Core Performance Measures

Section 5

Contents

Addendum to 1997 Joint Statement on Measuring Progress under NEPPS: Clarifying the Use and Applicability of Core Performance Measures	*page 5-5*
FY 2000-01 Core Performance Measures for Water	*page 5-11*
Comparison Between Core Performance Measures and FY 2002 Annual Performance Measures	*page 5-14*
Information Sources and Reporting for Water Core Performance Measures	*page 5-18*

ADDENDUM TO 1997 JOINT STATEMENT ON MEASURING PROGRESS UNDER NEPPS: CLARIFYING THE USE AND APPLICABILITY OF CORE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

When EPA and States initiated the National Environmental Performance Partnership System (NEPPS), our goals were to achieve greater environmental protection, better measurement of environmental progress, and the most efficient use of public resources in achieving these goals. While States vary in the extent to which they actively participate in specific aspects of NEPPS, the basic concept of performance partnerships guides State-EPA relationships throughout the country. The development of Core Performance Measures (CPMs) that has taken place under NEPPS auspices has been successful in focusing both EPA and State attention on improving how we measure the effectiveness of our environmental protection efforts.

In August 1997, leaders of ECOS and EPA signed a *Joint Statement on Measuring Progress under NEPPS*. The Joint Statement has served as a guidance document for use of CPMs. It also established a hierarchy of CPMs which was attached to the *Joint Statement* and is hereby reaffirmed. The purpose of this addendum is to clarify and update certain principles, guidance and time frames as originally referenced in the August 1997 Joint Statement. This Addendum accompanies a revised and updated set of Core Performance Measures. It is in effect during the life of the 1995 NEPPS Agreement unless otherwise amended.

This addendum addresses and clarifies four key issues. These issues generally relate to the implementation and use of Core Performance Measures, Associated Reporting Requirements, and Accountability Measures (hereafter referred to as CPMs). The clarifications presented below constitute official amendments to the Joint Statement.

Core Performance Measures: What Are They?

CPMs are a limited set of national measures, designed to help gauge progress towards protection of the environment and public health. They include a mix of three types of measures (as arrayed in the CPM hierarchy) needed to understand environmental programs and their effectiveness: (1) environmental indicators (high level trends describing environmental and public health conditions), (2) program outcomes (measures of program influence or effect), and (3) program outputs (measures of program activities). CPMs, based on data collected and reported primarily by States, serve the NEPPS objective of 'managing for environmental results' by:

- driving a system of measurement based on performance (with an emphasis on shifting "up the hierarchy" described above, to more meaningful reporting of environmental results);
- providing States and the Nation as a whole with the information and tools to increase accountability and make policy, resource or other changes to support improvements in environmental conditions; and
- providing a benchmark upon which States and EPA can focus efforts to reduce high cost/low value reporting for public and private entities.

In addition to using CPMs to help paint a national picture of environmental progress, States may wish to use additional indicators and measures to reflect progress toward State-specific goals and objectives. The Performance Partnership Agreements (PPAs) negotiated between EPA and States under NEPPS reflect

both State and Federal priorities, and, in addition to CPMs, may include State-specific environmental goals, objectives, indicators, and performance measures.

Together, EPA and ECOS have led, with participation by a number of other state organizations, the development of enhanced FY2000 CPMs for water, air, and waste management and remediation; as well as Accountability Measures for enforcement and compliance. In addition, work continues on developing CPMs for pollution prevention, pesticides, and lead for use in the future. Most of the current CPMs rely on data the states already collect and report. Over time, EPA and States will refine and improve the CPMs to enhance their ability to measure the responses of industry and the public to EPA and State programs, and the resulting changes in the environment. A few of the existing CPMs represent such an improvement, and may require new data and reporting.

Continued joint effort will be needed to bring these measures increasingly closer to an accurate and useful reflection of the most important environmental and program outcomes. EPA and States need to continue to ask such questions as:

- Are we focusing on the most important outcomes?
- Do we have the data we need to inform the American people on the progress and status of our work?
- Are we measuring cross-program outcomes in a way that encourages more efficient and effective collaboration among different environmental programs?
- How can we accelerate the pace of the transition to a results-based performance measurement system which emphasizes use of outcomes versus outputs?
- How can States and EPA continue to advance efforts to minimize high cost/low value reporting?

