

**For Official Use Only**



**United States  
Environmental Protection Agency**

**FISCAL YEAR 2018**

**Justification of Appropriation  
Estimates for the Committee  
on Appropriations**

**Tab 15: Appendix**

EPA-190-K-17-002

May 2017

[www.epa.gov/ocfo](http://www.epa.gov/ocfo)

**Environmental Protection Agency  
2018 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification**

**Table of Contents - Appendix**

---

<b>Coordination with Other Federal Agencies.....</b>	<b>650</b>
<b>Environmental Programs.....</b>	<b>650</b>
<b>Coordination with Other Federal Agencies.....</b>	<b>675</b>
<b>Enabling Support Programs.....</b>	<b>675</b>
<b>Major Management Challenges.....</b>	<b>682</b>
<b>EPA User Fee Program.....</b>	<b>694</b>
<b>Working Capital Fund.....</b>	<b>697</b>
<b>Acronyms For Statutory Authority.....</b>	<b>699</b>
<b>FY 2018 STAG Categorical Program Grants.....</b>	<b>705</b>
<b>Program Projects By Program Area.....</b>	<b>716</b>
<b>Eliminated/Discontinued Programs.....</b>	<b>726</b>
<b>Expected Benefits Of E-Government Initiatives.....</b>	<b>733</b>
<b>FY 2018 Administrator’s Priorities.....</b>	<b>738</b>
<b>Proposed FY 2018 Administrative Provisions.....</b>	<b>739</b>
<b>Attorney Fee And Cost Payments Obligated In FY 2016 Under Equal Access For Justice Act (EAJA).....</b>	<b>741</b>
<b>Fiscal Year 2018: Consolidations, Realignments, Or Other Transfers Of Resources.....</b>	<b>743</b>
<b>EPA Budget By National Program Manager And Major Office.....</b>	<b>744</b>
<b>IG’s Comments On The FY 2018 President’s Budget.....</b>	<b>748</b>
<b>Physicians’ Comparability Allowance (PCA) Worksheet For By 2018.....</b>	<b>750</b>



## **Coordination with Other Federal Agencies**

### **Environmental Programs**

#### **Air and Radiation Programs**

##### *National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) Implementation*

The EPA has cooperated with other federal, state, Tribal, and local agencies to achieve goals related to ground level ozone and particulate matter (PM) and to ensure the actions of other agencies do not interfere with state plans for attaining and maintaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The EPA has worked closely with the Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Department of the Interior (DOI), and the Department of Defense (DOD) on issues such as prescribed burning at silviculture and agricultural operations. The EPA, the Department of Transportation (DOT), and the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) have worked with state and local agencies to integrate transportation and air quality plans, reduce traffic congestion, and promote livable communities.

To improve our understanding of environmental issues related to the agricultural sector, the EPA has worked closely with the USDA and others to reduce emissions from agricultural operations and improve air quality while supporting a sustainable agricultural sector. Because the EPA does not have adequate emissions estimates for this sector, the agency has needed to develop an understanding of emissions profiles and establish monitoring and measurement protocols, technology transfer, and a research agenda. The agency encouraged partnerships between the EPA, USDA, and their established partners and utilized existing USDA infrastructure (e.g., Extension Service, Natural Resources Conservation Services, land grant colleges and universities, Farm Bill programs, etc.). Additionally, the agency will actively engage and reach out to the agriculture community.

##### *Regional Haze*

The EPA has worked with the DOI, National Park Service (NPS), and U.S. Forest Service in implementing its regional haze program and operating the Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments (IMPROVE) visibility monitoring network. The operation and analysis of data produced by this air monitoring system is an example of the close coordination of efforts between the EPA and state and Tribal governments. The EPA also has consulted with the DOI's Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on the potential impact of federally permitted actions on endangered species.

