Appendix B
Data Quality for Assessments of FY 2004 Performance Measures

GOAL 1 — CLEAN AIR AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Total number of people who live in areas designated in attainment of the clean air standards for 1-hr ozone, PM_{10}, CO, SO_2, NO_2, and Pb. - Additional people living in newly designated areas with demonstrated attainment of the 1-hr ozone, PM_{10}, CO, SO_2, NO_2, and Pb standards. - Cumulative percent increase in the number of people who live in areas with ambient 1-hour ozone, PM_{10}, CO, SO_2, NO_2, and Pb concentrations below the level of the NAAQS as compared to 1992. - Cumulative percent increase in the number of areas with ambient 1-hour ozone, PM_{10}, CO, SO_2, NO_2, and Pb concentrations below the level of the NAAQS as compared to 1992. - Areas designated to attainment for the ozone, PM_{10}, CO, SO_2, NO_2, and Pb standards. - Cumulative percent increase in the number of people who live in areas with ambient 8-hour ozone, and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations below the level of the NAAQS as compared to 2001. - Cumulative percent increase in the number of areas with ambient 8-hour ozone, and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations below the level of the NAAQS as compared to 2001. - Percent of areas with improving ambient PM_{10} concentrations.

[PM = particulate matter, PM_{10} = particulate matter 10 micrometers or less in diameter, $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter 2.5 micrometers or less in diameter, CO = carbon monoxide, SO_2 = sulfur dioxide, NO_2 = nitrogen dioxide, Pb = lead.]

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, pages 32-34, 36, 40.

DATABASE: The Air Quality Subsystem (AQS), which stores ambient air quality data used to evaluate an area's air quality levels relative to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The Findings and Required Elements Data System (FREDS) is used to track the progress of states and regions in reviewing and approving the required data elements of the State Implementation Plans (SIPs). SIPs are clean air plans and define what actions a state will take to improve the air quality in areas that do not meet the NAAQS.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data will not be available until August 2005 for the criteria pollutants (ozone, PM_{10}, CO, SO_2, NO_x, and lead). However, EPA designated attainment status for the 8-hour ozone in April 2004, which establishes the baseline to monitor progress. We will have performance data for 8-hour ozone in the summer of 2005 (the latest air quality monitoring data from 2001 through 2003) and the period of performance is based on a calendar year. We will also designate the attainment status for $PM_{2.5}$ areas in December 2004. Data are reliable and usable by the Agency in carrying out its decision-making responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page I-47 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: EPA enhanced the AQS to include data standards (e.g., latitude/longitude, chemical nomenclature) developed under the Agency's Reinventing Environmental Information (REI) Initiative. Also, EPA has completed reengineering the AQS to make it a more user friendly, Windows-based system. As a result, air quality data will be more easily accessible via the Internet.

Combined stationary and mobile source reduction in air toxics emissions. - Stationary source air toxics emissions reduced. - Mobile source air toxics emissions reduced. - Area and all other Air Toxics Emissions Reduced.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 39-40.

DATABASES: National Toxics Inventory (NTI) and National Emissions Inventory (NEI) for Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPS).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are incomplete and will be available as follows: data for FY 2000 and FY 2001 available in 2nd quarter of FY 2005, data for FY 2002 available in 1st quarter of FY 2006, and data for FY 2003 and FY 2004 available in latter part of FY 2006. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page I-66 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: In 2004 for the first time, all primary data submitters and reviewers were required to submit their data and revisions to EPA in a standardized format using the Agency's Central Data Exchange (CDX). For more information on CDX, please see the Agency's web site: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/nif/cdx.html.

Volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions reduced from mobile sources. - Nitrous oxides (NOx) reduced from mobile sources. - CO reduced from mobile sources. - PM_{10} reduced from mobile sources. - $PM_{2.5}$ reduced from mobile sources.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 41.

DATABASE: National Emissions Inventory Database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete and available for MOBILE6 and NONROAD models. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page I-47 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: EPA is currently working on a new modeling system termed the Multi-scale Motor Vehicles and Equipment Emission System (MOVES). This system will estimate emissions for on-road and off-road sources, cover a broad range of pollutants, and allow multiple-scale analysis from fine-scale analysis to national inventory estimation. The new system will encompass the necessary tools, algorithms, underlying data, and guidance necessary for use in all official analyses associated with regulatory development, compliance with statutory requirements, and national/regional inventory projections. Once fully implemented, MOVES will serve as the replacement for MOBILE6 and NONROAD analytical models. MOBILE6 is an analytical model used to estimate emissions for on-road sources (cars, trucks, and motorcycles). NONROAD is an analytical model used to estimate emissions from non-road sources (construction, agricultural, and industrial diesel-powered equipment).

Percent of tribes with tribal land monitoring for ozone and/or PM. - Percent of monitoring tribes monitoring clean air for ozone. - Percent of monitoring tribes monitoring clean air for PM. - Number of tribes implementing air programs.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 39.

DATABASE: Tribal monitoring database maintained by EPA headquarters in Washington, DC.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page I-49 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: EPA continued to work with tribal governments to increase monitoring in Indian Country to ensure that data exist to adequately characterize air quality in Indian Country, and to identify, prevent, and address violations of the national ambient air quality standards.

SO_2 emissions (reduced). - Total annual average sulfur deposition and mean ambient sulfate concentrations reduced. - Total annual average nitrogen deposition and mean ambient nitrate concentrations reduced.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 38.

DATABASES: Acid Rain Emissions Tracking System (SO_2 emissions reduced); Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNet) (dry deposition and ambient sulfate and nitrate concentrations); National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP) (wet deposition). See "Data and Maps" at http://www.epa.gov/airmarkets for a description of deposition monitoring network databases.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data will not be available until July 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page I-76 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: EPA is investigating ways to modernize aging CASTNet equipment; streamline site operation, data collection, and processing methods; reduce system operating costs; and provide a foundation for multipollutant measurement compatible with other networks.

NO_x emissions (reduced).

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 41.

DATABASE: Emissions Tracking System (for acid rain and NO_x budget programs).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page I-76 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: No tangible improvements were made during FY 2004. However, the Title IV Acid Rain NO_x reduction goal was satisfied in 2000, and reduction was maintained in 2001, 2002, and 2003. The annual performance measure has been replaced with two new performance measures developed under Office of Management and Budget (OMB) review of the acid rain program.

People living in healthier indoor air.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 42.

DATABASE: This performance measure is comprised of individual internal measures for radon, environmental tobacco smoke, and asthma. An external survey was produced by the National Association of Home Builders Research Center and reviewed by EPA to estimate the percentage of homes that are built radon resistant. Manufacturers report their radon fan sales to the Agency. EPA assumes one fan per radon-mitigated home and then multiplies it by the assumed average of 2.67 people per household. An EPA-developed telephone survey (National Survey on Environmental Management of Asthma) seeks information about the measures taken to minimize exposure to indoor environmental asthma triggers and how many people permit smoking in their home.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data will not be available until FY 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, pages IV-71 through IV-76 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: No tangible improvements were made during FY 2004.

Students/staff experiencing improved indoor air quality in schools.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 42.

DATABASE: EPA-developed survey. Results are tracked in an internal database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data will not be available until FY 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page IV-76 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: No tangible improvements were made in FY 2004.

Domestic consumption of class II hydrochlorofluorocarbons. - Domestic-exempted production and import of newly produced Class I chlorofluorocarbons and halons.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 43.

DATABASE: Clean Air Act (CAA) Title VI Stratospheric Ozone Tracking Database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: There will be a data lag for the actual results for this performance measure. Data will be available in 2005. Progress on restricting domestic-exempted consumption of Class I CFCs and halons is tracked by monitoring industry reports of compliance with EPA's CAA phase out regulations and U.S. obligations under the Montreal Protocol. Data are provided quarterly by U.S. companies producing, importing, and exporting ozone-depleting substances. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page VI-63 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: No tangible improvements made during FY 2004.

Number of 55-gallon drums of radioactive waste disposed of according to EPA standards.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 44.

DATABASE: The performance data used by EPA are collected and maintained by the Department of Energy (DOE). EPA ensures the safe characterization and disposal of drums of transuranic waste.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page V-94 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: No tangible improvements made during FY 2004.

Purchase and deploy state-of-the-art monitoring units.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 44.

DATABASE: Output measure; internal performance tracking database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page V-64 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: Data system will go on-line in 2007.

Annual greenhouse gas reductions - all EPA programs. - Reductions from EPA's buildings sector programs (Energy Star). - Greenhouse gas reductions from EPA's industrial efficiency/waste management programs. - Greenhouse gas reductions from EPA's industrial methane outreach programs. - Greenhouse gas reductions from EPA's industrial HFC/PFC programs. - Greenhouse gas reductions from EPA's transportation programs. - Greenhouse gas reductions from EPA's state and local programs.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 45-46.

DATABASE: EPA maintains a "tracking system" for emission reductions relative to appropriate baselines. Baseline data for carbon emissions related to energy use come from DOE's Energy Information Administration. Baseline data for non-carbon dioxide emissions,

including nitrous oxide and other global warming potential gases, are maintained by EPA and are compiled with input from industry and also independently from partners' information. EPA develops methane emission baselines and reductions using information from industry partners, including the natural gas, coal, and landfill gas development industries. EPA continues to develop annual inventories as well as update methodologies as new information becomes available.