As this work progresses, EPA and State work groups will continue to consult with the officials who implement the various programs covered by these measures, a range of experts on data and measurement, and the many stakeholder groups who constitute an important audience for Core Performance Measures. Many refinements will undoubtedly be needed as these measures come into use over a period of time. Up to this point, our initial efforts in improving environmental measurement systems have focused on the relationships between States and EPA. We now need to expand outreach efforts to include our many stakeholders as we continue to improve measurement systems over time.

Issue 1: Uses and Audiences for Core Performance Measures

One of the primary purposes of CPMs is to help “paint a national picture” of the nation’s progress in protecting public health and the environment. This picture reflects the progress and accomplishments achieved by EPA, the States, and others working together. This national picture is intended to inform Congress, the public, stakeholders and environmental managers of trends and environmental progress across the nation and in individual states; and to give them the tools to increase accountability and make (or influence) policy, resource and other decisions. In addition to informing a national audience, many states plan to use the measures to communicate environmental and program progress to state legislatures and residents.

CPMs are also intended to help shape EPA and State management decisions by providing environmental program managers with information on environmental conditions and trends, important program outcomes, and key program activities. EPA and States will strive to reduce the number of core program

output measures in favor of outcome measures and environmental indicators. CPMs do *not* attempt to capture the full range of information needed to manage environmental programs at the national, regional or state level; environmental managers at all levels will, in most cases, need additional information to guide program management decisions. As stated in the *Joint Statement*, "...information about activities (e.g., permitting) is routinely reported each year and maintained in national data bases which we recognize must be maintained through existing comprehensive data systems." CPMs are not intended to be used to rank states against each other. They will be used to analyze and describe important environmental and programmatic trends among states. CPMs should be carefully used in a way that recognizes the context and quality of the information upon which they are based.

Any reports that use CPMs should emphasize that the results reflect the achievements of States and EPA working together. Performance results for CPMs may provide Congress and others with a gauge of the success of important components of the Nation's environmental programs in which the states and EPA play a major role. States are not directly responsible for fulfilling EPA's Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) reporting requirements to Congress, but CPMs may represent a subset of the Agency's performance measures under GPRA. EPA intends that the information needed to report CPMs and other key reporting requirements described herein will satisfy any reporting EPA needs from States to meet EPA's GPRA reporting responsibilities.

Issue 2: Applicability of Core Performance Measures

States and EPA have identified CPMs as part of the overall NEPPS process for reinventing the State/EPA partnership. As a result of the NEPPS Agreement, States are active participants in the development of the CPMs and of the "national picture" that CPMs paint. CPMs as such only apply to States participating in NEPPS; States not participating in NEPPS will continue to provide key information needed by EPA through State/EPA Agreements, grant work plans, or other operating agreements. States participating in NEPPS are presumed to incorporate all CPMs in their Performance Partnership Agreements with EPA, subject to the conditions described in Issue #3 below. Non-NEPPS states may voluntarily choose to utilize CPMs to track environmental progress. The great majority of data points needed for the CPMs jointly approved in April 1999 are already being reported by all states through national data systems (such as RCRIS and SDWIS) or other established mechanisms. This reporting should continue by NEPPS and non-NEPPS states alike unless otherwise agreed by States and EPA.

Where CPMs involve data States are already reporting to EPA, EPA's expectation is that such data will suffice to report the CPM, i.e., no duplicate reporting is expected. We recognize that CPMs that require new data may take a year or more to implement. If a CPM requires new data, EPA will work with States (individually or collectively) to develop a plan to obtain the necessary data. This plan should articulate ways to manage, schedule, and finance any new data collection and reporting requirements. All States and Regions are encouraged to be flexible and creative in finding means to collect the needed data and report on these measures.

Issue 3: Flexibility in Using Core Performance Measures

One of the most challenging aspects of implementing CPMs is balancing the need for consistent information with the need to accommodate the circumstances of individual States. As per the August

1997 Joint Statement, it is presumed that states participating in NEPPS will use the CPMs. If a particular CPM does not fit a State's or Region's situation, that measure may be modified, substituted, or eliminated in any given year, as agreed to by both the State and EPA. Good judgment and common sense should guide the determination to modify or eliminate a CPM under the circumstances described below. The State and EPA may jointly agree to deviate from particular CPMs where:

1. The CPM does not apply to a State's or Region's physical setting or environmental condition (e.g. ocean beach closures in a land-locked state).

2. The state does not have authority for the program to which the CPM applies (e.g., EPA still has primacy for the program).

3. Data for the CPM are not available or alternative data are more relevant in painting a picture of environmental progress (e.g., a state-based environmental data and/or performance management system provides a better description of environmental performance than the CPM). If data are unavailable, EPA and the State may agree upon a plan to develop the necessary data.

