

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
1	<p><b>Evaluation of National Air Quality Regional Planning Organization Program</b>/Ross &amp; Associates Environmental Consulting, Ltd. The evaluation reviewed the role and funding of regional planning organizations in supporting U.S. air quality management and planning through technical assistance.</p> <p>The Office of Air and Radiation has disseminated the report and findings to the EPA's regional offices, which have provided the information to states and tribes.</p>	<p>RPOs provide significant air quality technical, coordination and capacity-building support to assist states, tribes, federal land managers, the EPA and local agencies with regional haze and other priority issues.</p> <p>While there are more similarities than differences across the regions, each RPO has unique organizational structures and has allocated resources for staff and contractor support somewhat differently to carry out regional air quality technical support activities.</p> <p>While comparisons of the relative productivity of RPO expenditures are extremely difficult, regional planning is a cost-effective means to support state, tribal and federal air quality planning needs.</p>	<p>Affirm and communicate a new phase of necessary multi-pollutant air quality planning work and the compelling value that RPO-type organizations can provide in supporting these efforts.</p> <p>Refine a list of desired attributes, roles and responsibilities, and performance measures for regional technical support.</p> <p>Re-examine the geographic scope of regional organizations to leverage resources and facilitate collaboration to best address future needs.</p> <p>Explore opportunities for greater collaboration among RPOs and multi-jurisdictional organizations to better leverage resources and coordinate policy.</p> <p>Establish a national coordinating committee to foster communications, coordination, and joint planning across the regional organizations and with the EPA.</p>
1	<p><b>The EPA Should Improve Guidance and Oversight to Ensure Effective Recovery Act-Funded Diesel Emissions Reduction Act Activities</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/The American Recovery and</p>	<p>The EPA guidance and oversight is needed to ensure that projects achieve the planned emission reductions and that activities are reported</p>	<p>Develop oversight procedures to provide reasonable assurance that grantee progress reports are accurate and that emission</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>Reinvestment Act of 2009 provided the EPA with \$300 million in grant funds for diesel emission reduction activities. The OIG conducted its review to determine whether these funds are effective in obtaining diesel retrofits and emission reductions.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110301-11-R-0141.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110301-11-R-0141.pdf</a> Date of the Evaluation: March 1, 2011 Report No. 11-R-0141</p>	<p>accurately.</p> <p>The OIG identified that documentation of grant activities did not always demonstrate that funded Diesel Emissions Reduction Act work achieved the desired emission reductions. Two subgrants involving 13 completed engine replacements, costing \$343,753, supporting documentation did not clearly indicate the emissions certification level of the new engines. Also, three subgrants to replace six vehicles, costing \$268,000, had engine model years different from the vehicle model year. These documentation errors could result in the EPA overestimating emission reductions for these projects</p>	<p>certification levels are verified.</p> <p>Require that DERA grant and subgrant agreements specify the emission certification level or year of new engines installed as part of vehicle replacement and engine repower projects. Issue guidance clearly defining eligible costs for early replacements of vehicles and engines for state grants.</p> <p>Recoup unsupported expenditures of funds.</p>
1	<p><b>The EPA Needs to Better Document Project Delays for Recovery Act Diesel Emissions Reduction Act Grants/EPA, Office of Inspector General/The OIG</b> conducted this audit to determine whether the EPA successfully used its grants management tools to identify and mitigate project delays in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) Diesel Emission Reduction Act grants.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110328-11-R-0179.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110328-11-R-0179.pdf</a></p>	<p>While DERA project officers were aware of Recovery Act grant project delays, they did not always document delays in the EPA's grants management system or, in some cases, take action to reduce the impact of project delay.</p>	<p>Revise the baseline monitoring report questions and corresponding guidance so that project officers and grant specialists understand what information is required and how the EPA uses the reports to monitor progress Ensure that project officers review the grants that received no-cost time extensions and verify that revised project timelines are established. If updated timelines are not</p>