Many of EPA's voluntary programs collect partners' reports on facility-specific improvements (e.g., number of projects implemented, quantity of methane saved). A carbon-conversion factor is used to convert this information to estimated greenhouse gas reductions. For other programs, EPA has developed peer-reviewed methodologies for estimating impacts on greenhouse gas reductions.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Performance data lag by approximately 9 months. Results will be reported in the FY 2005 Annual Performance Report. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: EPA devotes considerable effort to obtaining the best possible information on which to evaluate emission reductions from voluntary programs. For example, EPA has a quality assurance process in place to check the validity of partner reports.

Peer-reviewed carbon-conversion factors are used to ensure consistency with generally accepted measures of greenhouse gas emissions. The Administration regularly evaluates the effectiveness of its climate programs through interagency evaluations. The second such interagency evaluation, led by the White House Council on Environmental Quality, examined the status of U.S. climate change programs. The review included participants from EPA and the Departments of State, Energy, Commerce, Transportation, and Agriculture. The results were published in the U.S. Climate Action Report–2002 as part of the United States' submission to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC). The previous evaluation had been published in U.S. Climate Action Report–1997. A 1997 audit by EPA's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) concluded that the climate programs examined "used good management practices and effectively estimated the impact their activities had on reducing risks to health and the environment."

For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page VI-52 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: EPA continues to update inventories and methodologies as new information becomes available.

Annual energy savings - all EPA programs.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 46.

DATABASE: Climate Protection Partnerships Division Tracking System.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data collected by EPA's voluntary programs include national market data on shipments of efficient products, and engineering measurements of equipment power levels and usage patterns. Performance data lag by approximately 9 months and are not currently available. Data will be reported in the FY 2005 Annual Performance Report. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: EPA devotes considerable effort to obtaining the best possible information on which to evaluate energy savings from its voluntary programs. For example, EPA has a quality assurance process in place to check the validity of partner reports, and peer-reviewed methodologies are used to calculate energy savings from these programs.

The Administration regularly evaluates the effectiveness of its climate programs through interagency evaluations. The second such interagency evaluation, led by the White House Council on Environmental Quality, examined the status of U.S. climate change programs. The review included participants from EPA and the Departments of State, Energy, Commerce, Transportation, and Agriculture. The results were published in U.S. Climate Action Report–2002 as part of the United States' submission to the FCCC. The previous evaluation had been published in U.S. Climate Action Report–1997. A 1997 audit by EPA's OIG concluded that the climate programs examined "used good management practices and effectively estimated the impact their activities had on reducing risks to health and the environment."

For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page VI-53 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: EPA continues to update inventories and methodologies as new information becomes available.

Fuel Economy of typical SUV with EPA-developed hybrid technology over EPA driving cycles tested.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 47.

DATABASE: EPA fuel economy tests performed at the EPA's National Vehicle and Fuel Emissions Laboratory (NVFEL) in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Results are maintained in an internal EPA database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. NVFEL is recognized as a national and international facility for fuel economy and emissions testing. NVFEL is also the reference point for private industry. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, verification & validation, page VI-55 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: EPA is using solid engineering judgment and consultations with other expert organizations (including major auto companies) to develop internal procedures for testing hybrid vehicles.

Report on the chronic respiratory health effects in children of intra-urban gradients of particulate matter and co-pollutants in El Paso, TX. - Report on epidemiologic studies examining acute cardiac and respiratory effects in the elderly and children exposed to particulate matter (PM) and co-pollutants.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 1, page 47.

DATABASE: No internal database; program output. Therefore other data elements are not applicable.

GOAL 2 — CLEAN AND SAFE WATER

Number of community water systems (CWSs) and percent of population served by those CWSs that are implementing source water protection programs.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, pages 54-55.

DATABASE: The Source Water Assessment Program (SWAP) identifies at the state level the risk of contamination to drinking water supplies. The assessment-reporting database currently tracks five parameters:

- the number of source water assessments completed within a state;
- the most prevalent sources of contamination identified within a state;
- the most threatening sources of contamination identified within a state;
- a (high-medium-low) ranking of overall risk to the sources of drinking water within a state; and
- the number of source water areas that have source water protection strategies in place.

EPA currently holds these data for all states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico in an Excel spreadsheet. Beginning in 2004, states with approved programs will begin using a Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS)-based source protection module to submit all assessment and contamination prevention data to the Agency.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are incomplete and will be available in January 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages II-38 through II-40 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: In FY2004, EPA conducted a 1-year pilot to assess the potential for collecting electronic submissions of states implementation of source water protection programs. Data results from the pilot are currently unavailable. Efforts also are currently underway to facilitate the adoption of a Geographical Information System (GIS) database for all source water areas. This GIS effort as well as the electronic data collection through the SDWIS will provide solid information on states' source water protection efforts.

Population served by community water systems will receive drinking water meeting health-based standards promulgated in 1998. - Population served by community water systems will be receiving drinking water meeting all health-based standards, up from 83% in 1994.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, page 55.

DATABASE: SDWIS or SDWIS-FED, which is a data warehouse system.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages II-32 through II-38 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: EPA continued to work with the states to implement the Data Reliability Action Plan (DRAP) and Information Strategic Plan (ISP), which are improving the completeness, accuracy, timeliness, and consistency of the data in SDWIS-FED.

More states are using SDWIS-STATE, a software information system jointly designed by the states and EPA, to support states as they implement the drinking water program. SDWIS-STATE links directly to SDWIS-FED, which aids in easing the states' reporting burden to EPA, and in the process minimizes data conversion errors and improves data quality and accuracy.

EPA is modifying SDWIS-FED to:

- streamline its table structure, which simplifies updates and retrievals;
- minimize data entry options that result in complex software and prevent meaningful edit criteria;
- enforce compliance with permitted values and Agency data standards through software edits;
- ease the flow of data to EPA through a secure data exchange environment incorporating modern technologies, all of which will improve the accuracy of the data.

EPA has developed SDWIS, which is optimized for analyzing, retrieving, and integrating data from other sources, such as information from data verifications, sample data, source water quality data, and indicators from inspections conducted at the water systems. This system will improve EPA's ability to more efficiently use information to support decision-making and effectively manage the drinking water program.

EPA, in partnership with the states, has developed SDWIS-linked modules on other drinking water programs: the Source Water Protection Program, the Underground Injection Control Program (UIC), and the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. These modules provide a more comprehensive data set with which to assess the nation's drinking water supplies, a key component of the goal. Additionally, EPA has worked with the states to develop an action plan to address data completeness and data timeliness. This plan includes data verification audits of state drinking water tracking processes.

Lake acres assessed for the need for fish advisories and compilation of state-issued fish consumption advisory methodologies. - River miles assessed for the need for fish consumption advisories and compilation of state-issued fish consumption advisory methodologies. (Both cumulative)

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, pages 55-56.

DATABASE: National Listing of Fish Advisories.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, pages II-40 through II-41 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: EPA is using grants to help states assess additional waters for the need for advisories and to help states reevaluate some waters to determine whether environmental conditions have improved. This support could increase the absolute number of water bodies assessed and would lead to a more accurate and complete characterization of the safety of fish in the nation's rivers, lakes, and streams.

Cumulative number of beaches for which monitoring and closure data is available to the public at http://www.epa.gov/waterscience/beaches/.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, page 56.

DATABASE: PRAWN (PRogram tracking, beach Advisories, Water quality standards, and Nutrients), a new internal database that feeds into the National Health Protection Survey of Beaches Information Management System.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see both the FY 2004 Annual Performance Plan, pages II-18 and II-19, and the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, pages II-41 and II-42 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: With the passage of the BEACH Act of 2000, the Agency is authorized to award grants to states to develop and implement monitoring and notification programs consistent with federal requirements. As the Agency awards these implementation grants, it will require standard program procedures, sampling and assessment methods, and data elements for reporting. It is anticipated that continued EPA support will enable the states to increase the quantity of available beach data and improve the quality of the data.

Percent of the population and the number of community water systems serving more than 50,000 but less than 100,000 people have certified the completion of their vulnerability assessment and submitted a copy to EPA. - Percent of the population and the number of community water systems serving more than 50,000 but less than 100,000 people have certified the completion of their emergency response plan. - Percent of population and number of community water systems serving more than 3,300 but less than 50,000 people have certified the completion of their vulnerability assessment and submitted a copy to EPA.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, page 57.

DATABASE: In consultation with the states, EPA developed an Excel spreadsheet that listed all large, medium, and small systems subject to the requirements of the Bioterrorism Act of 2002. This list served as the database for tracking submissions of Vulnerability Assessments (VAs) and the certification of Emergency Response Plans to EPA from water utilities. EPA will not track these measures in FY 2005.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: The VAs are due to EPA in three phases, with the first phase due at the beginning of the summer of 2004. The last phase of the VAs for small systems is due December 31, 2004. For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification page II-30 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: The submittal of these VAs and certification of the completion of emergency response plans to EPA is a one-time event, as required by the Bioterrorism Act. The Act also defines large, medium, and small drinking water systems differently from the definition in the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Clean Water State Revolving Fund projects that have initiated operations.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, page 58.

DATABASE: Clean Water State Revolving Fund National Information Management System.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, pages II-91 through II-92 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: In FY 2004, EPA headquarters and regional offices conducted a quality review of data submitted by the states.

States with new or revised water quality standards that EPA has reviewed and approved or disapproved and promulgated federal replacement standards. - Tribes with water quality standards adopted and approved.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, pages 58-59.

