

## Additional FY 2019 Contributions to EPA’s Portfolio of Evidence

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<b>Office of the Administrator</b>			
<p><b>Annual Federal Procurement Scorecard Report Submission to the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA)</b></p> <p>Office of the Administrator (OA)</p> <p>Completed: May 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.sba.gov/document/support--environmental-protection-agency-contracting-scorecard">https://www.sba.gov/document/support--environmental-protection-agency-contracting-scorecard</a></p>	<p>The Annual Federal Procurement Scorecard is an assessment tool that measures the effectiveness of each federal agency in: (1) achieving its small business prime and subcontracting procurement goals; (2) increasing the number of small business prime contractors in the top 100 industry classification codes for the Agency’s acquisitions; and (3) complying with the governing provisions of the Small Business Act. As part of the Procurement Scorecard process, EPA is required to submit a series of reports, conduct a self-assessment, and provide supporting documentation for SBA evaluation and grading of EPA’s performance.</p>	<p>EPA’s most recent Federal Procurement Scorecard report was based on FY 2018 data and documentation regarding EPA’s performance in FY 2018. The most significant finding was that EPA received an “A” rating from SBA for FY 2018. This was EPA’s 10<sup>th</sup> consecutive “A” grade for each annual report. EPA’s prime contracting goal for small business accomplishments for FY 2018 was 39%. EPA exceeded that goal, with 43% of its eligible contract spend awarded to small businesses for FY 2018. EPA also exceeded its subcontracting goal of 55% by reaching 61% of its eligible subcontracting spend going to small business concerns.</p>	<p>This report assists the Agency in assessing how well it is complying with federal law and regulation. Additionally, it assists in the future Agency acquisition planning, small business outreach, and budgeting. EPA also works with each program office and region to utilize the Procurement Scorecard findings to target procurement improvement opportunities in areas where improvements can be made. One example is for the HUBZone small business goal, which was the only one of the five goals that EPA did not achieve in FY 2018. Based on that shortfall, EPA’s Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization collaborated with programs to identify possible HUBZone contracting opportunities, such as an Office of the Chief Financial Officer requirement for information technology support services.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p><b>Lean Project: Form 1900-37 Procurement Package Reviews</b></p> <p>Office of the Administrator (OA)</p> <p>Completed: Overall Process Evaluated in FY 2019</p>	<p>In deploying EPA’s Lean Management System (ELMS) Visual Management System, EPA evaluated and developed a 1900-37 Process Flow and Performance Board to track and determine the continuing effectiveness of its EPA Form 1900-37 Procurement Package reviews. As required by Section 15(k) of the Small Business Act, the Agency must review proposed strategies for the acquisition of goods and services with an estimated dollar value above \$250,000, to ensure that small businesses are afforded the maximum practicable opportunities to participate in the acquisition. EPA’s review of each 1900-37 Procurement Package is how the Agency complies with this mandate. In developing the Flow and Performance Boards, EPA dissected the process and developed a new 10 calendar day review stretch goal.</p>	<p>Since deployment, EPA’s stretch goal of 10 calendar days is two days under EPA’s historical 1900-37 Procurement Package review processing time. EPA succeeded in reducing the review time by 85.71% by the end of FY 2019. Additionally, only 7.14% of reviews exceeded the stretch goal and 7.14% exceeded the established customer review goal of 15 days.</p>	<p>The results from this EPA ELMS 1900-37 Process Flow Board were useful in reducing the lead times for the review of each 1900-37 Procurement Package. EPA also identified the areas that cause delays to the reviews and worked accordingly to make improvements. This allowed for EPA program offices to work together to assist each other in providing quality 1900-37 Procurement Packages more timely for the Agency.</p>
<p><b>Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) Model of the United States Economy</b></p> <p>Office of the Administrator (OA)</p> <p>Completed: August 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/environmental-economics/cge-modeling-regulatory-analysis">https://www.epa.gov/environmental-economics/cge-modeling-regulatory-analysis</a></p>	<p>A 2017 Science Advisory Board (SAB) report recommends that EPA utilize CGE modeling to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of regulatory impacts. CGE models provide a representation of the entire economy in equilibrium and are designed to evaluate the medium to long-run impacts of regulation on production, consumption, and trade, along with interactions with pre-existing policies (e.g., taxes). CGE models extend the typical evaluation by providing information on changes outside of the directly-</p>	<p>EPA developed a new CGE model called SAGE (a recursive acronym: SAGE is an Applied General Equilibrium model). SAGE is an intertemporal CGE model of the United States economy that captures differences across census divisions, income quintiles, and 23 production sectors, focused on the manufacturing and energy sectors. In FY 2019, EPA researchers published a peer-reviewed article evaluating the benefits of using SAGE in regulatory analysis, finding that traditional regulatory</p>	<p>The SAB report and peer reviewed article’s findings indicate that CGE models can play a role at EPA to provide decision makers with a more complete evaluation of regulatory impacts. Based on this evidence, the SAB is currently reviewing the SAGE model, so that it may be used in future analyses. EPA is also updating its <i>Guidelines for Conducting Economic Analysis</i> to reflect best practices for estimating the costs of regulatory</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
	regulated sector attributable to a regulation.	evaluations fail to capture important regulatory costs. Specifically, the study finds that social costs for single sector environmental regulations, including general equilibrium feedbacks, can be 6%–33% larger than engineering-based estimates of compliance expenditures, based on the scenarios considered.	actions, including the use of CGE modeling.
<p><b>Customer Satisfaction Surveys of Technical Assistance Recipients</b></p> <p>Office of the Administrator (OA)</p> <p>Completed: Ongoing through FY 2019</p>	<p>Communities receiving assistance through EPA’s Local Foods, Local Places and Healthy Places for Healthy People programs complete an online survey evaluating project technical assistance workshops. The surveys provide EPA with information about both the effectiveness of the community workshops as well as document the outcomes that follow from the technical assistance. Surveys are sent out to all workshop participants immediately following the workshop. One-year and two-year follow up surveys are sent to the members of the community workshop steering committee.</p>	<p>EPA reached more than a 65% response rate on surveys administered immediately following workshops, and a similar response rate for one-year and two-year follow-up surveys.</p>	<p>EPA used survey results to both refine the technical assistance process and track outcomes from the assistance. For example, successful implementation of community action plans was more likely in communities that used the assistance to expand partnerships with state and federal agencies. This finding from the survey led EPA to place additional emphasis on engaging partners upfront in the planning stages of each community workshop.</p>
<p><b>Lean Project: Digital Assessment Tools to Support Community Technical Assistance</b></p> <p>Office of the Administrator (OA)</p> <p>Completed: September 2019</p>	<p>EPA conducted a Lean project to improve the effectiveness of community-based technical assistance projects. EPA used the initiative to improve assessment of key community assets and major challenges using existing digital assessment tools.</p>	<p>Over the course of FY 2019, EPA was able to increase the use of digital assessment tools from less than 10% of total projects using tools to 79% of total projects. In smaller communities the value added from digital assessment tools was more limited given the scale of the neighborhoods.</p>	<p>By focusing on existing tools that had already been developed by EPA, the Agency used the initiative to use more data and digitize community asset maps to increase the technical rigor of the assistance projects at no additional cost. For example, EPA GeoPlatform enabled the Agency digitized information from a community-led walkability</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
			audit in Weldon, NC and shared the information with state transportation officials to inform sidewalk planning and funding.