4. The State and EPA agree that the CPM or the work associated with it are not a high priority in the state (e.g. use of available resources to work on other activities is a higher priority in that state). In this case, the level of effort devoted to reporting that CPM should be negotiated as part of the NEPPS process.

The States and EPA also affirm joint efforts to continue pursuing innovative environmental projects and measurement systems that may improve the effectiveness of current and future CPMs.

Issue 4: The Role of CPMs in Improving the Value/Reducing the Cost of Environmental Information (Burden Reduction)

While the primary purpose of CPMs is better environmental information to support improved environmental management, the August, 1997 *Joint Statement* also contains a clear commitment to reducing the reporting of those outputs that are lower priority. It states: "We are committed to working together to reduce the overall reporting burden placed on states, especially that created by reporting on outputs... Over time, we hope to reduce unnecessary reporting and activity counting and streamline necessary reporting so that our time is spent sharing information on the nation's environmental and pollution problems."

Burden reduction is critical to maintaining and hopefully increasing the resources available for environmental protection. Both EPA and ECOS remain firmly committed to reducing high cost/low value reporting requirements on states and others and wish to accelerate progress toward this end. The Joint State/EPA Information Management Work Group has begun work on this charge. The Work Group has proposed an

States need to work together to ensure that the reporting of CPM data is efficient and improvements in data collection and reporting are made where possible.

- CPMs serve to frame discussions of what reporting meets the value/cost test, by spelling out what information EPA and States jointly believe to be highest priority. Information not necessary to support CPMs then becomes subject to review according to value/cost criteria, and is a candidate for burden reduction. Together, EPA and States (as well as other suppliers and users of environmental information) will work to ensure that they collect and share information that has "specific and demonstrable uses," as outlined in the *State/EPA Vision and Operating Principles for Environmental Information Management*. The Joint Work Group should, in coordination with EPA and ECOS CPM Work Groups, expeditiously design a process for accomplishing this review and identifying opportunities for burden reduction.

- A State/Regional dialogue provides the best entry point for investigating what information -- especially information beyond that required to report on CPMs -- is needed for States and EPA to do their respective jobs. EPA and States need to create an atmosphere that promotes working together to explore possibilities for reducing high cost/low value reporting, and that encourages States and EPA Regions to test and apply specific initiatives to reduce high cost/low value reporting through their PPAs at the earliest possible time. EPA Regions should consult EPA national program offices prior to implementing any initiatives that change national reporting requirements. EPA and ECOS support the establishment of a clearinghouse of successful initiatives and pilot projects in specific States and Regions to improve the value and reduce the cost of information.

Extension of Joint Statement

The *Joint Statement on Measuring Progress Under NEPPS*, signed in August 1997, applied to FY98 and FY99. It is hereby extended to apply for FY 2000 and beyond, during the life of the 1995 NEPPS Agreement, subject to the amendments and clarifications contained in this Joint Statement Addendum. Specific references in the original Joint Statement to CPMs for FY 98 or FY 99 are also amended to apply for FY 2000, and beyond, as applicable.

This Addendum is effective as of the date of signature.

_____	_____	_____	_____
Robert Varney, New Hampshire DES, ECOS President	Date	Carol Browner, EPA Administrator	Date
_____		_____	
Lewis Shaw, South Carolina DHEC, ECOS Vice-President		Linda Rimer, EPA Deputy Associate Administrator	
_____		_____	
Langdon Marsh, Oregon DEQ, Chair, ECOS Strategic Planning Committee		J. Charles Fox, EPA Assistant Administrator	

Core Performance Measures for Water[1]

Subject Area: Protection of Public Health

Core Environmental Indicator	Core Program Outcome Measure	Core Program Output Measure
1. Number of: a) community drinking water systems and percent of population served by community water systems, and b) non-transient, non-community drinking water systems, and percent of population served by such systems, with no violations during the year of any federally enforceable[1] health-based standard.	2. Estimated number of community water systems (and estimated percent of population served) implementing a multiple barrier approach[2] to prevent drinking water contamination.	3. Percent of river miles and lake acres that have been assessed for the need for fish consumption advisories; and compilation of State-issued fish consumption advisory methodologies, as reported through the National Listing of Fish and Wildlife Advisories.