DATABASE: EPA maintains files on all approval/disapproval actions on new and revised state water quality standards and on promulgated federal replacement standards. EPA also maintains files on all tribal water quality standards actions.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, pages II-65 through II-67 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: In 2004, EPA developed an electronic tracking system for state Water Quality Standard submissions that will track the incoming packages and allow EPA to accurately measure progress in improving processing times.

By 2005, water quality will improve on a watershed basis, such that 500 of the nation's 2,262 watersheds will have greater than 80% of assessed waters meeting all water quality standards.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, page 59.

DATABASE: Watershed Assessment Tracking Environmental Results System (WATERS).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page II-67 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: The Office of Water is working with partners to enhance monitoring networks and assessment tools to achieve comprehensive coverage of all waters; use a consistent suite of core water quality indicators (supplemented with additional indicators for specific water quality questions); and document key data elements, decision criteria, and assessment methodologies in electronic data systems.

EPA is working with the states to enhance their monitoring and assessment programs, with a particular emphasis on the probabilistic approach that uses a statistical sample to generate a cost-effective assessment of the condition of all waters, and other predictive tools that help states prioritize areas needing more intensive or site-specific monitoring. EPA is also working with state and other partners to increase the use of electronic data systems, such as STORET and the Assessment Database (ADB), for maintenance and submission of data and information of documented quality. These enhancements, along with improving the quality and timeliness of data for making watershed-based decisions, will greatly improve EPA's ability to use state assessments in consistently portraying national conditions and trends.

Major point sources are covered by current permits. - Minor point sources are covered by current permits.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, page 60.

DATABASE: U.S. EPA Permit Compliance System (Washington, DC, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance) and Permit Issuance Forecasting Tool (Washington, DC, Office of Water).

The Permit Compliance System (PCS) is used to determine which individual permits are current through date fields for permit issuance and expiration. EPA has carried out detailed permit renewal backlog tracking with PCS data since November 1998. To supplement the individual permit data from PCS, EPA uses the Permit Issuance Forecasting Tool (PIFT) to track the current or expired status of facilities covered under non-stormwater general permits. The PIFT has been used to track non-stormwater general permit facilities since January 2001.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification pages II-86 through II-88 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS:

- PCS: EPA continued to improve the quality of the data in PCS, while simultaneously working to design the new Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS) data system.
- Legacy PCS: EPA continues to modify the existing PCS system to improve the quality and utility of the data. Data being added include state data, locational data for combined sewer overflows (CSOs) based on the database used to develop the CSO/Storm Sewer (storm sewer overflow) Report to Congress, and reconciled locational data from the Clean Water Needs Survey for Publicly Owned Treatment Works and other collections systems, including Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s). In addition, to prepare for migration to the new ICIS, EPA is analyzing data items and correcting incorrect and incomplete data.
- PER Management Report: As part of the Permitting for Environmental Results (PER) Strategy, a review is currently underway to identify discrepancies between PCS and state data. Any discrepancies will be included as part of the state program action plans to be developed in FY 2005.
- ICIS: EPA has completed the final design of the new ICIS, and is now developing the technical specifications and code. ICIS will be make data entry more user friendly than PCS, and will link to state data systems to avoid the need for dual entry.

Loading reductions (pounds per year) of toxic, non-conventional, and conventional pollutants from NPDES permitted facilities (POTWs, Industries, SIUs, CAFOs, SW, CSOs).

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, page 60.

DATABASE: This measure is calculated using an internal EPA spreadsheet that draws from several data sources. An average "per facility" loadings value is assigned to each permitted direct discharger that is subject to effluent guidelines. The average per facility value for pollutant reduction is derived from the Technical Development Documents produced at the time of the effluent guideline rulemaking for each industrial sector. Each EPA regional office reports the actual number of permits issued in the past year for each industrial sector, which is typically drawn from EPA's PCS. Using both the average per facility value and the number of permits issued, the spreadsheet then generates the values for the total pollutants reduced. In 2003, an estimate for CSOs was added, using a model that draws information from the Clean Water Needs Survey.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, pages II-89 through II-91 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: EPA continues to maintain and update the pollutant-loading reduction spreadsheet, and to improve PCS.

Percent of the population served by, and the number of large and medium-sized (10,001 and larger), publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) that have taken action for preparedness.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, pages 60-61.

DATABASE: To track this measure, EPA requires grantees that provide workshops and other means for making POTWs more secure to report to the Agency on the number of utilities trained. EPA then uses the Clean Water Needs Survey and PCS databases to determine and report the population served by each utility. EPA plans to continue offering this training to water system operators, first responders, and law enforcement personnel. These data are in an Excel spreadsheet. EPA will not track this measure in FY 2005.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies related to PCS and the Clean Water Needs Survey, please see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, page II-85 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: In FY 2004, EPA provided contractor assistance to improve the data quality of PCS. This modernization effort has made the system more user-friendly.

Final reports of full-scale demonstrations of arsenic treatment technologies. - Report on fecal indicator monitoring protocols for different types of recreational water. - Provide guidance on indicator selection and monitoring strategies for evaluating the effectiveness of BMPs.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 2, pages 61-62.

DATABASE: No internal database; program output. Therefore other data elements are not applicable.

GOAL 3 — LAND PRESERVATION AND RESTORATION

Daily per capita generation. - Millions of tons municipal solid waste diverted.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 3, pages 69-70.

DATABASE: Data are provided by the Department of Commerce, which collects materials production and consumption data from various industries. EPA does not maintain a database for this information. The baseline numbers for municipal solid waste (MSW) source reduction and recycling are developed using a materials flow methodology employing data largely from the Department of Commerce and described in the EPA report titled *Characterization of Municipal Solid Waste in the United States.*

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: FY 2004 data will be available in December 2007. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. Quality assurance and quality control are provided by the Department of Commerce's internal procedures and systems. The report prepared by the Agency, *Characterization of Municipal Solid Waste in the United States,* is reviewed by a number of experts for accuracy and soundness. The report, including the baseline numbers and annual rates of recycling and per capita municipal solid waste generation, is widely accepted among experts.

Data limitations stem from the fact that the baseline statistics and annual rates of recycling and per capita municipal solid waste generation are based on a series of models, assumptions, and extrapolations and, as such, are not an empirical accounting of municipal solid waste generated or recycled.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Goal 3 narrative, page III-31 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: Because the statistics on MSW generation and recycling are widely reported and accepted by experts, no new efforts to improve the data or the methodology have been identified or are necessary. EPA plans to develop regulations for improving reporting of source reduction activities by Toxics Release Inventory reporting facilities.

Percent of RCRA hazardous waste management facilities with permits or other approved controls in place.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 3, pages 70-71.

DATABASE: The Resource Conservation Recovery Act Information System (RCRAInfo) is the national database that supports EPA's RCRA program. Data are entered by the states. Supporting documentation and reference materials are maintained in regional and state files. EPA's regional offices and authorized states enter data on a rolling basis.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: FY 2004 data are available. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. RCRAInfo contains information on entities (generically referred to as "handlers") engaged in hazardous waste generation and management activities regulated under the portion of RCRA that provides for regulation of hazardous waste. RCRAInfo has several different modules, including status of RCRA facilities in the RCRA permitting universe.

States and EPA's regional offices generate the data and manage data quality related to timeliness and accuracy. Within RCRAInfo, the application software enforces structural controls that ensure high-priority national components of the data are properly entered. RCRAInfo documentation, which is available to all users on-line at http://www.epa.gov/rcrainfo/, provides guidance to facilitate the generation and interpretation of data. Training on use of RCRAInfo is provided on a regular basis, usually annually, depending on the nature of system changes and user needs. Determination of whether the annual performance goals are met is based on the legal and operating status codes for each unit (e.g., a facility can have more than one unit). Each year since 1999, in discussions with the regions and states,

EPA has highlighted the need to keep the data that support the permitting goal current. RCRAInfo is the sole repository for this information and is a focal point for planning from the local to the national level.

Note: Access to RCRAInfo is open only to EPA headquarters, regional, and authorized state personnel. It is not available to the general public because the system contains enforcement-sensitive data. The general public is referred to EPA's Envirofacts Data Warehouse to obtain filtered information on RCRA-regulated hazardous waste sites.

The 1995 General Accounting Office report *Hazardous Waste: Benefits of EPA's Information System Are Limited* (AIMD-95-167, August 22, 1995, http://www.gao.gov/archive/1995/ai95167.pdf) on EPA's Hazardous Waste Information System reviewed whether national RCRA information systems support EPA and the states in managing their hazardous waste programs. Recommendations coincide with ongoing internal efforts to improve the definitions of data collected, ensure that data collected provide critical information and minimize the burden on states. RCRAInfo, the current national database has evolved in part as a response to this report.

No data limitations have been identified. The states have ownership of their data, and EPA has to rely on them to make changes. The data that determine if a facility has met its permit requirements are prioritized in update efforts. Basic site identification data may become out-of-date because RCRA does not mandate annual or other periodic notification by the regulated entity when site name, ownership and contact information changes. Nevertheless, EPA tracks the facilities by their IDs, which should not change even during ownership changes.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Goal 3 narrative, page III-32 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None in FY 2004.

Increase in UST facilities in significant operational compliance with leak detection requirements. - Increase in UST facilities in significant operational compliance with spill, overfill, and corrosion protection regulation. - Number of confirmed releases at UST facilities nationally. - LUST cleanups completed.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 3, pages 70-74.