**FY 2011 Annual Performance Report  
Program Evaluations**

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
			<p>established, have recipients submit the timelines when submitting their next quarterly reports</p> <p>Ensure that project officers continuously document delays in baseline and advanced monitoring reports for Recovery Act DERA grants. Update milestones and institute corrective action plans when delays occur.</p> <p>Ensure that project officers establish a process to identify programmatic baseline monitoring reports that project officers submit for the quarter ending December 31, 2010, that do not accurately record project status. Where delays are not accurately reported, require project officers to revise the baseline monitoring reports.</p> <p>Ensure that project officers, using the information in the recipient monitoring database, regularly provide reports to management on progress of projects and status of corrective action plans until the Recovery Act grants are completed.</p>
1	<p><b>ENERGY STAR, Providing Opportunities for Additional Review of the EPA's Decisions Could Strengthen the Program</b>/General Accountability Office/The GAO examined 1) the status of the EPA's and the DOE's</p>	<p>The EPA and the DOE have made considerable progress in their ongoing efforts to implement significant changes to the ENERGY STAR program agreed to in the 2009</p>	<p>Assess the need to develop a process for independent review of adverse decisions related to setting specifications and disqualifications.</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>implementation of changes to the ENERGY STAR program under the Memorandum of Understanding to address weaknesses and 2) ENERGY STAR program partners' views of the program and recently implemented changes.</p> <p><a href="http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11888.pdf">http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11888.pdf</a> Report no. GAO-11-88, September 30, 2011</p>	<p>MOU. These changes include expanding product qualification and verification testing, updating program requirements, and piloting a program to promote the most efficient ENERGY STAR products.</p> <p>To examine the status of the changes, the GAO reviewed guidance and eligibility criteria and interviewed various program partners to gather their views. The results of these interviews are not generalizable but provided insight on changes to the ENERGY STAR program.</p> <p>Program partners cited the overall strength of the ENERGY STAR brand itself and its wide recognition by American consumers and said that the loss of the program would be detrimental to their business.</p>	
1	<p><b>ENERGY STAR Label Needs to Assure Superior Energy Conservation Performance</b> /EPA, Office of Inspector General/To identify design and management challenges that present risks to the program's integrity to promote energy efficiency and consumer savings.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101028-11-P-0010.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101028-11-P-0010.pdf</a> Report No: 11-P-0010</p>	<p>The OIG identified that the EPA's implementation of the ENERGY STAR program has become inconsistent with the program's authorized purpose to achieve environmental benefits by identifying and promoting energy-efficient products and practices that meet the highest energy conservation standards. In addition, the OIG determined that the ENERGY STAR program has sought to maximize the number of qualified products available at the expense of identifying</p>	<p>Develop a strategic vision and program design that assures that the ENERGY STAR label represents superior energy conservation performance.</p> <p>Develop a set of goals and valid and reliable measures that can accurately inform shareholders and the public of the benefits of the program.</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		products and practices that maximize energy efficiency.	
1	<p><b>Procedural Review of the EPA's Greenhouse Gases Endangerment Finding Data Quality Processes</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/Determine whether the EPA followed key federal and agency regulations and policies in developing and reviewing the technical data used to make and support its greenhouse gases endangerment finding.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110926-11-P-0702.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110926-11-P-0702.pdf</a> Report No. 11-P-070</p>	<p>The EPA met statutory requirements for rulemaking and generally followed requirements and guidance related to ensuring the quality of the supporting technical information. Whether the EPA's review of its endangerment finding TSD met Office of Management and Budget requirements for peer review depends on whether the TSD is considered a highly influential scientific assessment. In our opinion, the TSD was a highly influential scientific assessment because the EPA weighed the strength of the available science by its choices of information, data, studies, and conclusions included in and excluded from the TSD. The EPA officials told us they did not consider the TSD a highly influential scientific assessment. The EPA noted that the TSD consisted only of science that was previously peer reviewed, and that these reviews were deemed adequate under the agency's policy. The EPA had the TSD reviewed by a panel of 12 federal climate change scientists. This review did not meet all OMB requirements for peer review of a highly influential scientific assessment, primarily because the review results and the EPA's response</p>	<p>Revise the Peer Review Handbook to accurately reflect OMB requirements for peer review of highly influential scientific assessments. Instruct program offices to state in proposed and final rules whether the action is supported by influential scientific information or a highly influential scientific assessment.</p> <p>Revise the assessment factors guidance to establish minimum review and documentation requirements for assessing and accepting data from other organizations.</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>were not publicly reported, and because one of the 12 reviewers was an EPA employee.</p>	
1	<p><b>The EPA Plan to Reduce Agency Greenhouse Gas Emissions Is on Track to Meet Executive Order 13514 Requirements</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To evaluate the EPA's progress toward meeting the requirements of Executive Order 13514, "Federal Leadership in Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance." Specifically, the OIG sought to determine the EPA's status in planning and measuring greenhouse gas reductions at agency facilities.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110412-11-P-0209.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110412-11-P-0209.pdf</a></p>	<p>The OIG found that the EPA has completed its plan to reduce GHG emissions as required by Executive Order 13514. However, projected GHG reductions are contingent on the full funding and implementation of the plan's energy-efficiency projects. The EPA established a 25-percent GHG emission reduction target by fiscal year 2020. To reach this target, the agency's primary strategy is to reduce its facility energy intensity by 3 percent annually through fiscal year 2020. The EPA's Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan outlines specific projects that the agency will undertake to reduce GHG emissions. The OIG determined that funding for some of the projects in the plan has not been authorized or appropriated, and delays or deficits in plan funding may adversely impact the agency's ability to meet its GHG reduction goals.</p>	<p>Describe changes to GHG emission reductions and/or reduction goals based on actual funding and status of projects, and make adjustments to the overall reduction goal, as needed in the EPA's annual update of its Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan report.</p>
1	<p><b>The EPA Faced Multiple Constraints to Targeting Recovery Act Funds</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To determine the extent to which the EPA's American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) funds were targeted to economically disadvantaged communities, and the extent to which jobs were created and results were achieved in those communities.</p>	<p>The OIG identified that after obligating over \$7 billion in Recovery Act funds, the EPA is unable, both on a programmatic and national basis, to assess the overall impact of those funds on economically disadvantaged communities or those most impacted by the</p>	<p>Establish a clear and consistent regime that can address socioeconomic factors within the bounds of statutory and organizational constraints.</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
	<a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110411-11-R-0208.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110411-11-R-0208.pdf</a>	<p>recession. Recovery Act funds were intended to create or save jobs, address environmental and other challenges, and assist those most impacted by the recession. The EPA specifically sought to address location-specific, community-based public health and environmental needs with its Recovery Act dollars. While the EPA was able to track financial expenditures, it considered, but could not execute, an effort to track the distribution of its Recovery Act funds to economically disadvantaged communities. The effort was hindered by the absence of definitions, data and measures.</p>	
1	<p><b>The EPA Should Update Its Fees Rule To Recover More Motor Vehicle and Engine Compliance Program Costs</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To evaluate the EPA's assessment and collection of fees for its Motor Vehicle and Engine Compliance Program. With the Administration's focus on reducing the federal budget deficit, is the EPA charging sufficient fees to recover its costs of administering the MVECP, and are internal controls over the assessment and collection of vehicle emissions testing fees effective?</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110923-11-P-0701.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110923-11-P-0701.pdf</a></p>	<p>The EPA is not recovering all reasonable costs of administering the MVECP. By not recovering all reasonable costs, the federal government did not collect funds that otherwise could have been available to offset the federal budget deficit.</p> <p>The EPA's internal controls over the assessment and collection of fees are generally effective, except for minor exceptions related to segregation of duties, fee refund approvals, untimely recording of collections and correction of customer errors. The</p>	<p>Update the 2004 fees rule to increase the amount of MVECP costs the EPA can recover, and conduct biennial reviews of the MVECP fee collections and the full cost of operating the program to determine whether the EPA is recovering its costs.</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>OIG notes that the EPA corrected these exceptions when they were pointed out.</p>	
2	<p><b>Evaluation of the Drinking Water and Clean Water Infrastructure Tribal Set-Aside Grant Programs (DWIG-TSA and CWISA)/</b>Ross &amp; Associates Environmental Consulting, Ltd. (Ross &amp; Associates) and Industrial Economics, Incorporated conducted this evaluation under Contract EP-W-07-028 between IEc and the EPA's Office of Policy with sponsorship by OP through the EPA's Program Evaluation Competition and sponsorship by OWM &amp; OGWDW/The evaluation reviewed the EPA's CWISA and DWIG-TSA program activities and their influence since 2003, including data from over 650 projects. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the extent to which the combined program efforts have resulted in increased access to safe drinking water and sanitation facilities and increased compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Amendments, and to better understand and explain how these programs are implemented. The evaluation also was to determine if the strategic measures are accurate indicators of each program's progress. Finally, the evaluation sought to gain a deeper understanding of the EPA's interaction with the Indian Health Service and how that interaction might affect program results.</p> <p>The evaluation report can be found under Internal Reports - Office of Water at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/evaluate/reports.htm">http://www.epa.gov/evaluate/reports.htm</a>. Publication information: March 2011 EPA-100-R-11-006.</p>	<p>Program goals and priorities could be clearer and more focused.</p> <p>Funding allocation methods have an understandable basis and history; however, they are not an ideal match for the current program priorities and strategic measures.</p> <p>Project selection could be more clearly and consistently tied to the EPA's priorities, while still maintaining regional discretion and flexibility.</p> <p>Communication within the EPA and between the EPA and the IHS is inconsistent and not optimal for strategic program management or learning and improvement.</p> <p>Despite improvement in recent years, there are opportunities for improved interagency and tribal communication.</p> <p>The EPA has limited ability to make progress on the strategic measures due to reliance on other federal agencies and lower than needed funding levels.</p> <p>The EPA has limited ability to make progress toward the current compliance strategic measure, though the extent of limitation is not clear due to a lack of measurable data. Problems may be related to operations and maintenance at tribal systems or the introduction of new drinking water rules, rather than to infrastructure</p>	<p>Clarify the goals and priorities of both programs.</p> <p>Consider changing the access strategic measures to ones that more directly reflect the EPA's mandate, authority and scope of influence.</p> <p>Consider changing the compliance strategic measure to reflect the drivers of compliance problems and the EPA's scope of influence.</p> <p>Reassess the national annual budget allocation to more clearly tie funding to the EPA's goals and priorities.</p> <p>Update and clarify expectations for project selection to more clearly align with the program priorities; allow for regional flexibility and discretion; and promote increased consistency and transparency.</p> <p>Routinely collect and analyze data to enhance transparency and strategic coordination and improve the EPA's ability to report on, advocate, and improve both programs.</p>



## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>problems that the DWIG-TSA program can address. Programs' meaningful contributions to meeting tribal infrastructure needs are not well reflected by the reported program performance.</p>	<p>Update the national guidelines for both programs.</p> <p>Continue to improve communication within the EPA, between the EPA and the IHS, and between the EPA and the tribes.</p>
2	<p><b>Recovery Act Funds Supported Many Water Projects, and Federal and State Monitoring Shows Few Compliance Problems</b>/Government Accountability Office/The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) provided \$4 billion for the EPA Clean Water State Revolving Fund and \$2 billion for the agency's Drinking Water SRF. The GAO examined 1) the status and use of Recovery Act SRF program funds nationwide and in nine states; 2) the EPA and state actions to monitor the act's SRF program funds; 3) the EPA's and selected states' approaches to ensure data quality, including for jobs reported by recipients of the act's funds; and 4) challenges, if any, that states have faced in implementing the act's requirements.</p> <p><a href="http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11608.pdf">http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11608.pdf</a></p>	<p>The 50 states have awarded and obligated the almost \$6 billion in Clean Water and Drinking Water SRF program funds provided under the Recovery Act, and the EPA indicated that all 50 states met the act's requirement to award funds to projects under contract one year after the act's passage. States used the funds to support more than 3,000 water quality projects, and according to the EPA data, the majority of the funds were used for sewage treatment infrastructure and drinking water treatment and distribution systems. Since the act was passed, states have drawn down almost 80 percent of the SRF program funds provided under the act. According to the EPA data, states met the act's requirements that at least 1) 20 percent of the funds be used to support "green" projects and 2) 50 percent of the funds be provided as additional subsidies. In the nine states the GAO reviewed, the act's funds paid for 419 infrastructure projects that helped address major water quality</p>	None.

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>problems, but state officials said in some cases the act's requirements changed their priorities for ranking projects or the projects selected. In addition, although not required by the act, the nine states used about a quarter of the funds they received, most in additional subsidies, to pay for projects in economically disadvantaged communities. The EPA, states, and state or private auditors took actions to monitor Recovery Act SRF program funds. For example, the EPA officials reviewed all 50 states' Recovery Act SRF programs at least once and found that states were largely complying with the act's requirements. Also, in part as a response to a GAO recommendation, in June 2010, the EPA updated—and is largely following—its oversight plan, which describes monitoring actions for the SRF programs. Furthermore, state officials visited sites to monitor Recovery Act projects, as indicated in the plan, and found few problems. Officials at the EPA and in the nine states have also regularly checked the quality of data on Recovery.gov and stated that the it has remained relatively stable, although GAO identified minor inconsistencies in the FTE data that states reported.</p> <p>Some state officials that</p>	