##### *Air Quality Assessment, Modeling, and Forecasting*

For pollution assessments and transport, the EPA has worked with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) on technology transfer using satellite imagery. The EPA has worked to further distribute NASA satellite products and NOAA air quality forecast products to states, local agencies, and tribes to provide a better understanding of air quality on a day-to-day basis and to assist with air quality forecasting. The EPA has worked with NASA to develop a

better understanding of PM formation using satellite data. The EPA has worked with the Department of the Army on advancing emission measurement technology and with NOAA for meteorological support for our modeling and monitoring efforts. The EPA has collected real-time ozone and particulate matter (PM) measurements from state and local agencies, which are used by both NOAA and the EPA to improve and verify Air Quality Forecast models. The EPA's AIRNow program (the national real-time Air Quality Index reporting and forecasting system) has worked with the National Weather Service (NWS) to coordinate NOAA air quality forecast guidance with state and local agencies for air quality forecasting efforts and to render the NOAA model output in the EPA Air Quality Index (AQI), which helps people determine appropriate air quality protective behaviors. In wildfire situations, the EPA and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) have worked closely with states to deploy monitors and report monitoring information and other conditions on AIRNow. The EPA also has worked with USFS by providing new science on the impacts of smoke on health to inform smoke management practices and intervention strategies to reduce health impacts. The AIRNow program also has collaborated with the NPS and the USFS in receiving air quality monitoring observations, in addition to observations from over 130 state, local, and Tribal air agencies. AIRNow also collaborates with NASA in a project to incorporate satellite data with air quality observations.

The EPA, USDA, and the DOI established a collaborative framework to address issues pertaining to wildland fire and air quality. The agreement recognizes the key roles of each agency, as well as opportunities for collaboration. For example, the partnership explains that the agencies seek to reduce the impact of emissions from wildfires, especially catastrophic wildfires, and the impact of those emissions on air quality. In addition, the partnership highlights opportunities for enhancing coordination among the agencies through information sharing and consultation, collaboration on tools and information resources, and working together to collaborate with state and other partners, among other goals.

#### *Mobile Sources*

The EPA has worked with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) on the coordinated national program establishing standards to improve fuel efficiency and reduce GHG emissions for light-duty vehicles for model years 2017 and later. Specifically, the EPA, in coordination with Department of Transportation's fuel economy and fuel consumption standards programs, implement vehicle and commercial truck greenhouse gas standards with a focus on industry compliance to ensure the standards are realized.

In the maritime sector, the EPA has collaborated with the Coast Guard (USCG) and other nations, such as Mexico and Canada. In the aviation area, the EPA has collaborated with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). To address criteria pollutant emissions (such as nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) and PM) from marine and aircraft sources, the EPA has worked collaboratively with the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), as well as with other federal agencies, such as USCG and the FAA. The EPA also has collaborated with the USCG in the implementation of Emission Control Area (ECA) around the United States, and with Mexico and Canada in the Commission for Environmental Cooperation to evaluate the benefits of establishing a Mexican ECA.

To better understand the sources and causes of mobile source pollution, the EPA has worked with the DOE and DOT to fund applied research projects including transportation modeling projects. The EPA also has worked closely with DOE on refinery cost modeling analyses and the development of clean fuel programs. The EPA also has coordinated with DOE's EIA regarding fuel supply during emergency situations. For mobile sources program outreach, the agency has participated in a collaborative effort with DOT's Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to educate the public about the impacts of transportation choices on traffic congestion, air quality, and human health. This community-based public education initiative also includes the Centers for Disease Control (CDC). The EPA also has worked with FHWA to develop and deliver training on modeling emissions from cars and trucks. The EPA also has worked with other federal agencies, such as the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), on air emission issues. Other programs targeted to reduce air toxics from mobile sources are coordinated with DOT. These partnerships can involve policy assessments and toxic emission reduction strategies in different regions of the country. The EPA has worked with DOE, DOT, and other agencies, as needed, on the requirements of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, such as the Renewable Fuel Standard. The EPA also has worked with other agencies on biofuel topics through the Biomass Research and Development Institute.

To develop air pollutant emission factors and emission estimation algorithms for aircraft, ground equipment, and military vehicles, the EPA has partnered with the DOD. This partnership provides for the joint undertaking of air-monitoring/emission factor research and regulatory implementation.