Notes/Comments

1. EPA will develop language clarifying meaning of "federally enforceable," i.e., includes more stringent State standards.
2. EPA and States are still working to develop a source water protection measure. ECOS will adopt this measure only upon agreement to the definition by the ECOS Water Committee. *As of April 2000, work continues to develop a final source water CPM. Thus for FY2001, there will not be a source water CPM.*

Subject Area: Protection of Ecological Health, Protection of Public Health

Core Environmental Indicator	Core Program Outcome Measure	Core Program Output Measure
4. Number and percent of assessed river miles, lake acres, and estuary square miles that have water quality supporting designated beneficial uses, including, where applicable, for: a) fish and shellfish consumption; b) recreation; c) aquatic life support; d) drinking water supply. (The reporting period is two years.)	5. Number and percent of impaired, assessed river miles, lake acres, and estuary square miles that a) are covered under Watershed Restoration Action Strategies, and b) were restored to their designated uses during the reporting period. (The reporting period is two years.)	6. The TMDL status for each State, including: a) the number of TMDLs identified on the 1998 303(d) list that the State and EPA have committed to produce in the two year cycle; b) the number of TMDLs submitted by the State to EPA; c) the number of State-established TMDLs approved by EPA; and d) the number of EPA-established TMDLs. (This cumulative measure would be jointly reported by EPA and the State.)

[1] As stated in the 1997 *Joint Statement on Measuring Progress under NEPPS*, "Beyond core performance measures, there are other program output and fiscal reporting requirements we must use to document our various program activities." States are expected to continue reporting this routine program and fiscal tracking information. At the same time, States and EPA Regions are encouraged to work together to review the value and cost of these data exchanges and eliminate low-priority reporting.

Subject Area: Reduction of Point source and Non-point Source Pollutant Discharges

Core Environmental Indicator	Core Program Outcome Measure	Core Program Output Measure
	7. Percent of POTWs that are beneficially reusing all or a part of their biosolids and, where data exists, the percent of biosolids generated that are beneficially reused.	8. Number and percent of facilities that have a discharge requiring an individual permit: a) that are covered by a current individual NPDES permit; b) that have expired individual permits; c) that have applied for but not been issued an individual permit, and d) that have individual permits under administrative or judicial appeal. 9. Number of storm water sources associated with industrial activity, number of construction sites over five acres, and number of designated storm water sources (including Municipal Phase I) that are covered by a current individual or general NPDES permit. 10. Number of permittees (among the approximately 900 CSO communities nationwide) that are covered by NPDES permits or other enforceable mechanisms consistent with the 1994 CSO policy. 11. Number and percent of approved pretreatment programs audited in the reporting year. Of those, the number of audits finding significant shortcomings and the number of local programs upgraded to achieve compliance. 12. EPA will report to Congress on the pace of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CW SRF) Program. (EPA and States are working to develop an outcome measure for the CW SRF.) 13. Number of EPA approvals of State submitted upgraded Nonpoint Source Programs (incorporating the nine key elements outlined in the national *Nonpoint Source Program and Grants Guidance for FY 1997 and Future Years* jointly transmitted by EPA and ASWIPCA). (This CPM is discontinued in 2001.)

Comparison Between Core Performance Measures as Agreed to with ECOS April 1999 and Core Performance Measure Language included in FY 02 President's Budget as Annual Performance Measures

Core Performance Measures as Agreed to with ECOS (April 1999)	Parallel EPA Annual Performance Measure (APM) included in FY 02 OMB Submission	Comments
1. Number of: a) community drinking water systems and percent of population served by community water systems, and b) non-transient, non-community drinking water systems, and percent of population served by such systems, with no violations during the year of any federally enforceable health-based standard.	% of population served by community drinking water systems with no violations during the year of any federally enforceable health-based standards that were in place by 1994. % of population served by non-community, non-transient drinking water systems with no violations during the year of any federally enforceable health-based standards that were in place by 1994.	Split into two measures to allow 2 different targets to be entered into EPA's BAS database. APMs are missing number of systems. APMs add clause "that were in place by 1994" at the end of the measure.
2. Estimated number of community water systems (and estimated percent of population served) implementing a multiple barrier approach to prevent drinking water contamination.		Work overtaken by Source Water Contamination Prevention Strategy in 2000-01.
3. Percent of river miles and lake		