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>GAO interviewed identified challenges in implementing the Recovery Act's Clean Water and Drinking Water SRF requirements for green projects and additional subsidies, both of which were continued with some variation, in the fiscal year 2010 and 2011 appropriations for the SRF programs. Officials in four states said achieving the green-funding goal was difficult, with one suggesting that the 20 percent target be changed. In addition, officials in two of the four states, as well as in two other states, noted that when monies are not repaid into revolving funds to generate future revenue for these funds, the SRF program purpose changes from primarily providing loans for investments in water infrastructure to providing grants.</p>	
2	<p><b>Assessing the Effectiveness of the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act Notification Program</b>/Industrial Economics, Incorporated, funded through the EPA's program evaluation competition /The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the effectiveness of the notification component of the BEACH Act Notification Program.  <a href="http://www.epa.gov/evaluate/pdf/beach-act-evaluation-factsheet.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/evaluate/pdf/beach-act-evaluation-factsheet.pdf</a></p>	<p>The content and format of beach notification messages varies, and examples drawn from states and localities suggest good practices.</p> <p>Notification messages reach only a fraction of beachgoers, but social networking tools, as well as traditional media, can expand the reach of these messages.</p> <p>Public awareness of beach advisories varies; but beachgoers who are aware of signs often find them helpful.</p>	None.