DATABASE: There is no national database. States individually maintain records for reporting state program accomplishments. Designated state agencies submit semi-annual progress reports to the EPA regional offices.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: FY 2004 data will be available in April 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. EPA's regional offices verify and then forward the data in a word processing table to EPA's Office of Underground Storage Tanks (OUST). OUST staff examine the data and resolve any discrepancies with the regional offices. The data are displayed in a word processing table on a region-by-region basis, which enables regional staff to check their data.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Goal 3 narrative, pages III-31 and III-71 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: Refer to the Goal 3 Highlights section of this report for discussion of improvements to the data gathering policy for this program.

Superfund removal response actions initiated. - Superfund site assessment decisions. - Superfund hazardous waste sites with human exposures controlled. - Superfund hazardous waste sites with groundwater migration controlled. - Remedies (cleanup targets) selected at Superfund sites. - Number of Superfund construction completions. - Refer to DOJ, settle, or write off 100% of Statute of Limitations (SOLs) cases for Superfund sites with total unaddressed past costs equal to or greater than $200,000, and report value of costs recovered. - Reach a settlement or take an enforcement action before the start of a remedial action at 90 percent of Superfund sites having viable, liable responsible parties other than the Federal government.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 3, pages 72-76.

DATABASE: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) is the automated database used by the Agency to track, store, and report Superfund site information. EPA's headquarters and regional offices enter data into CERCLIS on a rolling basis. Each performance measure is a specific variable within CERCLIS.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: FY 2004 data are available. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

To ensure data accuracy and control, the following administrative controls are in place: (1) the Superfund Implementation Manual (SPIM), the program management manual that details what data must be reported; (2) Report Specifications, which are published for each report detailing how reported data are calculated; (3) the Coding Guide, which contains technical instructions to such data users as Regional Information Management Coordinators, program personnel, report owners, and data input personnel; (4) Quality Assurance (QA) Unit Testing, an extensive QA check against report specifications; (5) the Regional CERCLIS Data Entry Internal Control Plan, which includes: (a) regional policies and procedures for entering data into CERCLIS, (b) a review process to ensure that all Superfund accomplishments are supported by source documentation, (c) delegation of authorities for approval of data input into CERCLIS, and (d) procedures to ensure that reported accomplishments meet accomplishment definitions; and (6) a historical lockout feature that ensures that changes in past fiscal year data are made only by approved and designated personnel and are logged to a change-log report. Specific directions for these controls are contained in the Fiscal Year 2004/2005 SPIM (http://www.epa.gov/superfund/action/process/spim04.htm).

An EPA Office of the Inspector General audit, *Information Technology - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) Data Quality* (Report No. 2002-P-00016), dated September 30, 2002, identified weaknesses in CERCLIS that were attributed to the lack of an effective QA process and adequate internal controls for CERCLIS data quality. Although the Agency disagrees with the study design and report conclusions, the report provided 11 recommendations with which EPA concurs. Many of the identified problems have been corrected, or actions that would address these recommendations are underway. The development and implementation of a QA process for CERCLIS data have begun. This process includes delineating QA responsibilities in the program office and periodically selecting random samples of CERCLIS data points to check against source documents in site files.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Goal 3 narrative, page III-71 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: A CERCLIS modernization effort is currently underway to enhance CERCLIS, with a focus on data collection and data analysis and how to best satisfy the current needs of the Superfund program. Among other initiatives, this effort includes reviewing current and anticipated data needs. Items in CERCLIS that are no longer needed will be deleted, and new items identified will be added. Strict standards for quality will be enforced.

High-priority RCRA facilities with human exposures to toxins controlled. - High-priority RCRA facilities with toxic releases to groundwater controlled.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 3, pages 72-74.

DATABASE: RCRAInfo is the national database that supports EPA's RCRA program. The states and regions enter a "yes" or "no" entry in the database with respect to meeting the measures for human exposures to toxins controlled and releases to groundwater controlled. Supporting documentation and reference materials are maintained in the regional and state files. EPA's regional offices and authorized states enter data on a continual basis.

The annual performance measures are used to summarize and report on the facility-wide environmental conditions at the RCRA Corrective Action Program's highest-priority facilities. They are used to track the RCRA program's progress in controlling releases at the highest-priority contaminated facilities. Known and suspected facility-wide conditions are evaluated using a series of simple questions and flow-chart logic to arrive at a reasonable, defensible determination. (These questions were issued as a memorandum titled: Interim Final Guidance for RCRA Corrective Action Environmental Indicators, Office of Solid Waste, February 5, 1999.) Lead regulators for the facility (authorized state or EPA personnel) make the environmental indicator determination; however, facilities or their consultants may assist EPA in the evaluation by providing information on the current environmental conditions. Remedies selected and complete constructions of remedies are used to track the RCRA program's progress in moving the highest-priority contaminated facilities toward final cleanup. The lead regulators for the facility select the remedies and complete constructions of remedy determinations.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: FY 2004 data are available. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. States and regions generate the data and manage data quality related to timeliness and accuracy (i.e., the data correctly reflect the environmental conditions and determination). Within RCRAInfo, the application software enforces structural controls that ensure that high-priority national components of the data are properly entered. RCRAInfo documentation, which is available to all users on-line, provides guidance to facilitate the generation and interpretation of data. Training on use of RCRAInfo is provided on a regular basis, usually annually, depending on the nature of systems changes and user needs.

Access to RCRAInfo is open only to EPA headquarters, regional, and authorized state personnel. It is not available to the general public because the system contains enforcement-sensitive data. The general public is referred to EPA's Envirofacts Data Warehouse to obtain filtered information on RCRA-regulated hazardous waste facilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Goal 3 narrative, page III-71 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None during FY 2004.

Percentage of emergency response and homeland security readiness improvement.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 3, pages 75-76.

DATABASE: There is no database. Data are collected through detailed surveys of all regional programs, and interviews with personnel and managers in each program office. Results are scored, tabulated, and stored using standard software (spreadsheets, etc.). The survey instrument was developed based upon Core Emergency Response (ER) elements needed to ensure an excellent emergency response program, including such elements as Regional Response Centers, transportation, coordination with backup regions, health and safety, delegation and warrant authorities, response readiness, response equipment, identification clothing, training and exercises, and outreach.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: FY 2004 data are available. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. An evaluation team reviews the data during the data collection and analysis process. The data are reviewed after they have been analyzed to ensure that the scores are consistent with the data and program information.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Annual Plan and the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Goal 3 narrative, page III-71 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None during FY 2004.

Oil spills responded to or monitored by EPA.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 3, pages 75-76.

DATABASE: There is no database. Currently a new, more streamlined reporting system is under development to store oil spill prevention, emergency preparedness, and response information. Information included in the new database will be similar to CERCLIS information, but definitions and activities pertaining to oil will be included to support oil spill program needs for FY 2004 and beyond.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Goal 3 narrative, page III-71 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: Not applicable.

Reports on performance data for conventional sediment remedies for 3 sites.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 3, pages 76-77.

DATABASE: No internal database; program output. Therefore other data elements are not applicable.

GOAL 4 — HEALTHY COMMUNITIES AND ECOSYSTEMS

Reregistration eligibility decisions. - Product reregistration. - Number of inert ingredients tolerances reassessed.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 85-87.

DATABASE: The Office of Pesticide Programs Information Network (OPPIN) is a consolidation of various Office of Pesticide Program (OPP) databases. One of OPPIN's functions is to track regulatory data submissions and studies submitted by the registrant (pesticide manufacturer/producer) in support of the application for registration of a pesticide. OPP staff updates the data regularly.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-13 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: OPPIN consolidated 19 separate systems into one storage, tracking, and decision information system. This has greatly reduced the amount of resources spent on data entry and collection, and has reduced the potential for loss of data/documents. Analysis of information and error detection have also improved with the consolidation.

EPA is working internally and with stakeholders from environmental organizations and industry to develop outcome data and measures that more accurately depict risk from pesticides.

Tolerance reassessment. - Tolerance reassessments for top 20 foods eaten by children.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 85-87.

DATABASE: Tolerance Reassessment Tracking System (TORTS) is an OPP in-house system that contains records on all 9,721 tolerances subject to reassessment. It includes the total number of tolerances reassessed by fiscal year, the outcomes of reassessments (number of tolerances raised, lowered, revoked, or unchanged), and the appropriate priority group for the tolerance. Additionally, it breaks out the tolerances for specific chemical groups, including organophosphates, carbamates, organochlorines, carcinogens, high-hazard inerts, children's foods, and minor uses. OPP staff updates the data regularly. In addition, OPP is investigating the integration of the TORTS information into OPPIN.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-13 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: EPA is working internally, as well as with stakeholders from environmental organizations and industry, to develop outcome data and measures that more accurately depict risk from pesticides.

Register safer chemicals and biopesticides. - New chemicals. - New uses.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 87-88.

DATABASE: OPPIN is a consolidation of various OPP databases. One of OPPIN's functions is to track regulatory data submissions and studies submitted by the registrant (pesticide manufacturer/producer) in support of the registration application for registration of a pesticide. OPP staff updates the data regularly.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-5 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: OPPIN consolidated 19 separate systems into one storage, tracking, and decision information system. This has greatly reduced the amount of resources spent on data entry and collection, and has reduced the potential for loss of data/documents. Analysis of information and error detection have also improved with the consolidation.

EPA is working internally and with stakeholders from environmental organizations and industry to develop outcome data and measures that more accurately depict risk from pesticides.