<b>Office of Air and Radiation</b>			
<p><b>Our Nation’s Air: Status and Trends Through 2018</b></p> <p>Office of Air and Radiation (OAR)</p> <p>Completed: July 2019</p> <p><a href="https://gispub.epa.gov/air/trendsreport/2019/#homeProgram">https://gispub.epa.gov/air/trendsreport/2019/#homeProgram</a></p>	<p>EPA is committed to protecting public health and the environment by improving air quality and reducing air pollution. In this review and annual report, EPA presents the trends in the nation’s air quality and summarizes the detailed information found at EPA’s Air Trends website.</p>	<p>Nationally, concentrations of the criteria air pollutants dropped significantly since 1970. Between 1970 and 2018, the combined emissions of the six common pollutants (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, VOCs, CO and Pb) dropped by 74%. This progress occurred while the U.S. economy continued to grow, Americans drove more miles, and population and energy use increased.</p>	<p>Annual emissions estimates are used as one indicator of the effectiveness of the Air Program. EPA and states track direct emissions of air pollutants and emissions that contribute to the formation of key pollutants, also known as precursor emissions. Emissions data are compiled from many different organizations, including industry and state, tribal, and local agencies. Understanding emission sources helps EPA and states control air pollution.</p>
<p><b>Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (DERA) Fourth Report to Congress: Highlights of the Diesel Emissions Reduction Program</b></p> <p>Office of Air and Radiation (OAR)</p> <p>Completed: July 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-07/documents/420r19005.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-07/documents/420r19005.pdf</a></p>	<p>In the report, EPA evaluates the implementation of the Diesel Emissions Reduction Program per statutory requirement (42 USC 16134).</p>	<p>DERA grants fund projects that provided immediate health and environmental benefits. From fiscal years 2008 to 2016, EPA awarded \$629 million to retrofit or replace 67,300 engines in vehicles, vessels, locomotives or other pieces of equipment. EPA estimates that these projects will reduce emissions by 472,700 tons of NO<sub>x</sub> and 15,490 tons of PM<sub>2.5</sub> over the lifetime of the affected engines.</p>	<p>The report results help the program prioritize statutory and programmatic goals, such as targeting areas and populations with disproportionate levels of exposure to diesel exhaust while maximizing cost-effectiveness.</p>
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA Effectively Screens Air Emissions Data from Continuous Monitoring Systems but</b></p>	<p>OIG conducted this audit to determine whether selected continuous emissions monitoring data meet applicable quality assurance</p>	<p>EPA’s automated process for screening CEMS data reported to EPA worked as intended and was effective in verifying the quality of</p>	<p>The Agency concurred with OIG’s two recommendations. As a result, EPA is implementing a multistep</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p><b>Could Enhance Verification of System Performance</b></p> <p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Air and Radiation (OAR)</p> <p>Completed: June 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-effectively-screens-air-emissions-data-continuous-monitoring">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-effectively-screens-air-emissions-data-continuous-monitoring</a></p>	<p>(QA) and quality control (QC) criteria. Continuous emissions monitoring involves operating and maintaining equipment to continuously sample and analyze emissions at pollution sources. A continuous emissions monitoring system (CEMS) includes all equipment required to continuously sample, analyze, and provide a permanent record of stack emissions. CEMSs are required under some EPA regulations and programs for either compliance determinations or determinations of exceedances of the emissions standards. Two EPA programs that require continuous emissions monitoring are the Acid Rain Program (ARP) and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR).</p>	<p>reported data. However, OIG identified minor inaccuracies in the display of some of the reported data where monitoring plan changes occurred. While these inaccuracies had no impact on whether the data met QA requirements, the inaccurate data could be confusing to data users.</p>	<p>process to identify monitoring plan changes that could affect previously reported data. As a longer-term corrective action, EPA plans to implement an automated check requiring facilities to reevaluate and resubmit affected data when facilities make retroactive changes.</p>
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA's 2017 Glider Vehicle Testing Complied with Standard Practices</b></p> <p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Air and Radiation (OAR)</p> <p>Completed: July 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epas-2017-glider-vehicle-testing-complied-standard-practices">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epas-2017-glider-vehicle-testing-complied-standard-practices</a></p>	<p>OIG conducted this audit in response to two congressional requests that raised concerns about glider vehicle testing conducted by EPA in 2017. A glider vehicle is a truck that uses a previously owned powertrain (including the engine, transmission and usually the rear axle) but has new body parts. In 2017, EPA performed emissions testing on two glider vehicles, which it received by donation, at its National Vehicle and Fuel Emissions Laboratory in Ann Arbor, Michigan.</p>	<p>The OIG found that EPA's selection and testing of the donated glider vehicles in 2017 was consistent with relevant Clean Air Act (CAA) and other authority. However, EPA did not fully adhere to its delegation of authority related to the acceptance of donated property which led to OIG's two recommendations.</p>	<p>The Agency concurred with OIG's two recommendations. As a result, EPA is: (1) revising the Delegation of Authority 7-170 to enable practical implementation for the acceptance of donated property; and (2) evaluating/documenting whether further guidance to implement the authority is needed.</p>
<p><b>OIG Report: More Effective EPA Oversight Is Needed for Particulate Matter Emissions Compliance Testing</b></p>	<p>OIG conducted this audit to determine the effectiveness of EPA's oversight in assuring that emission stack tests are conducted in accordance with EPA regulation, policy and guidance. EPA estimates that</p>	<p>OIG audited 30 stack test reports from state and local agencies in Washington state and found numerous examples of nonadherence to EPA test methods and inadequate supporting</p>	<p>EPA concurred with OIG's six recommendations. As a result, EPA is working with delegated agencies to review currently available stack testing materials and assess training needs with</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Air and Radiation (OAR)</p> <p>Completed: July 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-more-effective-epa-oversight-needed-particulate-matter-emissions">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-more-effective-epa-oversight-needed-particulate-matter-emissions</a></p>	<p>there are approximately 14,700 major stationary sources of air emissions in the U.S., such as refineries and power plants that typically release emissions via tall chimneys called smokestacks or stacks. Most of these facilities are subject to emission limits set by state-issued construction or operating permits. If there are no other means to demonstrate compliance with permit limits, as is typically the case with particulate matter emissions, stack emissions must be determined using EPA approved test methods. If stack testers do not follow applicable EPA methods, test results are subject to greater variability and uncertainty. Accurate stack tests and reports are needed to verify that excess emissions do not negatively impact human health and the environment.</p>	<p>documentation to assess data quality. These problems were not identified by state and local regulatory agencies responsible for implementing CAA permitting programs in Washington state. OIG also found that some state and local agencies rarely observe stack tests to verify that EPA methods are properly followed.</p>	<p>respect to approving stack test plans, reviewing stack test reports and conducting EPA test methods. OAR then will work with EPA regions and delegated agencies to identify training shortfalls and develop a plan to address the shortfalls. Further, OAR will work with EPA regions and delegated agencies to develop checklists for reviewing stack test reports for seven EPA methods. policies and guidance.</p>
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA Demonstrates Effective Controls for Its On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicle Compliance Program; Further Improvements Could Be Made</b></p> <p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Air and Radiation (OAR)</p> <p>Completed: June 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-demonstrates-effective">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-demonstrates-effective</a></p>	<p>OIG conducted this audit to determine whether EPA existing internal controls effectively detect and prevent on-road heavy-duty (HD) vehicle emissions fraud. Effective internal controls provide reasonable—though not absolute—assurance that the potential for fraud is minimized.</p>	<p>The OIG found that EPA demonstrated that its current internal controls are effective at detecting and preventing noncompliance in the on-road HD vehicle sector. Although OIG found that EPA demonstrated that its existing internal controls are effective, OIG identified specific risks to EPA’s goal of achieving public health and environmental benefits through its HD vehicle compliance program. OIG also identified areas where existing controls could be strengthened.</p>	<p>EPA concurred with OIG’s eight recommendations. As a result, EPA is refining measures to assess program performance; conducting a formal risk assessment that addresses specific risks; evaluating whether specific programmatic or regulatory changes are necessary; assessing whether the development of data analysis tools is feasible; evaluating opportunities for targeted testing; tracking compliance issues in a standardized manner; and</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<a href="#">controls-its-road-heavy-duty-vehicle</a>			developing procedures and criteria for referring compliance issues to the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance.