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>Beach advisories appear to have some effect on behavior, but other factors may predominate.</p>	
2	<p><b>The EPA Lacks Internal Controls to Prevent Misuse of Emergency Drinking Water Facilities</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To evaluate the ability of the EPA and states to ensure emergency drinking water facilities do not distribute contaminated water to their customers in violation of the Safe Drinking Water Act. This review was in response to the recent discovery that a local community water system in Illinois distributed drinking water to its customers from a known contaminated well that should have been removed from the distribution system and properly closed.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101012-11-P-0001.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101012-11-P-0001.pdf</a></p>	<p>Currently, there is no federal regulatory requirement for the EPA or the states to oversee or monitor emergency drinking water facilities. As a result, the EPA does not know the total number of contaminated emergency facilities and the scope of their use.</p> <p>The EPA and the states do not have common definitions or a common understanding of what constitutes an emergency facility, nor when and how emergency facilities may be used. States rely on water systems to self-report when they use these emergency facilities. However, that system is voluntary, based on trust rather than a verifiable control.</p> <p>The EPA cannot accurately assess the risk of public water systems delivering contaminated drinking water from emergency facilities because of limitations in Safe Drinking Water Information System data management.</p>	<p>Develop standard definitions for the five facility availability codes.</p> <p>Develop standard operating procedures to assist the states with entering data into Safe Drinking Water Information System/state databases, and determine whether additional fields are needed in the Safe Drinking Water Information System/federal version to improve the oversight of emergency facilities.</p> <p>Assess the risk associated with the unauthorized use of emergency facilities and, if necessary, develop controls to mitigate that risk.</p>
2	<p><b>Region 4 Should Strengthen Oversight of Georgia's Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation Program</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To determine whether the EPA provides adequate oversight of the Georgia National Pollutant Discharge</p>	<p>The OIG found significant deficiencies in the Georgia Environmental Protection Division's management and Region 4's oversight of the CAFO program. Our review identified a number of deficiencies for 34 of the 48</p>	<p>The EPA Region 4: Implement controls as stated in the 2007 memorandum of agreement between the EPA Region 4 and GEPD to require enforcement data</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>Elimination System, Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation program in response to a hotline complaint over the EPA Region 4 oversight of the CAFO program.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110623-11-P-0274.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110623-11-P-0274.pdf</a></p>	<p>CAFOs Georgia inspected. CAFOs were operating without NPDES permits or Nutrient Management Plans, inspection reports were missing required components, and the Georgia Department of Agriculture was not assessing compliance with permit conditions. As a result, there is a significant risk that the Georgia's CAFO program is failing to protect water quality.</p>	<p>tracking between GEPD and Region 4; ensure CAFO inspections are accurate and complete, and ensure that GEPD takes timely and appropriate enforcement actions.</p>
3	<p><b>The EPA Actively Evaluating Effectiveness of Its BP and Enbridge Oil Spill Response Communications</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To evaluate the actions that the EPA took to communicate oil spill risk to affected communities near the Gulf of Mexico and Michigan's Kalamazoo River.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110623-11-P-0273.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110623-11-P-0273.pdf</a></p>	<p>The EPA is actively evaluating the effectiveness of its spill response communications activities and has several ongoing efforts focused on lessons learned. The OIG did not continue into a field work phase and closed this assignment upon issuing the report.</p>	<p>No recommendations are identified for this report.</p>
3			None.
3	<p><b>Leaking Underground Storage Tank Recovery Act Grants Contained Requirements but Priority Lists Need More Oversight</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To examine the EPA's management of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding for the Leaking Underground Storage Tank program under requirements of the Recovery Act's Clean Water State Revolving Fund program.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101122-11-R-0018.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101122-11-R-0018.pdf</a></p>	<p>There were three management control deficiencies found in Recovery Act grants: 1) the EPA had not clarified to states whether municipally owned LUST sites would be eligible for ARRA LUST funds, 2) the EPA had no plan to deobligate unspent ARRA funds from grant recipients, and 3) the EPA in many instances does not use state data to ensure that grants comply with site priority requirements of the Solid Waste Disposal Act,</p>	<p>Ensure that the Solid Waste Disposal Act site priority requirement is consistently incorporated into the terms and conditions of future LUST Trust Fund grant agreements.</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>as amended.</p> <p>The EPA corrected the first two deficiencies by spring 2010 through additional guidance to the regions. However, the EPA has not yet corrected the third deficiency.</p>	
3	<p><b>The EPA Could Improve RCRAInfo Data Quality and System Development/EPA, Office of Inspector General and contractor Williams, Adley &amp; Company, LLP/To determine whether data within the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Information System complied with prescribed system edit and validation checks designed to control data entry.</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110207-11-P-0096.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110207-11-P-0096.pdf</a></p>	<p>RCRAInfo data, which track hazardous waste handlers and the shipment and receipt of hazardous waste, contain errors and are missing source documentation. These conditions call into question the quality and reliability of data within the RCRAInfo system, as well as any resulting reporting. Further, RCRAInfo system owners did not follow the prescribed System Life Cycle Management testing procedures to test and validate the updated software and updated system. Overall, the above conditions were caused by not having specific data quality procedures for RCRAInfo that align with the agency's data quality policy, not following the System Life Cycle Management procedures for system development, and not adequately communicating with the states regarding the RCRAInfo test environment.</p>	<p>Implement a procedure for regional personnel to notify a state when changes are made to handler records.</p> <p>Provide guidance and policy on retaining source documentation and implementing control procedures for updating documentation and on reviewing test data on a semiannual basis.</p>
3	<p><b>The EPA Must Implement Controls To Ensure Proper Investigations Are Conducted at Brownfields Sites/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To evaluate how the EPA is ensuring that brownfields</b></p>	<p>The EPA does not review AAI reports submitted by grantees to ensure that they comply with federal requirements. Rather, of the 35 AAI reports reviewed,</p>	<p>Establish accountability for compliant AAI reports, to include those conducted under ARRA brownfields grants.</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>assessment grantees adhere to all appropriate inquiries requirements (AAI).</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110214-11-P-0107.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110214-11-P-0107.pdf</a></p>	<p>from the three EPA regions, none contained all the required documentation elements. This occurred because the agency does not have management controls requiring the EPA project officers to conduct oversight of AAI reports.</p>	<p>Develop a plan to review AAI reports to determine the reports' compliance with AAI documentation requirements, and establish criteria to determine whether noncompliant grantees should return federal grant money.</p>
3	<p><b>The EPA Needs an Agencywide Plan to Provide Tribal Solid Waste Management Capacity Assistance</b> /EPA, Office of Inspector General/To determine whether the EPA's tribal solid waste management activities are helping tribes develop the management and enforcement capacity they need to eliminate open dumps.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110321-11-P-0171.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110321-11-P-0171.pdf</a></p>	<p>The EPA cannot determine whether its efforts are assisting tribal governments in developing the capacity to manage solid waste or reduce the risks of open dumps in Indian Country. The EPA's performance measures do not assess whether the agency's efforts are effective in building solid waste management capacity in Indian Country. The EPA lacks internal data controls to track the status of open dumps.</p>	<p>Develop an agency-wide plan to implement consistent and effective tribal solid waste management capacity assistance. The plan should include: 1) roles and responsibilities of the EPA's program and regional offices; 2) agency resources required for activities; 3) output and outcome measures that track how consistent and effective the EPA activities are; 4) internal controls to ensure consistent data collection; 5) a process to ensure coordination between the EPA program offices and regions, and (6) a timeline specifying when the activities and outcomes outlined in the plan are expected to be accomplished.</p>
3	<p><b>The EPA's Gulf Coast Oil Spill Response Shows Need for Improved Documentation and Funding Practices</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To determine whether the EPA has controls in place to recover its Gulf Coast oil spill response costs as required and recommended by policy and guidance.</p>	<p>The EPA needs additional management controls to track and recover its Gulf Coast oil spill response costs. The EPA needs controls to ensure documentation for its response activities is consistent and provides a clear audit trail that links response costs to authorized</p>	<p>The EPA Chief Financial Officer should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Implement controls to ensure that the EPA generates response activity documentation that provides a clear audit trail linking response work performed to response work billed.</li> </ol>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
	<a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110825-11-P-0527.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110825-11-P-0527.pdf</a>	<p>activities. While response costs were charged to a site code, we were unable to determine the specific tasks associated with certain costs to ensure they were related to authorized activities. Further, the EPA also needs controls in its billing review to ensure that cost documentation packages are clear and complete.</p>	<p>2) Implement controls to ensure that bills and supporting cost documentation packages submitted to the Coast Guard are clear and complete and comply with cost documentation requirements. 3) Seek new or additional emergency response funding authority for oil spills. 4) The EPA Deputy Administrator should: 5) Work with Coast Guard counterparts to develop and implement an appropriate means of sharing the EPA contractors' response cost documentation designated as confidential business information.</p>
3	<p><b>The EPA Should Clarify and Strengthen Its Waste Management Oversight Role With Respect to Oil Spills of National Significance</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To evaluate the effectiveness of the EPA's oversight of BP America Production Company's waste management plans and activities during the Gulf Coast oil spill, and to determine whether plans and activities for tracking and transporting oil-contaminated waste effectively provided a full accounting of the volume and disposition of the waste.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110926-11-P-0706.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110926-11-P-0706.pdf</a></p>	<p>As a support agency to the Coast Guard, the EPA had a key role in reviewing and approving BP's waste management plans and activities. The EPA conducted assessments of landfills to ensure that waste could be safely disposed. The agency independently sampled waste and kept the public informed about its oversight activities and results. The Gulf Coast oil spill was the first to be designated a "Spill of National Significance."</p> <p>At the time of the spill, the EPA did not have adequate waste management guidance for a spill of this</p>	<p>In response to this spill, work with other federal partners to determine whether the National Contingency Plan and National Response Framework for waste management oversight and roles should be updated.</p> <p>Complete waste management guidance in Area Contingency Plans, and develop a model waste management plan.</p> <p>To the extent needed, seek additional authorities to perform waste management oversight in offshore Spills of National</p>



## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>magnitude. In part, this was due to limitations in the oil spill response regulations, which do not specifically address Spills of National Significance, as well as incomplete response plans. The EPA fell short of its own goals for waste management oversight and did not conduct oversight for all states and facilities that received waste. In addition, the EPA's lack of planning and transparency on its decision to manage the oil spill waste in a manner different than provided by guidance resulted in staff confusion, frustration, and inefficiency.</p>	<p>Significance.</p> <p>Update the 2002 guidance on the oil and gas exploration and production waste exemption.</p>
3	<p><b>EPA Progress on the 2007 Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To evaluate the effectiveness of the EPA's methamphetamine laboratory, or meth lab, cleanup guidelines, and the status of the EPA's required activities under the 2007 Methamphetamine Remediation Research Act (Meth Act).</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110927-11-P-0708.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110927-11-P-0708.pdf</a></p>	<p>The EPA has met some, but not all, of its requirements under the Meth Act. While the EPA did publish an initial set of guidelines, <i>Voluntary Guidelines for Methamphetamine Laboratory Cleanup</i>, in August 2009, it has not yet developed plans to periodically update the guidelines as required. The EPA developed a draft multiyear research plan but has delayed its implementation. The EPA also has no plans to convene the technology transfer conference within the required timeframe. Finally, although the EPA satisfied the requirement to conduct a study of residual effects by performing a literature review of the health impacts of chemicals remaining in meth labs, it</p>	<p>The Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste should determine the agency's ability to implement the Meth Act requirements and communicate its plan to Congress.</p> <p>The Associate Administrator for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations and the Associate Administrator for Policy should update several areas of the voluntary guidelines and develop internal controls to ensure that legislative requirements are identified, tracked and met.</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>did not transmit the required report to Congress.</p> <p>The EPA has no controls in place to track legislative requirements agency-wide. The EPA relies on its program offices to do so, but these program offices also do not have controls in place to track all legislative requirements.</p>	
3	<p><b>Effectiveness Assessment of the R4 Superfund Alternative Approach</b> /Industrial Economics, Inc., funded through the EPA’s program evaluation competition/To explore the extent to which the SA approach is achieving the same outcomes as the traditional NPL process, the extent to which the SA approach is reducing site costs and speeding remediation, and finally, to update information about community and principal responsible party experiences with the approach.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/evaluate/pdf/SA_evaluation_report.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/evaluate/pdf/SA_evaluation_report.pdf</a>, November 2010, EPA-100-R-10-007</p>	<p>The EPA, principal responsible parties and community interviewees stressed that the SA approach generally mirrors the NPL process for most of the EPA’s activities. Consistent with this input, CERCLIS and IFMS data reveal that the SA approach does not appear to result in significant cost or time savings for the EPA, though some preliminary data suggest that certain negotiations proceed more quickly at some sites using the SA approach, and cost data are incomplete. While identified remedies suggest that NPL sites employ more contaminant removal remedies, anticipated future-use patterns for NPL and SA approach sites are similar. Interviews with the EPA staff suggest that sites using the SA approach may have a higher potential for redevelopment than comparable NPL sites if avoided “stigma” increases financing options and willingness to redevelop.</p>	<p>Investigate the role that “stigma” may play in the effectiveness of site remediation programs and continue to improve tracking of community involvement activities to document successes and challenges in remediation programs.</p> <p>Update and expand the analysis of SA approach effectiveness as sites using the SA approach achieve construction completion and reuse.</p> <p>Update and expand the analysis of SA approach efficiency as sites using the SA approach achieve construction completion.</p> <p>Examine the potential for the SA approach to be used as a method to efficiently address multiple sites.</p> <p>Investigate</p>

**FY 2011 Annual Performance Report  
Program Evaluations**

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
			<p>opportunities to integrate the SA approach (where appropriate) in other regions, using the Region 4 management approach as a template, and also normalize accounting for the SA approach site progress to reflect similarity with NPL site activities.</p>
3	<p><b>The EPA Promoted the Use of Coal Ash Products With Incomplete Risk Information, and Website for Coal Combustion Products Partnership Conflicts with Agency Policies</b> /EPA, Office of Inspector General/ To evaluate whether the EPA followed standard practices in determining that coal combustion residuals (CCRs) are safe for the beneficial uses the EPA has promoted.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110323-11-P-0173.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110323-11-P-0173.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101013-11-P-0002.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101013-11-P-0002.pdf</a></p>	<p>The EPA did not follow accepted and standard practices in determining the safety of the 15 categories of CCR beneficial uses it promoted through the Coal Combustion Products Partnership program. The EPA's application of risk assessment, risk screening, and leachate testing and modeling was significantly limited in scope and applicability. Without proper protections, CCR contaminants can leach into ground water and migrate to drinking water sources, posing significant public health concerns.</p>	<p>Define and implement risk evaluation practices for beneficial uses of CCRs, and determine if further action is warranted to address historical use of CCR for structural fill.</p> <p>Remove the Coal Combustion Products Partnership Website during the rulemaking process. The EPA should identify why actions prohibited by the EPA policies occurred and implement controls to establish accountability.</p>
		<p>The EPA's Coal Combustion Products Partnership Website presents an incomplete picture regarding actual damage and potential risks that can result from large-scale placement of CCRs. According to the EPA's proposed rule, unencapsulated use of CCRs may result in environmental contamination, such as</p>	

