaluate the Impact of the Revised Agricultural Worker Protection Standard (WPS) on Pesticide Exposure Incidents</p> <p>Office of Inspector General (OIG)</p>	<p>OIG conducted this evaluation to determine the adequacy of EPA’s management controls for implementing the revised Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) Agricultural WPS requirements. OIG</p>	<p>EPA had policies and procedures in place to implement the revised Agricultural WPS. Further, the Agency provided training to regional staff, state inspectors and program leads. However, OIG found that management controls to implement the revised WPS were not fully</p>	<p>EPA does not have the ability to collect agricultural pesticide exposure incident data to measure the impact of the revised WPS rule among target populations. The Agency relies on information assessed during pesticide</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p>Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP)</p> <p>Completed: February 2018</p> <p>https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-needs-evaluate-impact-revised-agricultural-worker-protection</p>	<p>focused on training resources, educational materials and outreach efforts. OIG also looked at how the Agency plans to collect and utilize WPS compliance and enforcement information to track pesticide exposures among target populations. The WPS is intended to reduce pesticide exposure incidents among agricultural farmworkers and pesticide handlers who use and have contact with pesticides. EPA established the WPS in 1974, expanded it in 1992, and revised the standard in late 2015. Compliance with most of the 2015 revisions was required on January 2, 2017; and the final three revisions on January 2, 2018.</p>	<p>adequate as of January 2, 2017, when compliance with most of the revised rule was required.</p> <p>Essential training and implementation materials were not available by January 2, 2017. In addition, two key documents—the WPS Inspection Manual and the How to Comply manual—were not available when EPA conducted the majority of its training and outreach activities for states and tribes in 2016. As a result, many state officials said they did not have the time, tools or resources to successfully implement the revised WPS by the January 2, 2017, compliance date. EPA granted a state agricultural association’s petition to delay the compliance date until the necessary training resources and educational materials were made available to state agencies responsible for implementing the WPS.</p> <p>However, in a December 21, 2017, Federal Register notice, EPA rescinded its plan to delay compliance dates. The Agency announced that compliance dates in the revised WPS published on November 2, 2015, remain in effect and that the Agency does not intend to extend them. EPA also announced plans to revise certain WPS requirements.</p>	<p>re-evaluations and from voluntary reporting databases. EPA is working on improving its Incident Data System, but the Agency stated that the improvements will not enable the collection of additional occupational exposure data.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
Office of Land and Emergency Management			
<p>OIG Report: Self-Insurance for Companies with Multiple Cleanup Liabilities Presents Financial and Environmental Risks for EPA and the Public</p> <p>Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Office of Land and Emergency Management (OLEM)</p> <p>Completed: December 2017</p> <p>https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-12/documents/epa_oig_20171222-18-p-0059.pdf</p>	<p>OIG conducted this evaluation to determine whether EPA includes all environmental liabilities in its reviews of financial assurance and whether it reviews the validity of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and Superfund financial assurance liabilities for companies with multiple facilities/sites nationwide.</p>	<p>EPA faces significant challenges to validating forms of self-insurance.</p>	<p>The Agency agreed with nine of OIG's 14 recommendations. Work is underway to reach agreement on the five unresolved recommendations.</p>
Office of Research and Development			
<p>Triennial Renewable Fuel Standards Report</p> <p>Office of Research and Development (ORD)</p> <p>Completed: June 2018</p> <p>https://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_report.cfm?Lab=IO&dirEntryId=341491</p>	<p>Section 204 of the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) requires an assessment of environmental and resource conservation impacts of the Renewable Fuel Standards (RFS) program. Air and water quality, soil quality and conservation, water availability, ecosystem health and biodiversity, invasive species, and international impacts are assessed, along with opportunities to mitigate these impacts.</p>	<p>This report updates the findings of the first Report to Congress published in 2011, with respect to environmental and resource conservation impacts, which together are intended to address the Section 204 statutory impacts since the passage of the EISA. Data from observations made since the 2011 Report indicate that the biofuel production and use conditions that led to the conclusions of that report have not materially changed.</p>	<p>This report reflects the current scientific understanding of the Section 204 impacts as presented in the published literature about biofuel use and production using data gathered through May 2017. The report also reviews data on U.S. land use and the scientific literature through April 2017. Greenhouse gas emission reductions that result from replacing biofuel with fossil fuel are not assessed in this report. This report does not make comparisons to estimated environmental</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
			impacts of other transportation fuels or energy sources. This information can be used to inform land use, air quality, and water quality decision making, particularly those related to the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) program.