<b>Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention</b>			
<p><b>OIG Report: Pesticide Registration Fee, Vulnerability Mitigation and Database Security Controls for EPA’s FIFRA and PRIA Systems Need Improvement</b></p> <p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP)</p> <p>Completed: June 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-pesticide-registration-fee-vulnerability-mitigation-and-database">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-pesticide-registration-fee-vulnerability-mitigation-and-database</a></p>	<p>OIG conducted this audit of the information technology security controls for EPA systems and servers hosting Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) data.</p> <p>OIG’s objectives specifically addressed controls relating to registration fees, the testing and correction of system vulnerabilities, and database security.</p> <p>Under FIFRA, as amended by PRIA, EPA regulates the distribution, sale and use of all pesticides in the United States and establishes maximum allowable levels of pesticide residues in food, thereby safeguarding the nation’s food supply.</p>	<p>OIG recommended that the Assistant Administrator for OCSPP implement the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Internal controls for the fee posting and refund processes</li> <li>2. Corrective actions identified in the Agency’s risk assessment of those processes</li> <li>3. A formal process for creating plans of action and milestones, and tracking vulnerability management</li> <li>4. Controls related database security.</li> <li>5. EPA’s patch management process</li> <li>6. Periodic review of roles</li> <li>7. Procedures for the independent review of administrative access logs.</li> </ol>	<p>EPA agreed with all seven of OIG’s recommendations and completed or provided acceptable corrective actions and milestones for all recommendations.</p>
<p>OIG Report: EPA Needs to Determine Strategies and Level of Support for Overseeing State Managed Pollinator Protection Plans</p> <p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP)</p> <p>Completed: August 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-pesticide-registration-fee-vulnerability-mitigation-and-database">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-</a></p>	<p>OIG conducted this audit to determine how EPA oversees states’ Managed Pollinator Protection Plans (MP3s), which are designed to reduce pesticide exposure to pollinators through timely communication and coordination among key stakeholders. Managed pollinators are generally honey bees that beekeepers contract out to growers for their pollination services. In June 2014, a presidential memorandum, creating a</p>	<p>EPA assisted in developing guidance, encouraged state development of MP3s, and consulted with AAPCO and SFIREG as they developed the nationwide survey. Further, OIG made five recommendations to the Assistant Administrator for OCSPP, including determining whether the outcomes of states’ MP3s are meeting EPA’s goals for the program and what support EPA will</p>	<p>The Agency agreed with OIG’s recommendations and provided acceptable corrective actions. By clarifying its future role in MP3 implementation, developing a strategy to use state-gathered data and considering additional risks to pollinators, EPA’s oversight of MP3s will be improved.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<a href="#">epa-needs-determine-strategies-and-level-support-overseeing-state</a>	Federal Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators, charged numerous federal agencies to address the factors contributing to pollinator decline. As part of this effort, EPA worked to encourage state pesticide agencies to develop state-specific MP3s with clearly defined scopes, including the species of managed pollinators addressed.	provide to assist MP3 implementation efforts.	
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA Not Effectively Implementing the Lead-Based Paint Renovation, Repair and Painting (RRP) Rule</b></p> <p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP)</p> <p>Completed: September 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-not-effectively-implementing-lead-based-paint-renovation-repair">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-not-effectively-implementing-lead-based-paint-renovation-repair</a></p>	OIG conducted this audit to determine whether EPA has an effective strategy to implement and enforce the Lead-Based Paint RRP Rule. EPA's Lead-Based Paint RRP Rule is intended to protect the public by addressing hazards associated with renovation, repair, and painting activities that disturb lead-based paint in specific housing and child-occupied facilities. Lead-based paint was used in an estimated 38 million homes prior to its ban for residential use in 1978. Renovation, repair, and painting activities that disturb lead-based paint can create hazardous exposures to lead. In children, exposure to lead can cause health problems, including the potential for slower growth, lower IQ, and behavioral problems.	OIG recommend that the Assistant Administrator for OCSPP: 1. Establish specific guidelines for resources and funding allocated to the Lead-Based Paint RRP Rule Program that will further the goals of the Federal Action Plan to Reduce Childhood Lead Exposures and Associated Health Impacts. 2. Establish the Lead-Based Paint RRP Program's objectives, goals and measurable outcomes, such as measures to demonstrate the effectiveness of program contributions toward decreasing elevated blood lead levels.	The Agency provided acceptable corrective actions and completion dates for OCSPP's recommendations. EPA's response to issue guidance for resources and funding that will further the goals of the Federal Lead Action Plan, met the intent, but not the wording, of the recommendation. Therefore, OIG slightly revised the recommendation to enable flexibility in EPA's delivery of guidance.