Percentage of acre-treatments with reduced risk pesticides.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 87-88.

DATABASE: Two non-EPA databases are used for this measure: the Doane Marketing Research database, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) National Agricultural Statistical Survey database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-5 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: USDA and Doane Marketing Research have not indicated that any improvements are planned in the foreseeable future.

Occurrences of residues on a core set of 19 foods eaten by children relative to occurrence levels for those foods reported in 1994-1996.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, Pages 87-88.

DATABASE: Data collection is conducted by the states. Information is coordinated by USDA agencies, cooperating state agencies, and USDA's Pesticide Data Program (PDP).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data will not be available until 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. The core of PDP's quality assurance (QA) program is the standard operating procedure (SOP) based on EPA's Good Laboratory Practices. At each participating laboratory, there is a QA unit, which operates independently from the rest of the laboratory staff. QA Plans are followed as the standard procedure, with any deviations documented extensively. Final QA review is conducted by PDP staff responsible for collating and reviewing data for conformance with SOPs. PDP staff also monitors the performance of participating laboratories through proficiency evaluation samples, quality assurance internal reviews, and on-site visits. Additionally, analytical methods have been standardized in such various areas as analytical standards, laboratory operations, data handling, instrumentation, and QA. With the exception of California, all samples of a commodity collected for PDP are forwarded to a single state laboratory, allowing greater consistency, improved QA, and reduced sample loss. Program plans may be accessed at http://www.ams.usda.gov/science/pdp/SOPs.htm.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-5 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: USDA has not informed EPA of any improvements.

Certified nationally (federally-administered and state-administered program) to perform lead based paint abatement.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 88-89.

DATABASE: Currently, all information is received through informal reporting from EPA's regional offices, and originates from information submitted via certification applications. In the future, EPA will track certifications centrally using the newly created Federal Lead-based Paint Program (FLPP) database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-51 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: The FLPP database was launched in June 2003 to incorporate new regional certification applications.

Number of children aged 1-5 years with elevated blood lead levels (>10 ug/dL).

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 88-89.

DATABASE: Begun in the early 1960s, the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey conducted by the Centers for Disease Control is a coordinated program of studies designed to assess the health and nutritional status of adults and children in the United

States. The survey examines a nationally representative sample of approximately 5,000 men, women, and children each year located across the nation.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable, and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-69 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Annual number of PCB-containing capacitors safely disposed and annual number of PCB-containing transformers safely disposed.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 88-89.

DATABASE: Performance Database is the PCB Annual Report Database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable, and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. Data are provided by annual reports from commercial storers and disposers of PCB waste. One data limitation is missing and inaccurate submissions. PCB-contaminated transformers, of PCB concentrations 50 to 499 parts per million (ppm), and those containing 500 ppm PCBs or greater are not distinguished in the data. Similarly, large and small capacitors of PCB waste may not be differentiated. Data are collected for the previous calendar year on July 1 of the next year, creating a lag of approximately one year. Despite these limitations, the data provide the only estimate of the amount of PCB waste disposed of annually.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-69 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Cumulative number of participants in Hospitals for a Healthy Environment (H2E).

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 88-89.

DATABASE: EPA, in cooperation with its institutional partners, operates a voluntary program whereby hospitals and associated industries can voluntarily sign up to become an H2E Partner (hospitals) or Champion (associated industries). Sign-up forms from participating H2E institutions are used to track the number of participants in H2E.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. Limitations arise from reliance on individual healthcare facilities to gather data. Efforts to coordinate data collection with compliance audits and Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations will help manage the data collection activity.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2004 Congressional Justification, page IV-98 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Number of TSCA pre-manufacture notice reviews.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 90-92.

DATABASE: The New Chemicals Management Information Tracking System (MITS), maintained by the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages IV-7 and IV-36 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: No improvements made during FY 2004.

Cumulative number of Notice of Commencements (NOCs) received as percent of total number of chemicals on TSCA Inventory.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 90-92.

DATABASE: The New Chemicals Management Information Tracking System (MITS) tracks information from the beginning of the Premanufacture Notice (PMN) program (1979) to the present. Information includes the number of PMNs submitted, the final disposition (whether regulated or not), and the number of low-volume and test market exemptions.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, aggregated nationally, and suitable for cross-year comparisons. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2004 Congressional Justification, page IV-57 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Make screening level health and environmental effects data publicly available for HPV chemicals.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 90-92.

DATABASE: Currently, this is an output measure with no associated database; however, a U.S. High-Production Volume (U.S. HPV) Database is being developed.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: The database will be available January 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-7 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: No major improvements for FY 2004. However, EPA continues to solicit input on system design from potential users of the U.S. HPV database.

Annual number of TSCA Section 5 Pre-Manufacture Notices (PMNs) received self-audited using complete battery of P2 Framework/PBT Profiler screening tools.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 90-92.

DATABASE: The New Chemicals Management Information Tracking System (MITS) tracks information from the beginning of the Premanufacture Notice (PMN) program (1979) to the present. Information includes the number of PMNs submitted, the final disposition (whether regulated or not), and the number of low-volume and test market exemptions.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable, and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2004 Congressional Justification, pages IV-56 and IV-57 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Annual reduction in the current year production-adjusted Risk Screening Environmental Indicators (RSEI) risk-based score of releases and transfers of toxic chemicals.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 90-92.

DATABASE: The RSEI Model uses annual reporting from individual industrial facilities, along with a variety of other information, to evaluate chemical emissions and other waste management activities. RSEI incorporates detailed data from EPA's Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) and Integrated Risk Information System, the U.S. Census, and many other sources.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable, and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. RSEI relies on data from a variety of EPA and other sources. TRI data may have errors that are not corrected in the standard TRI quality control process. In the past, RSEI has identified some of these errors, and corrections have been made by reporting companies. Data sources are updated annually, and all RSEI values are recalculated annually.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages IV-70 through IV-73 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Cumulative number of chemicals for which AEGL values proposed.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 90-92.

DATA BASE: EPA manages a Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) committee that reviews short-term exposure values for extremely hazardous chemicals. The supporting data, from both published and unpublished sources and from which the acute exposure guideline level (AEGL) values are derived, are collected, evaluated, and summarized by FACA Chemical Managers and Oak Ridge National Laboratory scientists. Proposed AEGL values are published for public comment in the *Federal Register*. After reviewing public comments, EPA presents interim values to the AEGL Subcommittee of the National Academies of Sciences (NAS) for review and comment. After review and comment resolution, the National Research Council under the auspices of the National Academies of Sciences (NAS) publishes the values as final. Performance is measured by the cumulative number of chemicals with "Proposed," "Interim," and/or "Final" AEGL values. There is no performance database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages IV-73 and IV-74 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Annual number of HPV chemicals with complete Screening Information Data Sets (SIDS) submitted to OECD SIDS Initial Assessment Meeting (SIAM).

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 90-92.

DATABASE: Record of submission maintained by both the U.S. EPA and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.(OECD). U.S. EPA submission packages are located at http://www1.oecd.org. U.S. SIDS packages that have been to a SIAM are marked in the table by "SIAM assessed."

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete and suitable to support screening-level assessments only. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2004 Congressional Justification, pages VI-73 and VI-74 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/budget/2004/g06final.pdf).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Standardization and validation of screening assays.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, page 92.

DATABASE: Program output; internal tracking system. Data collected by program office on number of screening assays validated.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: All screening assays are peer reviewed by the Scientific Advisory Panel or the Agency Science Advisory Board. Study reports will be presented to the Endocrine Disruptor Methods Validation Subcommittee for review and comment.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages IV-14 and IV-136 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: This measure is not accurately depicting the standardization and validation of screening assays. As a result, the Agency has undertaken the task of revising this measure and has developed a series of measurement development plans to better assess the goal's performance.

Number of incidents and mortalities to terrestrial and aquatic wildlife caused by the 15 pesticides responsible for the greatest mortality to such wildlife.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, page 92.

DATABASE: The Ecological Incident Information System (EIIS) is a national database of information on poisoning incidents of non-target plants and animals caused by pesticide use. Data are extracted from written reports of fish and wildlife incidents submitted to the Agency by pesticide registrants under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), Section 6(a)(2), as well as from incident reports voluntarily submitted by state and federal agencies involved in investigating such incidents.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: FY 2004 data will not be available until 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. Internally and externally conducted data quality reviews related to data entry are ongoing. EPA follows a quality assurance plan for accurately extracting data from reports and entering it into the EIIS database. This quality assurance plan is described in Appendix D of the Quality Management Plan for pesticides programs. When resources allow incorporation of wildlife data from private organizations, such as the American Bird Conservancy, the new data and EIIS data are reviewed for quality during data entry using the same standards.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages IV-11 and IV-66 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: The Agency is currently conducting a project with the American Bird Conservancy, reviewing the data in its Avian Incident Monitoring System on bird kills caused by pesticides. These data will be incorporated into EIIS. The project is expected to improve the quantity and quality of the data in the EIIS database on avian incidents. However, this enhancement does not address the ability to quantify the extent to which reported incidents reflect environmental conditions.

Number of risk management plan audits completed.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, page 93.

DATABASE: There is no database for this measure. EPA's regional offices and the states provide the data to EPA headquarters. Data are collected and analyzed by surveying EPA's regional offices to determine how many audits of facilities' risk management plans have been completed.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: FY 2004 data will be available in November 2004. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. Data quality is evaluated by both regional and headquarters personnel. Data quality is dependent on completeness and accuracy of the data provided by state programs.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Goal 4 narrative, page IV-61 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).[1]

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: No significant improvements in FY 2004.