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>leaching of heavy metals into drinking water sources.</p> <p>The Website also contained material that gave the appearance that the EPA endorses commercial products, which is prohibited by the EPA's ethics policies and communications guidelines. OIG identified 23 case studies on the Website that were marked with the EPA's official logo but none had the required disclaimer stating that the EPA does not endorse the commercial products.</p>	
3	<p><b>The EPA Has Not Fully Implemented a National Emergency Response Equipment Tracking System/</b> EPA, Office of Inspector General/To determine the extent to which the EPA implemented the Emergency Management Portal (EMP) equipment tracking software, what efforts the EPA has made to assess functionality and cost effectiveness, and how the EMP equipment module compared to the previous interim system.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110913-11-P-0616.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110913-11-P-0616.pdf</a></p>	<p>The EPA has not fully implemented an EMP emergency equipment tracking module, and the module suffers from operational issues. OIG's review found that: 1) The EPA does not fully use the EMP equipment tracking module because no agency office with overall authority has mandated its use, 2) The EPA has made no formal effort to assess functionality and cost effectiveness due to its decision to perform such assessments only after fully implementing the EMP equipment module, and 3) The EMP equipment module is cumbersome and slow, and may not be the most efficient and effective emergency equipment tracking alternative.</p>	<p>Ensure that only essential equipment tracking data are required to be recorded and determine whether the EMP equipment module is the most cost-efficient alternative. The OIG also recommend that the EPA Deputy Administrator mandate that regions and emergency response teams employ the national tracking system that the EPA decides to use for emergency response equipment.</p>
4	<p><b>The EPA's Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program Should Establish Management Controls</b></p>	<p>Fourteen years after passage of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 and</p>	<p>The EPA should: 1) Define and identify the universe of</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
	<p><b>to Ensure More Timely Results</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To determine whether the EPA's Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program has planned and conducted the requisite research and testing to evaluate and regulate endocrine disrupting chemicals.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110503-11-P-0215.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110503-11-P-0215.pdf</a></p>	<p>Safe Drinking Water Act amendments, the EPA's EDSP has not determined whether any chemical is a potential endocrine disruptor. The program has not developed a management plan laying out the program's goals and priorities, or established outcome performance measures to track program results. The EDSP missed milestones for assay validation and chemical selection established by the 2001 Natural Resources Defense Council settlement agreement. It has not created a final statement of policy, finalized specific procedures to evaluate Tier 1 screening results, or established specific procedures to evaluate Tier 2 testing results.</p>	<p>chemicals for screening and testing to establish the scope of the program</p> <p>2) Develop and publish a standardized methodology for objectively prioritizing the universe of chemicals for screening and testing, including elements recommended by the federal advisory committees, such as use of effects and exposure data, as well as public nominations.</p> <p>3) Finalize specific criteria for evaluating the Tier 1 screening data received and establish specific criteria for evaluating Tier 2/hazard assessment testing data received.</p> <p>4) Develop short-term, intermediate and long-term outcome performance measures, and additional output performance measures, with appropriate targets and timeframes, to measure the progress and results of the program.</p> <p>5) Develop and publish a comprehensive management plan for EDSP, including estimates of EDSP's budget requirements, priorities, goals, and key activities covering at least a five-year period.</p> <p>Annually review the EDSP program results, progress toward milestones, and achievement of</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
			performance measures, including explanations for any missed milestones or targets.
4	<p><b>Revisions Needed to National Contingency Plan Based on Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To determine what steps the EPA took to analyze Corexit, an oil dispersant, for inclusion on the National Contingency Plan Product Schedule, and to determine the EPA's role in the decision to use Corexit over other dispersants in the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110825-11-P-0534.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110825-11-P-0534.pdf</a></p>	<p>The EPA and the manufacturer of Corexit completed required steps to include Corexit products on the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, also known as the National Contingency Plan Product Schedule. However, the EPA has not updated the NCP since 1994, including changing in Subpart J the efficacy testing protocol to the more reproducible Baffled Flank test. If the EPA had updated Subpart J before the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, more reliable efficacy data might have been available during the spill.</p>	<p>Establish policies to review and update contingency plans incorporating lessons learned during the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, and clarify roles and responsibilities for Spills of National Significance.</p> <p>Revise Subpart J to incorporate the most appropriate efficacy testing protocol and capture dispersant information.</p> <p>Develop a research plan on long-term health and environmental effects of dispersants.</p>
4	<p><b>An Overall Strategy Can Improve Communication Efforts at Asbestos Superfund Site in Libby, Montana</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To investigate the EPA's efforts to communicate the risks and information of asbestos exposure in Libby, Montana.</p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110803-11-P-0430.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110803-11-P-0430.pdf</a></p>	<p>Region 8 does not have an overall communication strategy to guide, coordinate and evaluate its communication efforts at the Libby Asbestos Superfund Site. Despite extensive communication efforts that exceed minimum Superfund requirements, Region 8 has not fully satisfied community concerns about health risk or effectively communicated the limitations of its risk assessment. Recurring questions may signify that Region 8 needs to address them more clearly.</p>	<p>Ensure that Libby outreach products are readable for a general audience.</p> <p>Revise the Libby community engagement plan to serve as the overall communication strategy by adding key messages to address specific public concerns and site activities, timelines for community involvement activities and outreach products, measures for successful communication, and mechanisms for</p>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
			<p>identifying community concerns and collecting feedback.</p> <p>Implement a process for ongoing evaluation of the EPA's Region 8 communication efforts.</p>
4	<p><b>The EPA's Voluntary Chemical Evaluation Program Did Not Achieve Children's Health Protection Goals/EPA, Office of Inspector General/The objective of this evaluation was to determine the outcomes of the EPA's Voluntary Children's Chemical Evaluation Program, whether the program achieved its goals, and if there are alternative mechanisms for achieving children's health protection goals from chemical exposures.</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110721-11-P-0379.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110721-11-P-0379.pdf</a></p>	<p>The VCCEP pilot did not achieve its goal to design a process to assess and report on the safety of chemicals to children. Specifically, the pilot had a flawed chemical selection process and lacked an effective communication strategy. Programmatic effectiveness was hampered by industry partners who chose not to voluntarily collect and submit information, and the EPA's decision not to exercise its regulatory authorities under the Toxic Substances Control Act to compel data collection. The EPA has not demonstrated that it can achieve children's health goals with a voluntary program.</p>	<p>Design and implement a new process to assess the safety of chemicals to children that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Identifies the chemicals with highest potential risk to children.</li> <li>2) Applies the Toxic Substances Control Act regulatory authorities as appropriate for data collection.</li> <li>3) Interprets results and disseminates information to the public.</li> <li>4) Includes outcome measures that assure valid and timely results.</li> </ol>
4	<p><b>The EPA Needs to Assure the Effectiveness of Antimicrobial Pesticide Information/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To determine whether the EPA systems ensure that registered antimicrobial products are effective or whether appropriate corrective actions are taken when products are found to be ineffective.</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101215-11-P-0029.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101215-11-P-0029.pdf</a></p>	<p>The Antimicrobial Testing Program design and implementation cannot provide assurance to the public that the product label claims are valid. ATP has been testing to ensure antimicrobial products, including hospital disinfectants and tuberculocides, meet stringent efficacy standards.</p>	<p>Initiate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A testing program to provide reasonable assurance of the efficacy of currently registered tuberculocides and hospital-level disinfectants by the end of 2011. Subsequently registered products should be subject to</li> </ol>