<b>Office of the Chief Financial Officer</b>			
<p><b>Lean Project: Superfund Billing</b></p> <p>Office of Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)</p> <p>Completed: Ongoing</p>	Across the Agency, regions establish different processes to accomplish the singular goal of recovering Agency resources spent on Superfund sites. Multiple processes lead to inefficiencies in how the	OCFO hosted a Lean event including representatives from all 10 regions during the week of June 10, 2019. At this event, EPA investigated the current processes and identified inefficiencies, pain	To date, the following improvements were achieved: <b>Process Improvements:</b> i. The process by which Superfund Bills are developed, reviewed, and

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
	<p>Agency does redistributions and billings, resulting in longer timeframes to process the bills, different levels of workload, and the need for increased government resources in both the regional offices and in EPA's OCFO.</p> <p>The goal of this Lean project was to develop and implement an agencywide standardized process for Superfund redistributions and billing, based on best practices throughout the regional offices and OCFO to achieve 25% reduction in process time by the end of FY 2019 and \$2.75M in total cost savings by the end of FY 2022 (\$310K in cost savings for FY 2020 and \$982K in annual costs savings for FY 2021 and FY 2022).</p>	<p>points, and best practices. The group developed a standard 100-day process to guide a Superfund bill from cradle to grave.</p> <p>In FY 2019, all regions and headquarters offices fully deployed ELMS visual flow boards to track Superfund bills in this new process.</p>	<p>distributed was reduced from 120 days to 100 days (17% reduction)</p> <p>ii. The process by which missing contract documentation are remedied was reduced from 30 days to 5 days (83% savings)</p> <p>iii. The process by which OCFO's Research Triangle Park Finance Center (RTPFC) scans and indexed superfund billing documentation was reduced from 20 days to 10 days (67% reduction).</p> <p><b><u>Bulk Funding Reduction:</u></b> Upfront site charging increased throughout the regions and savings will begin to be realized in Q2 FY 2020 Regions already reported up to a 37% reduction in bulk funding, drawing down the number of transactions needing to be processed by RTPFC.</p>
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA Complied with Improper Payments Legislation but Stronger Internal Controls Are Needed</b> <b>Report No. 19-P-0163</b></p> <p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)</p> <p>Completed: May 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-complied-improper-payments-legislation-stronger-internal">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-complied-improper-payments-legislation-stronger-internal</a></p>	<p>The Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010 (IPERA) and the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 require that each fiscal year the Inspector General of each agency determine whether the agency is in compliance with the law. IPERA requires agencies to annually estimate and report improper payments for programs and activities that are deemed susceptible to significant improper payments. In addition, OMB Circular A-123, Appendix C, states that OIG</p>	<p>OIG recommended that EPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise OCFO's grant improper payments review process to include internal controls for training reviewers and annually verifying that reviewers are knowledgeable and proficient in the identification and reporting of improper payments.</li> <li>• Comply with EPA's sampling and estimation plan annually submitted to Office of Management and Budget (OMB).</li> </ul>	<p>The Agency concurred with OIG's two recommendations and stated that corrective action was completed in April 2019. The Agency agreed with OIG's overall conclusion that EPA must comply with EPA's sampling and estimation plan annually submitted to OMB. In addition, the Agency indicated that, moving forward, if a selected sample is deemed exempt from IPERA, it will replace that sample with a statistically valid sample and revise</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
	<p>should evaluate the accuracy and completeness of agency reporting. This audit focused on EPA's compliance with these requirements.</p>		<p>the population criteria for future tests.</p>
<p><b>OIG Report: Risk Assessment Determines that Travel Card Program Merits an Audit Next Year Because Internal Controls Not Adequate</b></p> <p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)</p> <p>Completed: September 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-risk-assessment-determines-travel-card-program-merits-audit-next">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-risk-assessment-determines-travel-card-program-merits-audit-next</a></p>	<p>The Government Charge Card Abuse Prevention Act of 2012 requires the Inspector General of each executive agency with more than \$10 million in travel card spending to conduct periodic audits or reviews of travel card programs to analyze risks of illegal, improper or erroneous purchases and payments. The risk assessment objective was to analyze risks of illegal, improper or erroneous purchases and payments within EPA's travel card program.</p>	<p>OIG observed the following anomalies in the transaction data, internal EPA reports and quarterly reports to OMB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No refunds were reported for the last quarter of FY 2018. On an EPA quarterly report to the OMB, the number of active accounts was blank for the first two quarters of FY 2019.</li> <li>• Zero net new accounts were reported in the second quarter of FY 2019.</li> <li>• The total Credit Remaining Report was not available.</li> <li>• Two of the 10 employees on the separated employee list were included on the EPA travel cardholder list.</li> <li>• Transaction expenses for two of the 10 employees did not match the Citibank records.</li> <li>• For one out of the 10 sample transactions, the credit limit per Citibank records did not match the credit limit per the EPA travel cardholder list.</li> <li>• As of July 16, 2019, 20 percent of travel cardholders had not activated their travel card received in November 2018.</li> </ul>	<p>EPA stated that it corrected several of these issues in the third quarter FY 2019. In addition, EPA stated that some travelers' credit limits were temporarily increased during the government shutdown when the Agency was unable to process payroll or travel vouchers. Overall, EPA has addressed these items by correcting the quarterly report to OMB. Some of these issues resulted from the transition from Smartpay2 to Smartpay3. In addition, EPA has established controls to confirm separated employees on a bi-weekly basis. The agency will address any recommendations from the OIG travel card audit that began on Jan. 28, 2020.</p>
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA's Fiscal Years 2018 and 2017</b></p>	<p>OIG conducted this audit in accordance with the Government Management</p>	<p>EPA noted the following <u>material</u> weakness:</p>	<p>EPA has a corrective action plan in place to address each of the</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p><b>Consolidated Financial Statements</b></p> <p>Office of Inspector General (OIG) Office of Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)</p> <p>Completed: November 2018</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epas-fiscal-years-2018-and-2017-consolidated-financial-statements">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epas-fiscal-years-2018-and-2017-consolidated-financial-statements</a></p>	<p>Reform Act of 1994, which requires EPA's OIG to audit the financial statements prepared by the agency each year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EPA's accounting for unearned revenue for Superfund special accounts continues to be a material weakness.</li> </ul> <p>EPA noted the following <u>significant</u> deficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional efforts are needed to resolve cash differences with the U.S. Department of the Treasury.</li> <li>EPA misstated uncollectible debt.</li> <li>EPA improperly increased accounts receivable and related revenue.</li> <li>EPA materially overstated earned revenue.</li> <li>EPA improperly processed General Services Administration rent payments.</li> </ul>	<p>weaknesses and deficiencies identified in the report. EPA has updated accounting models in the Agency's accounting system and prepared quarterly reconciliation of Superfund special accounts general ledger balances to the special accounts database. The agency also researched and resolved the old cash differences cited in the audit report and has completed the remaining corrective actions associated with this audit.</p>
<b>Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance</b>			
<p><b>Effectiveness of Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) Submission Reminders</b></p> <p>Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA)</p> <p>Completion Date: Preliminary results in FY 2019, will be continuing based on these results</p>	<p>In 2017, EPA began sending reminders when National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) DMR submissions were seven, 14, or 21 days late. This analysis sought to determine whether these reminders reduce the number of DMRs that are more than 30 days late.</p>	<p>Initial results indicate that the reminder program reduced the proportion of DMR values more than 30 days late by 1.3 percentage points for majors and by 3.6 percentage points for minors</p>	<p>Results inform work under the National Compliance Initiative effort to reduce the rate of significant noncompliance in the NPDES program.</p>
<b>Office of Land and Emergency Management</b>			
<p><b>Lean Project: Sitewide Ready for Anticipated Use (SWRAU)</b></p> <p>Office of Land and Emergency Management (OLEM)</p> <p>Completed: October 2018</p>	<p>The purpose of this Lean project was to document the current-state process, identify and compare pain points on the process map (referencing the <a href="#">Superfund Task Force report</a>), and establish Superfund tracking points and measurement points.</p>	<p>The initial Lean project helped EPA to focus on working to review information collected during the FY 2017 national SWRAU audit to set appropriate targets and regional commitments and identify</p>	<p>The Superfund program worked to update the Regional Best Management Practices document developed at the end of FY 2017. This will advance practices for frequently used remedies, various field stages and</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
		sites that could achieve SWRAU in FY 2018-2019.	other aspects posing significant opportunities to achieve SWRAU.