[1] For more information on the Brownfields program, see Reusing Land and Restoring Hope: A Report to Stakeholders from the US EPA Brownfields Program (http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/news/stake_report.htm); assessment demonstration pilots and grants (http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/assessment_grants.htm); cleanup and revolving loan fund pilots and grants (http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/rlflst.htm); job training pilots and grants (http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/job.htm); and cleanup grants (http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/cleanup_grants.htm).

Assist in the development or implementation of improved environmental laws or regulations in priority countries. - Increase the transfer of environmental best practices among the U.S. and its partner countries and build the capacity of developing countries to collect, analyze, or disseminate environmental data. - Train farmworkers on pesticide risks and safe handling, including ways of minimizing families' and children's risks.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 95-96.

DATABASE: Manual collection.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete for assessment of whether 2004 targets have been met. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: Validating measurements under international capacity-building programs presents several challenges. Technical assistance projects, for instance, typically target developing countries, which often do not have sound data collection and analysis systems in place. Several of the Agency's activities under Goal 4 attempt to improve this data gathering and analysis process. Nontechnical projects, such as assistance in regulatory reform, frequently must rely on more subjective measures of change, such as the opinions of project staff or reviews by third-party organizations, including other U.S. government organizations, in judging the long-term efficacy of the assistance provided. For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2003 Final Annual Plan, page VI-24.

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Number of Brownfields properties assessed. - Number of Brownfields cleanup grants awarded. - Number of properties cleaned up using Brownfields funding. - Number of acres of Brownfields property available for reuse. - Number of jobs leveraged from Brownfields activities. - Percentage of Brownfields job training trainees placed. - Amount of cleanup and redevelopment funds leveraged at Brownfields properties.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 93-94.

DATABASE: The Brownfields Management System (BMS) contains the performance information identified in the above measures. Key fields related to performance measures include:

- Properties with Assessment Completed with Pilot/Grant Funding
- Properties assessed with Targeted Brownfields Assessment Funding
- Properties with Cleanup Complete
- Acres Made Ready for Reuse
- Cleanup/Redevelopment Jobs Leveraged
- Assessment/Cleanup/Redevelopment Dollars Leveraged
- Number of Participants Completing Training
- Number of Participants Obtaining Employment

Data are extracted from quarterly reports prepared by assessment, cleanup, revolving loan fund (RLF), and job training cooperative agreement award recipients. Information on Targeted Brownfields Assessments is collected from EPA regions.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: FY 2004 data will be available in FY 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. Cooperative agreement award recipients submit reports quarterly on project progress to EPA. Data used to track performance measures are extracted from quarterly reports by an EPA contractor. Data are then forwarded to regional pilot managers for review and finalization. Given the reporting cycle and the data entry/QA period, there is typically a six-month data lag for BMS data.

Note that accomplishments reported by Brownfields Assessment Grantees, Brownfields Cleanup Grantees, Brownfields Revolving Loan Fund Grantees, Brownfields Job Training Grantees, and Targeted Brownfields Assessments all contribute towards these performance measures. "Number of Brownfields properties assessed" is an aggregate of assessments completed with Assessment Grant funding and

assessments completed with Targeted Brownfields Assessment funding. "Number of Brownfields properties cleaned up" is an aggregate of properties cleaned up by RLF Grantees and Cleanup Grantees. "Number of acres made ready for reuse" is an aggregate of acreage assessed that does not require cleanup under Assessment Grants, acreage cleaned up under RLF Grants, and acreage cleaned up under Cleanup Grants. "Number of cleanup and redevelopment jobs leveraged" is the aggregate of jobs leveraged by Assessment, Cleanup, and RLF Grantees. "Amount of cleanup and redevelopment funds leveraged at Brownfields properties" is the aggregate of funds leveraged by Assessment, Cleanup, and RLF Grantees. "Percentage of Brownfields job training trainees placed" is based on the "Number of Participants Completing Training" and the "Number of Participants Obtaining Employment" reported by Job Training Grantees.

Data reported by cooperative award agreement recipients are reviewed by EPA regional pilot managers for accuracy and to ensure appropriate interpretation of key measure definitions. Reports are produced monthly with detailed data trends analyses.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Goal 4 narrative, page IV-95 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).[2]

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: In FY 2004, the Brownfields Program fully implemented the Property Profile and Job Training Profile reporting forms to be used by Assessment, Cleanup, RLF, and Job Training Grantees awarded under the Brownfields Law. These forms, approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), allow EPA to collect standardized data and will improve data quality and reliability. The BMS database has been updated to track and store the data reported in these forms.

Number of additional people in Mexico border area protected from health risks because of adequate water and wastewater sanitation systems funded through border environmental infrastructure funding.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 94-95.

DATABASE: There is no associated database. Performance is tracked and reported quarterly by the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission (BECC) and the North American Development Bank (NADBank).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, see the FY 2004 Congressional Justification, pages IV-97 and IV-98 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: Partners meet quarterly, providing standardized progress reports for their areas of responsibility. EPA project officers conduct periodic program reviews of BECC and NADBank operations and performance. Annual performance and progress reports are submitted to EPA.

Acres of habitat restored and protected nationwide as part of the National Estuary Program (annual).

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 96-97.

DATABASE: EPA developed a database/tracking system that documents the number of acres of habitat restored and protected, based on specific National Estuary Program (NEP) reports. Key fields include the type of actions (e.g., protection or restoration) and habitat type (e.g., estuarine, riparian).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-112 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

[2] For more information on the Brownfields program, see Reusing Land and Restoring Hope: A Report to Stakeholders from the US EPA Brownfields Program (http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/news/stake_report.htm); assessment demonstration pilots and grants (http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/assessment_grants.htm); cleanup and revolving loan fund pilots and grants (http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/rlflst.htm); job training pilots and grants (http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/job.htm); and cleanup grants (http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/cleanup_grants.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: EPA is exploring the development and use of an on-line reporting tool that will enable the NEPs to directly input their data into a Lotus Notes database. Currently, NEPs send their individual reports to EPA to compile the reports into a central spreadsheet or database (Excel or Access), after which the data are revised as necessary. An on-line tool would be housed on EPA's NEP web site and would be password protected. Use of this tool would make reporting more efficient and accurate, thereby reducing the time needed to conduct quality assurance and quality control.

Long-term concentration trends of toxics (PCBs) – in Great Lakes top predator fish, and in the air. Phosphorus concentration in the Lake Erie Central Basin.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 97-98.

DATABASE: The Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) base monitoring program and the GLNPO integrated atmospheric deposition network (IADN), operated jointly with Canada.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are incomplete and anticipated to be available in 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2003 Congressional Justification, pages IV-118 and IV-119 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: The data system specifically for the Great Lakes index is being developed. Data continue to be collected through the State of the Lakes Ecosystem Conference (SOLEC) process by various agencies, including GLNPO. Efforts are currently in progress to integrate various Great Lakes monitoring programs to better meet SOLEC objectives and to increase efficiencies in data collection and reporting. To address data lags, EPA is increasing quality assurance support for fish toxics data and is discussing speedier atmospheric deposition data delivery with Environment Canada.

Acres of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) present in the Chesapeake Bay (cumulative).

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, page 99.

DATABASE: The data for the Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Acres in Chesapeake Bay measure are located at: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/pubs/statustrends/88-data-2002.xls. The data source is the Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages IV-126 and IV-127 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: No improvements made in FY 2004.

Assist the Gulf States in implementing watershed restoration actions in 71 (5-year rolling average) priority impaired coastal river and estuary segments.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, page 99.

DATABASE: State Water Quality Agencies supply EPA's Office of Water with lists of waters reported under Clean Water Act Section 303(d) every even year (http://www.epa.gov/surf/).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the 2003 Congressional Justification, pages IV-129 and IV-130 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: The Gulf of Mexico Program Office compared the 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2004 lists for removal and addition of segments listed by the states. The locations of impaired segments provided by grantees receiving funding for restoration efforts were quality assured with the state 303(d) lists.

A study of fish genetic diversity that demonstrates the power of this modern approach for evaluating condition and vitality of biotic communities to federal, state and local resource managers. - A restricted access database of EPA experts with knowledge, expertise, impacts focused on safe buildings and water security. - Prepare ETV evaluations on a least 5 new technologies for detection containment, or decontamination of chemical/biological contaminants in buildings to help workers select safe alternatives. - Through SBIR awards, support at least 3 new technologies/methods to decontaminate HVAC systems in smaller commercial buildings or decontaminate valuable or irreplaceable materials. - Prepare technical guidance for building owners and facility managers on methods/strategies to minimize damage to buildings from intentional introduction of biological/chemical contaminants. - Verify two treatment technologies for application in buildings by commercial and residential users, utilities, and public officials to treat contaminants in drinking water supplies. - Complete 4 human health assessments and publish their results on the IRIS website. - Initiate or submit to external peer review human health assessments of at least 20 high priority chemicals. - Produce a computational toxicology research strategic framework. - Analysis of the "Children Total Exposure to Pesticides and Persistent Organic Pollutants (including EDCs) Study" to estimate aggregate exposures and identify critical exposure factors that can be used by the Agency to improve exposure and risk assessments.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 100-103.

DATABASE: No internal database; program output. Therefore the other data elements are not applicable.