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
		<p>However, after nearly 19 years, over 40 percent of registered products have not been tested. Those that have been tested have experienced a consistently high failure rate. During our review, the EPA was requesting test sample submissions from manufacturers using a voluntary process known as the ATP “direct shipment” initiative, adopted in December 2008. However, the process is considered insufficient for enforcement actions.</p>	<p>same program.</p> <p>2) An efficient sampling protocol that enables regulatory and enforcement actions as appropriate.</p> <p>3) Consistent implementation, communication, and follow-up of enforcement actions by the EPA regions.</p> <p>4) A testing program to provide reasonable assurance of the efficacy of registered sanitizers.</p>
ESP	<p><b>The EPA Needs to Reexamine How It Defines Its Payment Recapture Audit/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To review the EPA’s payment recapture audit plan, as required by The Office of Management and Budget’s memorandum, “<i>Increasing Efforts to Recapture Improper Payments by Intensifying and Expanding Payment Recapture Audits</i>, November 16, 2010,” and provide feedback to the agency.</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110719-11-P-0362.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110719-11-P-0362.pdf</a></p>	<p>In its January 2011 submission to OMB, the EPA stated that it did not have a formal payment recapture audit program. However, based on the OMB guidance issued in April 2011 and information the EPA had previously submitted to OMB, OIG determined that many of the recovery activities the EPA already conducts meet the definition of a payment recapture audit program.</p>	<p>The EPA’s Chief Financial Officer should report the results of all activities, including audits that the OIG and other audit organizations conduct, when reporting on its payment recapture audit program in 2011.</p>
ESP	<p><b>Improvements Needed in the EPA’s Network Traffic Management Practices/ EPA, Office of Inspector General/To evaluate whether the EPA is effectively managing its resources by implementing a management control structure to monitor internal and external computer network traffic.</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/</a></p>	<p>The Office of Environmental Information does not have consistent, repeatable intrusion detection system monitoring practices in place, which inhibits the EPA’s ability to monitor unusual network activity and thus protect agency systems and associated data. OEI also</p>	<p>OEI should develop and implement comprehensive log review policies and procedures, establish a management control process to review contractor performance, update and approve the Wide Area Network (WAN) security plan,</p>



## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
	<a href="#">20110314-11-P-0159_glace.pdf</a>	<p>has not documented a methodology to aid in making decisions about potentially unusual network traffic. The Federal Information Security Management Act requires each agency head to provide information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of agency information systems. Agency network security program deficiencies greatly decrease the likelihood that potential threats will be identified.</p>	<p>and properly certify and accredit future significant WAN configuration changes prior to moving them into production.</p>
ESP	<p><b>The EPA Should Improve Timeliness for Resolving Audits Under Appeal</b>/EPA, Office of Inspector General/To evaluate how efficiently and timely the EPA resolves audits under appeal.  <a href="http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110921-11-P-0687.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20110921-11-P-0687.pdf</a></p>	<p>The EPA’s Regions 2 and 5 have more than \$55 million in disputed claims in audits under appeal. Problems include: inadequate communication between audit follow-up coordinators and the EPA personnel responsible for resolving audits under appeal, which results in inaccurate information in the Management Audit Tracking System and incomplete, inconsistent or irrelevant policies and procedures for audits under appeal. There are policies for the timely resolution of audits under appeal, but as of September 2010, 17 of 30 audits under appeal had been in resolution for 10 to 21 years.</p>	<p>The Chief Financial Officer should revise the EPA Manual 2750 to include a communication strategy for keeping records current in MATS: establish a finite number of reconsideration requests, and provide for consistency among policies for resolving audits under appeal. The Assistant Administrator for Administration and Resources Management should reference revisions to the EPA Manual 2750 in the Office of Administration and Resources Management’s in-process revision to the agency’s <i>Assistance Administration Manual</i>.</p>
ESP	“ENVIRONMENTAL	This GAO ‘systems	GAO recommends seven

## FY 2011 Annual Performance Report Program Evaluations

Goal	Evaluation Title/Evaluator/Scope	Findings	Recommendations
	<p><b>PROTECTION AGENCY: To Better Fulfill Its Mission, EPA Needs a More Coordinated Approach to Managing its Laboratories</b>"/U.S. Government Accountability Office/To evaluate the ability of the EPA's laboratory enterprise to meet the Agency's mission and current and future program needs?</p> <p><a href="http://www.gao.gov">www.gao.gov</a> Report Number GAO-11-347 (July 2011)</p>	<p><i>evaluation</i>' concluded:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The EPA laboratories have an essential role within the Agency which is virtually unique in the federal government, and</li> <li>2) The EPA has not been able to implement fully many recommendations from independent expert evaluations of its laboratories that the Agency has sponsored during the past twenty years</li> </ol>	<p>actions to improve cohesion in the management and operation of the EPA's laboratories. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Develop an overarching issue-based planning process linking laboratory science activities to Agency goals and priorities</li> <li>2) Establish a top science official with the authority over all the EPA laboratories and major science activities</li> <li>3) Manage individual laboratory facilities as an integrated portfolio</li> <li>4) Ensure that master plans for the EPA laboratory facilities are up-to-date</li> <li>5) Improve the reliability of operating-cost data for the EPA facilities</li> <li>6) Develop a comprehensive workforce planning process for the EPA laboratories</li> <li>7) Include alternate approaches in the NAS study for organizing the laboratories' workforce and infrastructure</li> </ol>