<p><b>LEAN Project: National Priorities List (NPL) Full and Partial Deletions</b></p> <p>Office of Land and Emergency Management (OLEM)</p> <p>Completed: May 2019</p>	<p>The purpose of this Lean project was to document the current-state process and identify and compare pain points on the process map for the Superfund Deletions Process.</p>	<p>EPA improved the clarity and efficiency of moving sites through the deletion process; including clarifying the roles and responsibilities of key actors in EPA headquarters and regional offices, eliminating redundant steps, and setting timeframes for milestones in the process.</p>	<p>The Lean project resulted in the development of new visual management tools to improve the clarity and efficiency of moving sites through the deletion process. This process led to a 25% increase in the number of full and partial site deletions in FY 2019 (27) over FY 2018 (22).</p>
<p><b>Redevelopment Economics at Federal Facilities</b></p> <p>Office of Land and Emergency Management (OLEM)</p> <p>Completed: December 2018</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/edfac/redevelopment-economics-federal-facilities">https://www.epa.gov/edfac/redevelopment-economics-federal-facilities</a></p>	<p>The purpose of this project was to provide current, reliable business-related information for a subset of federal facility Superfund sites in reuse and continued use.</p>	<p>The effort identified a total of 1,422 businesses that generate \$9.4 billion in annual sales and provide 115,097 jobs and nearly \$7 billion in estimated annual employment income at 22 Federal Facility Superfund Sites.</p>	<p>The results increased EPA's understanding on the impact of restoration and revitalization of Superfund sites. Results show that the revitalization of contaminated sites brings real and substantial benefits to communities.</p>
<p><b>GAO Report: EPA Should Improve the Reliability of Data on National Priorities List (NPL) Sites Affecting Indian Tribes</b></p> <p>U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) Office of Land and Emergency Management (OLEM)</p> <p>Completed: January 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-19-123">https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-19-123</a></p>	<p>GAO was asked to analyze NPL sites that are on tribal property or that affect tribes and EPA's consultation with tribes at these sites. This report: (1) examines the extent to which EPA has reliable data identifying NPL sites that are located on tribal property or that affect tribes, (2) examines the extent to which EPA has reliable data on the Agency's consultation with tribes regarding NPL sites, and (3) describes the actions EPA has taken to address the unique needs of tribes when</p>	<p>GAO's main recommendation to EPA was that the Agency take actions to improve the data it collects and to clearly define circumstances under which consultation with tribes should be considered.</p>	<p>EPA concurred with GAO's recommendations in this report. EPA planned actions include developing plans to: (1) issue a memorandum from EPA's Office of International and Tribal Affairs to EPA Regional Administrators on the importance of following EPA's Tribal Consultation and Coordination Policy and documenting consultation actions into the Tribal Consultation Opportunities Tracking System (TCOTS),</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
	making decisions about cleanup actions at Superfund sites.		estimated to occur in; (2) issue a monthly TCOTS report to Deputy Assistant Administrators and Regional Assistant Administrators on the status of consultations recorded in TCOTS; (3) initiate trainings specifically targeted to EPA's Regional Superfund staff on when and how to document consultation actions in TCOTS; and (4) conduct training on tribal consultation.
<b>Office of Mission Support</b>			
<p><b>Strategic Sourcing</b></p> <p>Office of Mission Support (OMS)</p> <p>Completed: FY 2019 and ongoing internal annual assessments</p>	<p>This is an annual internal assessment of EPA's buying patterns. The purpose of the assessment is to provide information that will help EPA determine services and products most conducive to strategic sourcing, thereby improving the Agency's buying power.</p>	<p>In FY 2019, EPA identified \$4.7 million avoided costs using data analysis tools to monitor specific, measurable data related to print services, cellular services, shipping, Microsoft software, voice services, office supplies, lab supplies, PCs, and furniture. Since the beginning of the Strategic Sourcing Program in FY 2013, EPA achieved cost avoidance of \$19.4 million. Building on the Strategic Sourcing's previous success and as a result of the annual assessment, in FY 2019, EPA added two new categories, PCs and Furniture.</p>	<p>As a result of the annual assessment, in FY 2020, EPA plans to add strategic sourcing initiatives for VMWare, Salesforce, Lab Equipment &amp; Maintenance, and SPLUNK (software).</p>
<p><b>Space Reduction – Annual Review</b></p> <p>Office of Mission Support (OMS)</p> <p>Completed: FY 2019 and ongoing annual reviews</p>	<p>This annual assessment is a continuation of the Real Property Efficiency Plan completed in FY 2016. The purpose of this assessment is to measure the square footage of unused EPA space released each fiscal year. As space is released, EPA tracks the square footage of the space</p>	<p>In FY 2019, EPA released 128,150 square feet of unused office and warehouse space. EPA is on track to meet the Long-Term Performance Goal of releasing over 850,000 sq ft of space by the end of FY 2022.</p>	<p>EPA leveraged this assessment to continue Headquarters consolidation work that will lead to the closure of Potomac Yards in FY 2021.</p> <p>Additionally, findings from this assessment allowed EPA to recognize the progress made toward</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
	released in OMS's Office of Administrative Services Information System (OASIS).	In FY 2019, EPA missed its space reduction target by 35,476 sq ft. Findings from the assessment highlighted that a major factor for this was the release of the Gross Ile research facility (35K sq ft) being pushed from FY 2019 to FY 2020.	achieving this long-term performance goal, identify logistical challenges associated with the Gross Ile facility and other consolidation efforts, and to focus on opportunities to close the gap needed to reach the annual performance goal.
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA Oversight over Enterprise Customer Service Solution Needs Improvement</b></p> <p>Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Office of Mission Support (OMS)</p> <p>Completed: August 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-oversight-over-enterprise-customer-service-solution-needs">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-oversight-over-enterprise-customer-service-solution-needs</a></p>	OIG conducted this audit to determine whether EPA followed documented policies and procedures for providing information technology (IT) software under the Working Capital Fund (WCF).	OIG's report highlighted there were areas for improvement in the Agency's oversight over Enterprise Customer Service Solution (ECSS) system. Areas for improvement in oversight of the ECSS system included documenting the agency's business justification, having the required plans, and doing a user satisfaction review.	EPA agreed with OIG's recommendations and provided planned corrective actions and completion dates that are acceptable and meet the intent of the recommendations.