The increased use of the TRI-Made Easy (TRI-ME) will result in a total burden reduction of 5% for Reporting Years 2003 and 2002 levels.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 4, pages 89-90.

DATABASE: CDX and the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) System; TRI Data Processing and Operations Statistical Report.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable, and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: Please reference the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page IV-94 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS:

- 52 training workshops were held during FY 2004 for the reporting community to improve data accuracy and enhance reporting procedures.
- More than 750 data quality alert phone calls were placed to reporting facilities that had questionable submissions. The facilities were asked to verify their data and submit corrections as necessary.
- Expanded and improved data quality checks were added to the TRI-ME software used by the facilities for reporting.
- Improved data reconciliation processing was implemented at the data center.
- A 73% increase in on-line data submissions through CDX reduced the data entry error rate over FY 2003 levels. FY 2004 data accuracy was less than 99%.

GOAL 5 — COMPLIANCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP

Number of facilities, states, technical assistance providers or other entities reached through targeted compliance assistance.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 110-111.

DATABASE: EPA headquarters manages data on the number of entities reached through targeted compliance assistance in the Integrated Compliance Information System (ICIS).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Final Annual Plan, page IX-17 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2004/2004ap/goal9.pdf), and the Office of Compliance Quality Management Plan (internal use).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: The Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assistance (OECA) reviews the quality of the data quarterly. Deputy Regional Administrators and OECA managers certify the data at the middle and end of the year.

Facilities voluntarily self-disclose and correct violations with reduced or no penalty as a result of EPA self-disclosure policies.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, page 111.

DATABASE: Headquarters manages information on the self-disclosing policies in ICIS Phase I.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Final Annual Plan, page IX-16 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2004/ 2004ap/goal9.pdf), and the Office of Compliance Quality Management Plan (internal use).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: OECA reviews the quality of the data quarterly. Deputy Regional Administrators and OECA managers certify the data at the middle and end of the year.

Number of EPA inspections conducted.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 111-112.

DATABASE: Data from national enforcement and compliance systems, including: Permit Compliance System (PCS), Airs Facility System, the Resource Conservation Recovery Act Information System (RCRAInfo), the National Compliance Database System and FIFRA/TSCA Tracking System (NCDB/FTTS), and ICIS. Also data are provided manually for several program areas.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Final Annual Plan, page IX-10 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2004/2004ap/goal9.pdf), and the Office of Compliance Quality Management Plan (internal use).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: OECA performs a mid-year and end-of-year data quality review of inspection/ evaluation data. Deputy Regional Administrators and OECA managers certify the data at the middle and end of the year.

Number of criminal investigations.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, page 111-112.

DATABASE: The Criminal Docket System (CRIMDOC) is a criminal case management, tracking, and reporting system. Information about criminal cases investigated by EPA's Criminal Investigation Division (CID) is entered into CRIMDOC at case initiation, and investigation and prosecution information is tracked until case conclusion.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Final Annual Plan, page IX-11 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2004/2004ap/goal9.pdf), and the Office of Compliance Quality Management Plan (internal use).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: A new case management, tracking, and reporting system (Case Reporting System) is currently being developed that will replace CRIMDOC. This new system allows for a more user-friendly database and greater tracking, management, and reporting capabilities. OECA performs a mid-year and end-of-year data quality review of criminal investigation data. Deputy Regional Administrators and OECA managers certify the data at middle and end of the year.

Number of civil investigations.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 111-112.

DATABASE: Data are manually collected and there is no database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Final Annual Plan, page IX-11 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2004/2004ap/goal9.pdf), and the Office of Compliance Quality Management Plan (internal use).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: OECA performs a mid-year and end-of-year data quality review of civil investigation data. Deputy Regional Administrators and OECA managers certify the data at middle and end of the year.

Seventy-five percent of concluded enforcement actions require physical action that result in pollutant reductions and/or changes in facility management or information practices.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 112-114.

DATABASE: Phase I of ICIS, a modernized system, replaced DOCKET and tracks EPA civil, judicial, and enforcement actions.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Final Annual Plan, page IX-7 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2004/2004ap/goal9.pdf), and the Office of Compliance Quality Management Plan (internal use).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: OECA reviews the quality of the data quarterly. Deputy Regional Administrators and OECA managers certify the data at middle and end of the year.

Millions of pounds of pollutants required to be reduced through enforcement actions settled this fiscal year.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 112-114.

DATABASE: Phase I of ICIS, a modernized system, replaced DOCKET and tracks EPA civil, judicial, and enforcement actions.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Final Annual Plan, page IX-8 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2004/2004ap/goal9.pdf), and the Office of Compliance Quality Management Plan (internal use).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: OECA reviews the quality of the data quarterly. Deputy Regional Administrators and OECA managers certify the data at the middle and end of the year.

Develop and use valid compliance rates or other indicators of compliance for selected populations.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 112-114.

DATABASE: Inspection-based compliance rates are managed manually. PCS tracks National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and enforcement actions, reporting, and scheduling requirements and is used for self-reported rates.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Final Annual Plan, page IX-9 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2004/2004ap/goal9.pdf), and the Office of Compliance Quality Management Plan (internal use).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: Not applicable.

Complete the data migration plan and begin software development as part of the system implementation life cycle stage (i.e. data migration and testing) of Phase II of ICIS (modernization of the Permit Compliance System (PCS) by September 2004.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 114-115.

DATABASE: No database; internal tracking of measure.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Final Annual Plan, page IX-12 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2004/2004ap/goal9.pdf), and the Office of Compliance Quality Management Plan (internal use).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: New and Improved Data or Systems: The modernization of OECA's legacy media systems into one multi-media system, ICIS, will support core enforcement, compliance monitoring, and NPDES permitting program needs. Phase I of ICIS, the core federal enforcement data component of ICIS, was implemented in FY 2002.

PCS Modernization (ICIS Phase II: ICIS-NPDES) is currently underway. Progress on PCS Modernization in FY 2004 is as follows:

- data migration (ongoing);
- Data Migration Plan completed April 2004;
- Data Migration Workgroup formed May 2004, with participants from 13 states (AR, CO,GA,HI,IN,WI,MD,MO,NJ,NY,OH,UT,VA), all 10 regions, and headquarters (OW,OECA,OEI);
- system software development begun May 2004; and
- software technical specifications completed September 2004.

Conduct EPA-assisted inspections to help build state program capacity.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 115-116.

DATABASE: Output measure; internal regional tracking system.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2004 Final Annual Plan, page IX-12 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/2004/2004ap/goal9.pdf), and the Office of Compliance Quality Management Plan (internal use).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: OECA performs a mid-year and end-of-year data quality review of EPA-assisted inspection data. Deputy Regional Administrators and OECA managers certify the data at the middle and end of the year.

Percentage reduction in generation of priority list chemicals from 1991 levels.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 116-117.

DATABASE: The Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) provides facility/chemical-specific data quantifying the amount of TRI-listed chemicals entering wastes associated with production processes in each year. The total amount of each chemical in production-related wastes can be broken out by the methods employed in managing such wastes, including recycling, energy recovery, treatment, and disposal/release. Amounts of these wastes that are not recycled are tracked for this performance measure. The performance measure uses the Chemical Abstract System (CAS) numbers for the 23 chemicals identified by EPA as priority chemicals (http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/minimize/chemlist.htm).

Regulated facilities report facility-specific, chemical-specific release, waste, and recycling data to EPA. For example, in calendar year 1999, 22,639 facilities filed 84,068 TRI reports. TRI data are collected, as required by Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (EPCRA) and expanded by the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (40 CFR Part 13101; http://www.epa.gov/tri/). Only certain facilities in specific Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes are required to report annually the quantities of over 650 listed toxic chemicals and chemical categories released to each environmental medium and otherwise managed as waste (40 CFR Part 13101; http://www.epa.gov/tri). Regulation requires covered facilities to use monitoring, mass balance, emission factors, and/or engineering approaches to estimate releases and recycling volumes. For purposes of the performance measure, data controls are employed to facilitate cross-year comparisons; a subset of chemicals and sectors is assessed that are consistently reported in all years; and data are normalized to control for changes in production using published U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis gross product indices (chain-type quantity index for the manufacturing sector).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data will be available in November 2006. FY 2001 data, the most recent data available, show a reduction of 53 percent from the adjusted FY 1991 baseline of approximately 147 million pounds. Thus, the target established for FY 2004 has already been met. In response to these better-than-expected results, EPA created a new measure that monitors an expanded list of chemicals in both hazardous and nonhazardous waste streams. This new measure will be introduced as part of the FY 2006 annual plan and budget.

Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities. Most facilities use EPA-certified automated TRI FORM R reporting tools, which contain automated error-checking mechanisms. Upon receipt of the facilities' reports, EPA conducts automated edits, error checks, data scrubs, corrections, and normalization during data entry and subsequent processing. While the Agency does not control the quality of the data submitted by the regulated community, it does, work with the regulated community to improve the quality of the estimates submitted.

Use of the data should be based on the user's understanding that the Agency does not have direct assurance of the accuracy of the facilities' measurement and reporting processes. TRI release data are reported by facilities on a good-faith, best-estimate basis. EPA does not have the resources to conduct on-site validation of each facility's reporting data, although on-site investigations do occur each year at a subset of reporting facilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Goal 4 narrative, page IV-93 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget/budget.htm).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: There were no significant improvements during FY 2004.

Annual reduction of TRI non-recycled waste (production-normalized pounds).

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 117-118.