### *Air Toxics*

The EPA has worked closely with other health agencies such as the CDC, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) on health risk characterization for both toxic and criteria air pollutants. The EPA also has contributed air quality data to the CDC's Environmental Public Health Tracking Program, which is made publicly available and used by state and local public health agencies.

### *Addressing Transboundary Air Pollution*

In developing regional and international air quality programs and projects, and in working on regional agreements, the EPA has worked with the Department of State (DOS), NOAA, NASA, DOE, USDA, USAID, and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), as well as with regional organizations. In addition, the EPA has partnered with other organizations worldwide, including the United Nations Environment Programme, the European Union, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Clean Air Initiative for Asian Cities, the Global Air Pollution Forum, and our air quality partners in several countries, including Canada, Mexico, Europe, China, and Japan.

The EPA, working closely with the DOS, helped advance a resolution calling for greater international action to improve air quality through the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP). The EPA will continue to strengthen the links between environment and public health

officials and provide technical assistance through UNEP to facilitate the development of air quality management strategies to other major emitters and/or to key regional or sub-regional groupings of countries.

### *Stratospheric Ozone*

The EPA has worked very closely with the DOS and other federal agencies in international negotiations among Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and in developing the implementing regulations. The environmental goal of the Montreal Protocol is to protect the ozone layer and the ozone depleting substances (ODS) it controls also are significant greenhouse gases. The EPA has worked on several multinational environmental agreements including negotiating the most recent amendment to the Montreal Protocol, working closely with the Department of State and other federal agencies, including OMB, Office of Science Technology and Policy, Council on Environmental Quality, USDA, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Department of Commerce, NOAA, and NASA.

The EPA has worked with other agencies, including the Office of the United States Trade Representative and the Department of Commerce, to analyze potential trade implications in stratospheric protection regulations that affect imports and exports. The EPA has coordinated efforts with the Department of Justice (DOJ), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Department of Treasury, and other agencies to curb the illegal importation of ozone-depleting substances (ODS). Illegal import of ODS has the potential to prevent the United States from meeting the goals of the Montreal Protocol to restore the ozone layer.

The EPA has continued discussions with DOD, GSA, and NASA to assist in the effective transition from ODS and high-global warming potential (GWP) substitutes to a suite of substitutes with lower GWPs.

The EPA has worked with USDA and the DOS to facilitate research, development, and adoption of alternatives to methyl bromide. The EPA also has consulted with USDA on domestic methyl bromide needs.

The EPA has coordinated with NASA and NOAA to monitor the state of the stratospheric ozone layer and to collect, analyze, and disseminate UV data.

The EPA has coordinated with the Small Business Administration (SBA) to ensure that proposed rules are developed in accordance with the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Act.

### *Radiation and Radiation Preparedness and Response*

The EPA has worked primarily with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), DOE, and the DHS on multiple radiation related issues. The EPA has ongoing planning and guidance discussions with DHS on general emergency response activities, including exercises responding to nuclear related incidents. As the regulator of DOE's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) facility, the EPA is charged with coordinating oversight activities with DOE to ensure the facility is operating in compliance with EPA regulations. The EPA is a member of the Interagency Radiation Source

Protection and Security Task Force, established in the Energy Policy Act, to improve the security of domestic radioactive sources. The EPA also is a working member of the interagency Nuclear Government Coordinating Council (NGCC), which coordinates across government and the private sector on issues related to security, communications, and emergency management within the nuclear sector.

For emergency preparedness purposes, the EPA has coordinated closely with other federal agencies through the Federal Radiological Preparedness Coordinating Committee and the Advisory Team for Environment, Food, and Health which provides federal scientific advice and recommendations to state and local decision makers such as governors and mayors during a radiological emergency. The EPA has participated in planning and implementing table-top and field exercises including radiological anti-terrorism activities, with the NRC, DOE, DOD, HHS, and DHS.

The EPA is a charter member and co-chairs the Interagency Steering Committee on Radiation Standards (ISCORS) which was created at the direction of Congress. Through quarterly meetings and the activities of its six subcommittees, member agencies are kept informed of cross-cutting issues related to radiation protection, radioactive waste management, and emergency preparedness and response. ISCORS also helps coordinate U.S. responses to radiation related issues internationally.