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA Needs to Improve Oversight of the Senior Environmental Employment Program</b></p> <p>Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Office of Mission Support (OMS)</p> <p>Completed: June 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-needs-improve-oversight-senior-environmental-employment-program">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-needs-improve-oversight-senior-environmental-employment-program</a></p>	OIG conducted this audit to determine whether internal controls for the Senior Environmental Employment (SEE) program cooperative agreements provide reasonable assurance that the Agency is complying with the Environmental Programs Assistance Act (P.L. 98-313) and EPA guidance and policies.	OIG's report highlighted areas for improvement in the Agency's SEE program and provided five recommendations including: 1. implementing internal controls to verify timely reporting; 2. developing a mechanism for the SEE program manager to verify effective oversight; 3. implement additional communication and guidance for monitors regarding SEE policies and procedures; 4. issuing memorandum to senior leadership in program and regional offices emphasizing compliance with SEE program guidance; 5. revising SEE program's	EPA agreed with all five recommendations in the report. The Office of Mission Support has already implemented corrective actions for recommendations 2 and 3, and provided high-level corrective actions and estimated completion dates for the remaining recommendations.

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
		guidance to include internal controls related to reviewing and setting wage rates, timing for pay scale reviews, and responsibilities.	
<p><b>OIG Report: Insufficient Practices for Managing Known Security Weaknesses and System Settings Weaken EPA's Ability to Combat Cyber Threats</b></p> <p>Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Office of Mission Support (OMS)</p> <p>Completed: May 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-insufficient-practices-managing-known-security-weaknesses-and-system">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-insufficient-practices-managing-known-security-weaknesses-and-system</a></p>	<p>OIG conducted an audit to determine whether EPA completed, and documented actions taken to remediate weaknesses in the Agency's information security program.</p>	<p>OIG's report highlighted improvement opportunities in managing Plan of Actions &amp; Milestones (POA&amp;Ms) for remediating security weaknesses within the Agency's information security weakness tracking system. The improvement opportunities included a process for planning, developing, implementing, evaluating, and documenting remedial actions to address deficiencies in information security controls.</p>	<p>EPA agrees with OIG's overall report, that identifying and mitigating known weaknesses is an important aspect of ensuring the security of the Agency's information assets. EPA further agrees with OIG's report that EPA is improving capabilities in this area over the past several years but there is room for improvement.</p>
<b>Office of Research and Development</b>			
<p><b>Long-Term Performance Goal Survey</b></p> <p>Office of Research and Development (ORD)</p> <p>Completed: August 2019</p>	<p>The purpose of this survey was to measure EPA's progress toward its long-term performance goal on the percentage of research products that met customer needs. EPA's ORD distributed over 200 surveys to research product users in EPA program offices, regions, and other federal partners to solicit feedback on the products.</p>	<p>ORD found that 79% (154/196) of ORD's research products delivered in FY 2018 had met customer needs.</p>	<p>The survey data collected provided important insights into ORD's contributions to its partners and customers' missions and the data was used to support research planning and engagement activities including: briefings and coordination with management and senior leadership, responding to questions and specific inquiries from ORD partners that responded to the survey, and information provided to researchers on user experiences with products.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
			<p>The data collected will inform staff-level and management discussions with ORD's partners ranging from technical improvements to the quality, usability, and timeliness of ORD's research products to broader improvements to ORD's relationship with its product user base.</p>
<p><b>Nutrients Solutions-Driven Research Pilot Problem Formulation Workshop</b></p> <p>Office of Research and Development (ORD)</p> <p>Completed: October/November 2018</p> <p><a href="https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Wayne_Munns_Jr/publication/335949800_Solutions-Driven_Research_Pilot_Problem_Formulation_Workshop_Report_and_Evaluation/links/5d851376299bf1996f82f37a/Solutions-Driven-Research-Pilot-Problem-Formulation-Workshop-Report-and-Evaluation.pdf">https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Wayne_Munns_Jr/publication/335949800_Solutions-Driven_Research_Pilot_Problem_Formulation_Workshop_Report_and_Evaluation/links/5d851376299bf1996f82f37a/Solutions-Driven-Research-Pilot-Problem-Formulation-Workshop-Report-and-Evaluation.pdf</a></p>	<p>EPA's ORD, together with The Barnstable Clean Water Coalition (a Massachusetts-based environmental non-profit organization) co-hosted a workshop to engage key stakeholders in coordinating a research effort focused on nutrient reduction in Three Bays, Cape Cod, Massachusetts. By deploying a dedicated evaluation team to host and evaluate the workshop, ORD applied and documented best practices of program evaluation for solutions-driven research. The Cape Cod regional stakeholders included individuals in other federal agencies, state and local governments, private industry, and academia.</p>	<p>ORD found that clearly defined targeted outputs, structured workshop activities, detailed facilitator guidance, and facilitator observed trainings all contributed to successful process implementation and information processing which catalyzed successful stakeholder engagement.</p>	<p>This workshop serves as a documented example of how to implement solutions-driven research efforts and manage effective stakeholder engagement processes. The methods, findings, and key lessons learned were published in a report now available for EPA staff and external parties to reference to inform future research program development and management.</p>
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA Office of Research and Development Needs to Address Barrier to Gathering External Customer Feedback</b></p> <p>Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Office of Research and Development (ORD)</p> <p>Completed: August 2019</p>	<p>OIG conducted this audit of ORD's long-term performance goal (formerly called strategic measure) on the customer satisfaction survey process. The project had two objectives: (1) to determine whether the data collected and used by ORD's long-term performance goal (SM-21) survey provides a reasonable and accurate measure of customer satisfaction and (2)</p>	<p>The project found that there was insufficient data beyond the FY 2018 baseline to completely answer its first objective. The project also found that ORD faces a key barrier of being significantly limited in its ability to collect sufficient data on the satisfaction of non-federal customers. Currently for its survey, ORD is limited to surveying a maximum of nine</p>	<p>ORD concurred with OIG's recommendation, and published a notice in the Federal Register on September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2019 announcing ORD's intent to submit an ICR to OMB to seek approval to survey non-federal product users in future rounds of data collection. ORD is on track to finalize the ICR in FY 2020.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-office-research-and-development-needs-address-barriers-gathering">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-office-research-and-development-needs-address-barriers-gathering</a></p>	<p>to determine whether ORD faces any barriers when collecting this data.</p>	<p>non-federal employees under the Paperwork Reduction Act. OIG recommended that ORD submit to OMB an Information Collection Request (ICR) which, if approved, would allow ORD to survey more than nine non-federal external customers in future rounds of data collection.</p>	