DATABASE: The Toxics Release Inventory System (http://www.epa.gov/tri/).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Performance data are not available currently; data will be available in the spring of 2005. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages V-58 and V-59 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/budget/2005/g05final.pdf).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Cumulative number of alternative feed stocks, processes, or safer products identified by Green Chemistry Challenge Award winners.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 117-118.

DATABASE: Industry and academia submit nominations annually to EPA in response to the Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Awards. Environmental and economic benefit information, included in the nomination packages, is pulled into a metrics database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2004 Congressional Justification, pages IV-97 and IV-98 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/budget/2004/g04final.pdf).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Cumulative number of pounds of hazardous chemicals/solvents eliminated by Green Chemistry Challenge Awards Program nominations.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 117-118.

DATABASE: Industry and academia submit nominations annually to EPA in response to the Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Awards. Environmental and economic benefit information, included in the nomination packages, is pulled into a metrics database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages V-60 through V-64 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/budget/2005/g05final.pdf).

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Cumulative number of eco-friendly laundry detergent formulations developed.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, pages 117-118.

DATABASE: EPA is developing an electronic ("metrics") database that will allow organized storage and retrieval of green chemistry data submitted to the Agency on alternative feedstocks, processes, and safer chemicals. The database is being designed to systematically store and retrieve information on the environmental and, where available, economic benefits that these alternative green chemistry technologies offer. The database is also being designed to track the quantity of hazardous chemicals and solvents eliminated through implementation of these alternative technologies.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2004 Congressional Justification, page IV-98 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/budget/2004/g04final.pdf)..

DATA IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Percent of Tribes with delegated and non-delegated programs. - Percent of Tribes with EPA-reviewed monitoring and assessment occurring. - Percent of Tribes with EPA-approved multimedia workplans.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, page 119.

DATABASE: Progress on these measures is tracked through the Goal 5.3 Reporting system, an internal EPA program management database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete to assess that these FY 2004 targets have been reached. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the final FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages IV-73 through IV-75 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/budget/2005/g05final.pdf).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Through the ETV program, verify the performance of 35 commercial-ready environmental technologies.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Goal 5, page 120.

DATABASE: No internal database; program output. Therefore other data elements are not applicable.

CHAPTER 6 — SUPPORTING ACHIEVEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESULTS

Number of private sector and local government entities, such as water authorities, will use CDX to exchange environmental data with EPA. - CDX offers online data exchange for all major national systems by the end of FY 2004. - Number of states using CDX as the means by which they routinely exchange environmental data with two or more EPA media programs or regions.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Chapter 6, page 127.

DATABASE: Central Data Exchange (CDX) Customer Registration Subsystem.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please refer to FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Enabling Support Programs chapter, pages ESP-5 and ESP-6 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: Weekly audits of CDX data collection procedures and customer service operations are conducted. Weekly project management meetings are held, during which progress on performance measures is reviewed and actions are identified when necessary.

Establish the baseline for the suite of indicators that are used by EPA's programs and partners in the Agency's strategic planning and performance measurement process.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Chapter 6, page 128.

DATABASE: Output measure; initial collection of indicators compiled during the drafting of EPA's *Report on the Environment*, supplemented by indicators currently used in the Agency's strategic planning and performance measurement process (e.g., EPA's Strategic Plan, Annual Performance Plan, Annual Performance Report, Annual Operating Plan, and National Environmental Performance Partnership Agreements), will comprise an Agency baseline of indicators (http://www.epa.gov/indicators/roe/index.htm).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please refer to EPA's FY 2005 FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Enabling Support Programs chapter, pages ESP-6 and ESP-7 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS:

- EPA conducted an extensive national dialogue on the *Draft Report on the Environment* to collect additional input into the suite of Environmental Indicators.
- Efforts are underway to develop environmental indicators and other analytical tools to answer more questions in the next *Report on the Environment,* anticipated for release in FY 2006.

Percent compliance with criteria used by OMB to assess Agency security programs reported annually to OMB under the Federal Information Security Management Act. - Percent of intrusion detection monitoring sensors installed and operational.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Chapter 6, page 128-129.

DATABASE: The Automated Security Self-Evaluation and Remediation Tracking (ASSERT) database.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: The Office of the Inspector General staff and the Chief Information Officer's information security staff conduct independent evaluations of security assessments, consistent with §3545 of the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA). The Agency certifies results to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in the annual FISMA report. For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please refer to EPA's FY 2005 Congressional Justification, Enabling Support Programs chapter, page ESP-7 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS:

- Automated edit checking routines are performed in accordance with ASSERT design specifications, to ensure answers to questions in ASSERT are consistent.
- EPA's information security staff reviews the self-reported data, conducts independent validation of a sample, and discusses anomalies with the submitting office.
- EPA released version 3.0 of ASSERT in FY 2004, offering users easier access to the tool.

Cumulative percentage reduction in energy consumption in EPA's 21 laboratories from the 1990 base.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Chapter 6, page 129-130.

DATABASE: The Agency's contractor receives energy bills regularly—either monthly or quarterly—from the utility companies. This information is compiled in the contractor's database and provided to the Agency quarterly and annually. The contractor is responsible for validating the data.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: The data are complete, reliable, and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: For more information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, page ESP-13.

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None.

Offices using workforce planning model which identifies skills and competencies needed by the Agency for strategic recruitment, retention, and development.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Chapter 6, page 130-131.

DATABASE: The National Strategic Workforce Planning System (NSWPS), a component of People Plus human resources software.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable, and usable by the Agency in carrying out decision-making responsibilities. Ten offices have completed pilot implementation of the system, which utilizes several feedback mechanisms to capture participant information useful for making improvements to the system.

DATA QUALITY: Data quality is good and has been validated by senior managers across EPA.

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: EPA will utilize pilot results to make modifications to the NSWPS and to the full strategic workforce planning approach.

Percentage of total eligible service contracting dollars obligated as performance-based in FY 2004.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Chapter 6, pages 130-131.

DATABASE: The Integrated Contracts Management System (ICMS).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable and usable by the Agency in carrying out decision-making responsibilities. A very detailed report is created that shows, on a contract-by-contract basis, whether individual contracts and task orders were coded as a Performance Based Service Acquisition. The report is provided to managers (including program managers, when requested) for review (of whether the annual performance goal has been met or not) and to verify with the contracting officers if contracts and/or orders were correctly coded in ICMS.

DATA QUALITY: When an action in ICMS is coded as performance-based, there are edit checks performed for applicable North American Industrial Classification codes (NAICS) and Product Service Codes (PSC) like those in the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS) to which the data are reported quarterly. The FPDS also flags any errors, which are corrected in ICMS and resubmitted. Few, if any, Performance Based Service Code errors have been returned. When ICMS begins transactional processing with the new FPDS-Next Generation (FPDS-NG) in 2004, there will be edit checks in that system, which will help data quality on a real-time basis.

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: None.

The number of financial and performance metrics where the Agency has met pre-established Agency or Government-wide performance goals.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Chapter 6, page 130-131.

DATABASE: There is no one database for this measure. The inventory of 14 key financial and resource performance measures, including for example, payroll payments, non-credit card invoices paid timely, and purchase card delinquency rates, originate from the following: Financial Management Officer certification, Senior Resource Officer certification, EPAYS payroll system, IFMS accounting system, or General Services Administration (GSA).

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: Data are complete, reliable, and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA QUALITY: Data complied from Financial Management Officer and Senior Resource Officer certifications are accepted only by email or signed certifications from those two sources. Both the EPAYS payroll system and the IFMS accounting system are audited annually by the Office of the Inspector General. GSA data are verified annually through their annual audit process.

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS: Data are reviewed periodically throughout the year by management and appropriate actions are identified when improvements are necessary.

Agency audited Financial Statements are timely, and receive an unqualified opinion.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Chapter 6, page 130-131.

DATABASE: Output measure–none. Therefore the other data elements are not applicable.

The number of actions taken for environmental improvement, reductions in environmental risks, and recommendations made for environmental improvement. - The number of actions taken for improvements in business practices, criminal/civil/administrative actions, recommendations for improved business practices, and value of potential dollar return.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Chapter 6, pages 131-132.

DATABASE: Performance data are in the OIG Performance Measurement and Reports System (PMRS). PMRS is used to capture and aggregate information on an array of measures in a logic-model format, linking immediate outputs with longer-term intermediate outcomes and results. Data in PMRS include numbers of recommendations for environmental program and management improvement; legislative, regulatory policy, directive, or process changes; environmental and integrity risks identified, reduced, or eliminated; best practices identified and transferred; environmental and management improvements; and monetary value of fines and costs questioned, saved, and recovered.

DATA COMPLETENESS AND RELIABILITY: EPA expects data to be complete by the end of October 2004. Data are reliable and accepted by Agency decision makers in carrying out their responsibilities.

DATA VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION: For more comprehensive information on performance data quality and methodologies, please see the FY 2005 Congressional Justification, pages ESP-54 and ESP-55 (http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage/budget).
).

DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS:

- Revised and clarified performance measure definitions.
- Provided tutorial sessions and presentations on the use of PMRS.
- Performed audits and reconciliations of performance data.

Manage Agency-wide information technology assets consistent with the Agency's multi-year strategic information resource management plan (Enterprise Architecture) reflecting current Agency mission priorities and resources.

Performance results related to these measures are presented in Chapter 6, page 29.

DATABASE: No internal database; program output. Therefore other data elements are not applicable.