During radiological emergencies, the EPA has worked with expert members of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Additionally, the EPA would work with OECD's Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) on two committees, the NEA Radioactive Waste Management Committee (RWMC) and the Committee on Radiation Protection and Public Health (CRPPH) as necessary during the response and remediation including those incidents involving significant waste issues. Through participation on the CRPPH and its working groups, the EPA has been successful in bringing a U.S. perspective to international radiation protection policy and benefits from having other countries' perspectives.

### *Research*

The EPA has continued to strengthen interactions with other agencies, including NOAA, DOE, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the National Institute of Health (NIH), the Federal Highway Administration, and the National Association of Clean Air Agencies to approach changes in air pollution sustainably. For example, the EPA has worked with NOAA and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to relate satellite-based air quality data to ambient monitoring.

In accordance with the Global Change Research Act, the EPA has coordinated with the 12 other federal agencies that are members of the U.S. Global Change Research Program to meet the Act's requirements to develop and publish a quadrennial assessment of the current and potential future impacts of global change.



## **Water Programs**

### *Collaboration with Public and Private Partners on Water Infrastructure Preparedness, Response, and Recovery*

The EPA has coordinated with other federal agencies, primarily the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Centers for Disease Control (CDC), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and Department of Defense (DOD), on biological, chemical, and radiological contaminants of high concern, and how to detect and respond to their presence in drinking water and wastewater systems. A close linkage with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Intelligence Analysis Directorate in DHS will be continued. The agency is strengthening its working relationships with the Water Research Foundation, the Water Environment Research Foundation, and other research institutions to increase our knowledge on technologies to detect contaminants, monitoring protocols and techniques, and treatment effectiveness.

The EPA has worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to refine coordination processes among federal partners engaged in providing emergency response support to the water sector. These efforts will include refining existing standard operating procedures, participating in cross-agency training opportunities, and planning multi-stakeholder water sector emergency response exercises. The EPA will be determining how ACE, FEMA, and the EPA are to clarify their roles and responsibilities under the National Disaster Recovery Framework. In addition, the EPA has continued to work with FEMA and the ACE, as well as other agencies, on the Federal Interagency Floodplain Management Task Force with regard to water resources and floodplain management.

Executive Order 13636 on *Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity* directs the EPA to coordinate with DHS and the Department of Commerce in developing implementation guidance on cybersecurity practices for water systems. The EPA intends to harness the extensive cybersecurity capabilities of DHS in carrying out its responsibilities under this mandate.

### *Geologic Sequestration*

The EPA has coordinated with federal agencies to ensure safe and effective implementation of regulations to protect underground sources of drinking water during geologic sequestration activities, as well as plan and obtain research-related data and coordinate regulatory activities. Specifically, the EPA has coordinated with the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior's Geological Survey, and the Internal Revenue Service to ensure that Safe Drinking Water Act regulations for geologic sequestration sites are appropriately coordinated with efforts to deploy projects, map geologic sequestration capacity, provide tax incentives for CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration, and manage the movement of CO<sub>2</sub> from capture facilities to geologic sequestration sites.

### *Collaboration with the U.S. Geological Survey*

The EPA and U.S. Geological Survey have established an Interagency Agreement to coordinate activities and information exchange in the areas of unregulated contaminants occurrence, the environmental relationships affecting contaminant occurrence, protection area delineation methodology, and analytical methods. This collaborative effort has improved the quality of

information to support risk management decision-making at all levels of government, generated valuable new data, and eliminated potential redundancies.

### *Sustainable Rural Drinking and Wastewater Systems*

The EPA and U.S. Department of Agriculture have agreed to work together to increase the sustainability of rural drinking water and wastewater systems to ensure the protection of public health, water quality, and sustainable communities. The two agencies have worked to facilitate coordinated funding for infrastructure projects that aid in the compliance of national drinking water and clean water regulations. In FY 2018, the EPA will continue to collaborate with the USDA to provide assistance to small rural drinking water systems that struggle to comply with drinking water regulations and/or lack an adequate governance structure to keep the system operating sustainably.