<p><b>OIG Report: Regional Research Programs Address Agency Needs but Could Benefit from Enhanced Project Tracking</b></p> <p>Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Office of Research and Development (ORD)</p> <p>Completed: April 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-regional-research-programs-address-agency-needs-could-benefit">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-regional-research-programs-address-agency-needs-could-benefit</a></p>	<p>OIG conducted this audit to determine whether or not two of ORD's regional research programs (Regional Applied Research Effort <i>RARE</i> and Regional Sustainability and Environmental Sciences <i>RESES</i>) are helping EPA accomplish its Agency mission, and whether or not the results of these initiatives are impacting Agency decision making.</p>	<p>This project sampled eight <i>RARE</i> and two <i>RESES</i> projects and interviewed regional staff to learn about project impacts. Key findings were that staff believed <i>RARE</i> and <i>RESES</i> projects were succeeding in helping the Agency address regions' high-priority, near-term research needs, and that staff were generally satisfied with the positive impacts these projects had on Agency decision making and engagement. The project also found that ORD could better document project progress, impacts and outputs. At the time of review, ORD's Regional Science Program (RSP) Tracker had not been updated to include <i>RESES</i> projects and contained incomplete data for other projects. It was recommended that ORD complete data entry of all <i>RESES</i> projects into the RSP Tracker and improve documentation visibility and protocols.</p>	<p>ORD concurred with OIG's recommendations and committed to working with the RSP Tracker support contractor to make technical changes to the systems infrastructure to accommodate <i>RESES</i> projects. ORD also committed to complete data entry of project records in the RSP tracker and take corrective actions to enhance the systems usability and user friendliness. These improvements are ongoing and are planned to be completed in FY 2020.</p>
<p><b>GAO Report: Chemical Assessments: Status of EPA's Efforts to Produce Assessments and Implement the</b></p>	<p>GAO conducted this study to evaluate the extent to which ORD's IRIS (Integrated Risk Information System) Program identified and overcome</p>	<p>This project found that ORD made efforts to improve IRIS assessment timeliness and transparency challenges by employing project</p>	<p>EPA improved its IRIS assessment processes by reshaping its project management plans and applying transparent,</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p><b>Toxic Substances Control Act</b></p> <p>U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) Office of Research and Development (ORD)</p> <p>Completed: March 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-19-270">https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-19-270</a></p>	<p>challenges with timeliness and transparency related to chemical assessments which previously bore external criticism. Secondly, the study aimed to describe the extent to which EPA successfully demonstrated progress implementing TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act).</p>	<p>management principles and specialized software to plan assessments and efficiently utilize staff. A systematic review process now provides a structured and transparent process for identifying scientific studies informing IRIS assessments and evaluating their methodological strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>uniform criteria to assessments. GAO did not make any recommendations in this report. However, ORD continues to address previous GAO report recommendations related to IRIS.</p>
<b>Office of Water</b>			
<p><b>Safe Drinking Water Act State Oversight - Program Reviews</b></p> <p>Office of Water (OW)</p> <p>Completed: FY 2019</p>	<p>Under the Safe Drinking Water Program regulations under 40 CFR Part 142, states which meet the primacy requirements are the primary regulators of drinking water systems in the state. Primacy refers to a state acquiring and maintaining primary responsibility for administration and enforcement of drinking water regulations. As outlined in 40 CFR § 142.17, EPA regions are required to conduct an annual assessment of each state's core program elements and verify that states continue to meet primacy requirements.</p>	<p>This year's assessment found that many states are challenged by the heavy workload associated with addressing unregulated contaminants (e.g. Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances [PFAS], Legionella). While core program functions continue, staff cannot offer the same level of technical assistance required to bring systems back into compliance as in previous years. In many cases, systems with repeat health-based violations are also on the EPA Enforcement Targeting Tool (ETT) list and are being addressed by the state. All states have some difficulties keeping track of the numerous reporting requirements.</p>	<p>The results indicate that all the states are placing a high priority on addressing health-based violations.</p> <p>Many states have trouble with reporting violations at the beginning of new rule implementation. In addition, when new rules are rolled out the noncompliance rate is generally higher, or states cannot report the violations for some period of time.</p> <p>The annual reviews are specific to each primacy agency and, where appropriate, identify areas where drinking water programs need to improve. The regions follow up on any areas requiring improvement. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Region 5 uses the data to document progress in annual reviews and works with the state to address the problems and to track state commitments.</li> </ul>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following the annual review, Region 1 continues working with the states to assist with noncompliance and in the case of Revised Total Coliform Rule (RTCR) violations, enforcement staff have contacted systems in Vermont and Connecticut.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Safe Drinking Water Act State Program Oversight – File Reviews and In-Depth Analyses</b></p> <p>Office of Water (OW)</p> <p>Completed: FY 2019</p>	<p>Two targeted analyses of state data are conducted to supplement the annual program evaluations.</p> <p>File Reviews are conducted every three to six years for each state. The goal of a program (file) review is to document whether the state makes appropriate compliance determinations for the drinking water regulations and accurately reports associated data to the national database, Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS) Fed Data Warehouse.</p> <p>In-depth analyses are rule-specific and are designed to evaluate the challenges, lessons learned, and recommendations on a specific aspect of the Safe Drinking Water Act.</p>	<p>From File Reviews, EPA identified areas where a state is not implementing a rule fully or reporting correctly to the national database. The region documents and tracks those deficiencies in many cases against commitments from the state for when the problem will be fixed. In the past three years, EPA conducted seven to ten file reviews each year. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Region 1 conducts one File Review per year in one state. The majority of deficiencies are related to monitoring and reporting violations. States do not have the resources to cross check every monitoring sample against approved monitoring plans and were relying on SDWIS Prime for improved data processing. States are concerned by their future ability to track data without updated data management systems</li> </ul>	<p>File reviews allow EPA to identify specific discrepancies within the state program, allowing the region to develop corrective actions and make recommendations for program improvements.</p> <p>In July 2019, EPA published the report <a href="#">Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (DBPR) and Consecutive System In-Depth Analysis</a>, which describes the challenges and best practices identified in the Stage 2 DBPR and Consecutive System In-Depth Analysis.</p> <p>EPA initiated a second national in-depth analysis, which will focus on the Ground Water Rule. This will be conducted in FY 2020 with a final report anticipated in early FY 2021.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
		<p>and the indefinite delay of SDWIS Prime. Some deficiencies are linked to database errors and others are due to lab capacity issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2018, EPA conducted a national deep dive for the Disinfection Byproducts Rule, which included Indiana, Kentucky, New Jersey, North Dakota and Pennsylvania.</li> <li>• In 2018, Region 5 began a deep dive of all six states' Lead and Copper Rule (LCR) implementation. The findings identified gaps or deficiencies in fully implementing the LCR, which Region 5 is now working with the states to resolve.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Chesapeake Bay Program's Strategy Review System (SRS) Process Improvements</b></p> <p>Office of Water (OW)</p> <p>Completed: First biennial cycle ended in December 2018. Second cycle began March 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.chesapeakebay.net/decisions">https://www.chesapeakebay.net/decisions</a></p>	<p>The Chesapeake Bay Program's Strategy Review System (SRS) is an adaptive management-based review process developed by the Chesapeake Bay Partnership to consistently assess and track progress across all 31 outcomes of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement.</p> <p>Beginning August 2018 and continuing through Spring of 2019, multiple rounds of user research and a two-day Lean process mapping event were conducted to evaluate the SRS, simplify the process and materials for the second cycle, and improve the quarterly progress outcome reviews.</p>	<p>Results from the user research and the Lean event indicate the need to simplify the process, clarify and build in additional time for some steps, and provide centralized support and information for those participating in the SRS.</p> <p>Results from the quarterly reviews include improved collaboration, accountability, and better alignment of our science and communications; more effective leveraging of partnership expertise and over \$1.5 billion federal and state funds.</p>	<p>Discussions and action items resulting from the quarterly progress reviews informed the Management Board on progress toward outcomes, identified opportunities to engage new partners, and informed the next two years of work.</p> <p>The SRS process and support materials were streamlined. <a href="#">ChesapeakeDecisions</a>, a web product, was developed which centralizes materials and provides clear and consistent instructions for</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