Core Performance Measures as Agreed to with ECOS (April 1999)	Parallel EPA Annual Performance Measure (APM) included in FY 02 OMB Submission	Comments
4. Number and percent of assessed river miles, lake acres, and estuary square miles that have water quality supporting designated beneficial uses, including, where applicable, for: a) fish and shellfish consumption; b) recreation; c) aquatic life support; d) drinking water supply. (The reporting period is two years.)	Assessed river miles, lake acres, and estuary square miles that have water quality supporting designated beneficial uses, where applicable, for fish and shellfish consumption. Assessed river miles, lake acres, and estuary square miles that have water quality supporting designated beneficial uses, where applicable, for recreation. Assessed river miles, lake acres, and estuary square miles that have water quality supporting designated beneficial uses, where applicable, for aquatic life support. Assessed river miles/lake acres/estuary square miles that have water quality supporting designated beneficial uses, where applicable, for drinking water supply.	Split CPM into 4 separate APMs in order to array the APMs under the most applicable subobjectives.
5. Number and percent of impaired, assessed river miles, lake acres, and estuary square miles that a) are covered under Watershed Restoration Action Strategies, and b) were restored to their designated uses during the reporting period. (The reporting period is two years.)	Assessed river miles, lake acres, & estuary square miles that a) are covered under WRAS and b) were restored to their designated uses during the reporting period.	APM doesn't contain the word "impaired".
6. The TMDL status for each state; including: a. The number of TMDLs identified on the 1998 303(d) list that the State and EPA have committed to produce during the current two-year cycle. b. The number of these TMDLs submitted by the State to EPA. c. The number of states-established TMDLs approved by EPA. d. The number of EPA-established TMDLs. (This cumulative measure can be reported jointly by EPA and the States.)	Number of TMDLs established by EPA (cumulative). Number of TMDLs scheduled to be completed by the end of 2001 (cumulative). Number of TMDLs submitted by the state (cumulative). Number of state-established TMDLs approved (cumulative).	

Core Performance Measures as Agreed to with ECOS (April 1999)	Parallel EPA Annual Performance Measure (APM) included in FY 02 OMB Submission	Comments
7. Percent of POTWs that are beneficially reusing all or a part of their biosolids and, where data exists, the percent of biosolids generated that are beneficially reused.	POTWs that are beneficially reusing all or a part of their biosolids and, where data exists, the percent of biosolids generated that are beneficially reused.	
8. Number and percent of facilities that have a discharge requiring an individual permit: a) that are covered by a current individual NPDES permit; b) that have expired individual permits; c) that have applied for but not been issued an individual permit, and d) that have individual permits under administrative or judicial appeal.	% of major point sources covered by current permits. % of minor point sources covered by current permits.	APM significantly shorter than CPM. APMs focus only on sources with current permits.
9. Number of storm water sources associated with industrial activity, number of construction sites over five acres, and number of designated storm water sources (including Municipal Phase I) that are covered by a current individual or general NPDES permit.	% of states with current permits for all industrial activities operating in the state. % of states with current permits for construction sites over 5 acres.	APMs in terms of states rather than sources. No parallel APM to the storm water portion of the CPM.
10. Number of permittees (among the approximately 900 CSO communities nationwide) that are covered by NPDES permits or other enforceable mechanisms consistent with the 1994 CSO policy.	% of permittees (among the approximately 900 CSO communities nationwide) that are covered by NPDES permits or other enforceable mechanisms consistent with the 1994 CSO policy.	APM is in terms of percent while CPM is in terms of number.
11. Number and percent of approved pretreatment programs audited in the reporting year. Of those, the number of audits finding significant shortcomings and the number of local programs upgraded to achieve compliance.	% of approved pretreatment programs audited in the reporting year. Of those, the number of audits finding significant shortcomings and the number of local programs upgraded to achieve compliance.	APM in terms of percent only while CPM is in terms of number and percent.

Core Performance Measures as Agreed to with ECOS (April 1999)	Parallel EPA Annual Performance Measure (APM) included in FY 02 OMB Submission	Comments
12. EPA will report to Congress on the pace of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CW SRF) Program. (EPA and States are working to develop an outcome measure for the CW SRF.)	EPA will report to Congress on the pace of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program.	No differences.
13. Number of EPA approvals of State submitted upgraded Nonpoint Source Programs (incorporating the nine key elements outlined in the national *Nonpoint Source Program and Grants Guidance for FY 1997 and Future Years* jointly transmitted by EPA and ASWIPCA).		This measure is not being continued in 2001.