	<p>The second cycle kick-off meeting was held in March 2019 and quarterly reviews were conducted in August and November 2019 to review progress toward outcomes and identify opportunities to collaborate and improve.</p>		<p>guiding the partnership through the SRS.</p> <p><a href="#">ChesapeakeDecisions</a> also transparently documents management decisions and follow-up actions, and tracks dates, deadlines, and status of documents.</p>
<p><b>Chesapeake Bay 2018 Progress Watershed Model Assessment</b></p> <p>Office of Water (OW)</p> <p>Completed: April 2019</p> <p><a href="http://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/clean-water/water-quality/watershed-implementation-plans">http://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/clean-water/water-quality/watershed-implementation-plans</a></p>	<p>The annual model progress assessment is one measure of the status of meeting pollutant load reduction goals associated with the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). The model uses reported wastewater discharge and air deposition data along with other information about conditions in the watershed – including implementation of best management practices – in a simulation of pollutant loads to local water bodies and tidal waters of the Chesapeake Bay. The results of the model progress scenario include estimates of the percentages of the goals achieved for each jurisdiction and each source of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment.</p>	<p>As of 2018, nutrient pollution-reducing practices are in place to achieve 39% of the nitrogen reductions and 77% of the phosphorus reductions necessary to attain applicable water quality standards, as compared to the 2009 baseline established by EPA as part of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL.</p> <p>The Chesapeake Bay TMDL and the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement call for practices to be put in place by 2017 to reduce nutrient, phosphorus, and sediment loads by 60%. The TMDL is designed to ensure that all pollution control measures needed to fully restore the Bay and its tidal rivers are in place by 2025. Following this trajectory toward the 2025 targets, the 2018 objective was not achieved for nitrogen but was met for phosphorus. Sediment targets are currently going through the approval process among Bay Program partners.</p>	<p>Under the accountability framework, EPA committed to conduct oversight of Bay jurisdictions' programs to ensure they are on track to meet the goals of their Watershed Implementation Plan and two-year milestones. For EPA's evaluation of progress, visit: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/chesapeake-bay-tmdl/epa-oversight-watershed-implementation-plans-wips-and-milestones-chesapeake-bay">https://www.epa.gov/chesapeake-bay-tmdl/epa-oversight-watershed-implementation-plans-wips-and-milestones-chesapeake-bay</a>.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA’s Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act Program Needs Additional Internal Controls</b></p> <p>Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Office of Water (OW)</p> <p>Completed: December 2018</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epas-water-infrastructure-finance-and-innovation-act-program-needs">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epas-water-infrastructure-finance-and-innovation-act-program-needs</a></p>	<p>OIG conducted this evaluation to determine whether EPA established effective internal controls for the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) program.</p>	<p>OIG recommended that EPA should prepare a comprehensive program risk assessment, and that EPA should develop program performance metrics to fully identify and capture financial data and public health benefits to affected communities. OIG also found that EPA needs to strengthen its SharePoint access controls for the WIFIA program.</p>	<p>EPA’s WIFIA program agreed with OIG on all recommendations. The WIFIA program completed a risk assessment in accordance with OMB Circular A-123 and implemented detailed internal controls for the program.</p> <p>The WIFIA program developed controls to ensure the WIFIA SharePoint site’s access controls function as intended and comply with federal requirements and EPA’s information technology security program. The WIFIA program also identified what types of data are needed to manage the program and what types of information technology controls are needed to safeguard such data.</p> <p>Finally, the WIFIA program developed a program performance metric to further assess the program’s effectiveness, “WIFIA financing provided to assist utilities that are out of compliance.” Based on the first 13 loans, the WIFIA program provided \$1,389,330 in loans to assist utilities that are out of compliance. This loan money will help utilities to comply with consent decrees by reducing sanitary sewer overflows and combined sewer overflows. This result is a</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
			cumulative total through FY 2019.
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA Must Improve Oversight of Notice to the Public on Drinking Water Risks to Better Protect Human Health</b></p> <p>Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Office of Water (OW)</p> <p>Completed: September 2019</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-must-improve-oversight-notice-public-drinking-water-risks-better">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-must-improve-oversight-notice-public-drinking-water-risks-better</a></p>	<p>OIG examined whether EPA adequately ensures that public drinking water systems notify their consumers as required by public notice regulations authorized under the Safe Drinking Water Act, such as when the drinking water poses a risk to public health (e.g., when there are unsafe levels of contamination).</p>	<p>OIG made nine recommendations, including that EPA require primacy agencies to comply with oversight requirements related to public notice and to follow data reporting requirements. OIG also recommended that the Agency update public notice guidance, define the acceptable methods and conditions under which notices can be delivered electronically, and improve public notice violation information in the national drinking water database.</p>	<p>EPA developed corrective actions to OIG's recommendations, along with estimated completion dates (in FY 2020 and the first quarter of FY 2021). The corrective actions include providing additional guidance, training and oversight on public notification.</p>
<p><b>OIG Report: EPA Unable to Assess the Impact of Hundreds of Unregulated Pollutants in Land-Applied Biosolids on Human Health and the Environment</b></p> <p>Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Office of Water (OW)</p> <p>Completed: November 2018</p> <p><a href="https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-unable-assess-impact-hundreds-unregulated-pollutants-land">https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-epa-unable-assess-impact-hundreds-unregulated-pollutants-land</a></p>	<p>OIG conducted this audit to determine whether EPA has controls over the land application of sewage sludge and if yes, whether they are being implemented so that they are protective of human health and the environment.</p>	<p>OIG recommended that EPA's Office of Water address control weaknesses in biosolids research, information sharing with the public, pathogen control and training. Further, OIG recommended that Office of Water and Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance improve the consistency of compliance monitoring and better record inspection data.</p>	<p>EPA's Office of Water worked in recent years to develop the capacity to screen pollutants found in biosolids by developing risk assessment tools and gathering pertinent data. The biosolids website overhaul, which provides clear and transparent information, began prior to the OIG report and was completed. The new website is currently under review. The biosolids webinar series and planning for the national meeting are underway, as are updates to the pathogen and vector attraction reduction guidance.</p>