Information Sources and Reporting
for
FY 2001-02 Water Core Performance Measures

Core Performance Measure	Source of Information / What Needs to be Reported for Measure
1. Number of: a) community drinking water systems and percent of population served by community water systems, and b) non-transient, non-community drinking water systems, and percent of population served by such systems, with no violations during the year of any federally enforceable health-based standard.	***Source:*** SDWIS. Every drinking water system -- community as well as nontransient, noncommunity -- (and, in some cases, State approved laboratories) report to the State such data elements as: sources of drinking water supply, population served by the system, violation(s) of MCL for drinking water contaminants (both chemical and microbial) and treatment techniques along with the failure to monitor for these types of violations. States enter this data into SDWIS. SDWIS provides data that while system specific can also be aggregated to show state-wide information, Regional information (States within EPA's Regional structure), and national information. ***What to Report:*** No separate reporting required.
2. Estimated number of community water systems (and estimated percent of population served) implementing a multiple barrier approach to prevent drinking water contamination.	Work overtaken by Source Water Contamination Prevention Strategy in 2000-01.
3. Percent of river miles and lake acres that have been assessed for the need for fish consumption advisories; and compilation of State-issued fish consumption advisory methodologies, as reported through the National Listing of Fish and Wildlife Advisories.	***Source:*** National Listing of Fish and Wildlife Consumption Advisories. In calendar year (CY) 1998, States submitted information to EPA on paper and EPA entered the data into the database; starting in CY 1999, States may enter data directly into the database. ***What to Report:*** No separate reporting required.
4. Number and percent of assessed river miles, lake acres, and estuary square miles that have water quality supporting designated beneficial uses, including, where applicable, for: a) fish and shellfish consumption; b) recreation; c) aquatic life support; d) drinking water supply. (The reporting period is two years.)	***Source:*** State Clean Water Act Section 305(b) Assessments ***What to Report:*** No separate reporting required.
5. Number and percent of impaired, assessed river miles, lake acres, and estuary square miles that a) are covered under Watershed Restoration Action Strategies, and b) were restored to their designated uses during the reporting period. (The reporting period is two years.)	***Source:*** For part (a), as part of Watershed Restoration Action Strategies submission, report which watersheds (8-digit HUC or finer detail) are covered by strategies (EPA will deduce stream miles, etc.). For part (b), States are encouraged to use Clean Water Act Section 305(b) reports. ***What to Report:*** No separate reporting required.

Core Performance Measure	Source of Information / What Needs to be Reported for Measure
6. The TMDL status for each state; including: a. The number of TMDLs identified on the 1998 303(d) list that the State and EPA have committed to produce during the current two-year cycle. b. The number of these TMDLs submitted by the State to EPA. c. The number of states-established TMDLs approved by EPA. d. The number of EPA-established TMDLs. (This cumulative measure can be reported jointly by EPA and the States.)	***Source:*** (1) Biennially-required Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Lists which include TMDL schedule and (2) TMDL Submittals ***What to Report:*** No separate reporting required.
7. Percent of POTWs that are beneficially reusing all or a part of their biosolids and, where data exists, the percent of biosolids generated that are beneficially reused.	***Source:*** Biosolids Data Management System. Key information for this measure are A) dry weight tons generated by Class I (40 CFR Part 503) facilities; B) use and disposal methods for the above in dry weight tons by categories: land application, surface disposal, incineration, other named; C) percentages for the above dry weight tons meeting Table III (40 CFR Part 503) land application requirements. ***What to Report:*** No separate reporting required.
8. Number and percent of facilities that have a discharge requiring an individual permit: a) that are covered by a current individual NPDES permit; b) that have expired individual permits; c) that have applied for but not been issued an individual permit, and d) that have individual permits under administrative or judicial appeal.	***Source:*** Permits Compliance System (PCS). Key information for this measure are permit application date, permit issuance date, and permit expiration date. ***What to Report:*** No separate reporting required.
9. Number of storm water sources associated with industrial activity, number of construction sites over five acres, and number of designated storm water sources (including Municipal Phase I) that are covered by a current individual or general NPDES permit.	***Source:***

Core Performance Measure	Source of Information / What Needs to be Reported for Measure
12. EPA will report to Congress on the pace of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CW SRF) Program. (EPA and States are working to develop an outcome measure for the CW SRF.)	***Source:*** State Revolving Fund Information System ***What to Report:*** No separate reporting required.
13. Number of EPA approvals of State submitted upgraded Nonpoint Source Programs (incorporating the nine key elements outlined in the national *Nonpoint Source Program and Grants Guidance for FY 1997 and Future Years* jointly transmitted by EPA and ASWIPCA).	***Source:*** Upgraded state nonpoint source programs submitted by states to EPA ***What to Report:*** No separate reporting required. This measure is discontinued in FY01.