### *National Water Sector Workforce Development: Department of Veterans Affairs*

The EPA and the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (VR&E) Service jointly promoted activities that will help advance and improve employment opportunities for Veterans with disabilities while supporting the development of a trained and competent workforce for the Water Sector. Key objectives of this collaborative effort are to: 1) educate those involved with transitioning veterans to civilian careers about the water and wastewater industries; 2) promote Water Sector career opportunities to veterans; 3) educate utilities about Veterans Affairs programs and connect them with veterans; and 4) promote state program collaboration (particularly operator certification programs) with local Veterans Affairs counselors.

### *Tribal Access Coordination*

The EPA, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Indian Health Service, and the Department of the Interior have worked together to maintain and improve coordination in delivering water and wastewater infrastructure services and financial assistance to American Indian communities. The agencies work together to increase the number of American Indian homes provided access to safe drinking water.

### *Source Water Protection and Harmful Algal Blooms*

The EPA has coordinated with other federal agencies, including with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (Natural Resources Conservation Service and Forest Service) and the U.S. Geological Survey, to support federal, state, and local implementation of source water protection actions. In addition, the EPA has coordinated with the Homeland Security Infrastructure Program (HSIP) of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) to integrate their data on national and defense-critical infrastructure into source water protection analyses such as identifying potential contributors to harmful algal blooms (HABs) and chemical spill response. To further combat harmful algal blooms, the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2014 (HABHRCA 2014, P.L. 113-124) emphasizes the mandate to advance the scientific understanding and ability to detect, predict, control, mitigate, and respond to harmful algal blooms

and hypoxia. This legislation established the Interagency Working Group on HABHRCA (IWG-HABHRCA). It tasked the group with coordinating and convening Federal agencies to discuss HAB and hypoxia events in the United States, and to develop action plans, reports, and assessments of these situations. The Working Group is co-chaired by the EPA and NOAA and also includes the: Food and Drug Administration; National Institute of Food and Agriculture; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Bureau of Ocean Energy Management; U.S. Navy; National Science Foundation; U.S. Geological Survey; and National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.

#### *Data Availability, Outreach, and Technical Assistance*

The EPA has coordinated with U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Department of Agriculture (Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Rural Utilities Service), Centers for Disease Control, Department of Transportation, Department of Defense, Department of Energy, Department of the Interior (National Park Service and Bureau of Indian Affairs, Land Management, and Reclamation), Department of Health and Human Services (Indian Health Service), and the Tennessee Valley Authority to make data more available to states and the public. In addition, the EPA has collaborated with other federal agencies, states, and industry associations to establish a National Ground Water Monitoring Network with States to provide a fuller set of ground water data nationally through a single portal. Data helps to address national and regional issues related to water use, adaptation, and food and energy production.

#### *Collaboration with the Food and Drug Administration*

The EPA and Food and Drug Administration are updating a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), first established in 1978, to coordinate the authorities and programs of the two agencies with respect to oversight of drinking water on interstate conveyance carriers (e.g., aircraft, trains). The updates to the MOU are in response to the EPA's Aircraft Drinking Water Rule (ADWR) promulgated on October 19, 2009. Coordination will include sharing information on sample results indicating microbial contamination, inspections and enforcement actions; working together when water quality events occur that could impact the quality of water boarded onto aircraft; and other activities to ensure that a safe and reliable supply of drinking water is provided to passengers and crew. In addition, EPA scientists are collaborating with FDA scientists to evaluate the health effects of perchlorate exposure.

#### *Collaboration with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)*

The EPA and CDC meet quarterly to discuss cross-cutting issues related to drinking water contaminants and potential public health concerns.

#### *Collaboration with Housing and Urban Development (HUD)*

The EPA's Ground Water and Drinking Water Program has collaborated with HUD to develop strategies to decrease drinking water lead exposure in homes. The partnership would share information, leverage funding, and review processes to facilitate better informed decisions and coordinate investments.

## *Watersheds*

Protecting and restoring watersheds will depend largely on the direct involvement of many federal agencies, including the EPA, as well as state, Tribal, and local governments who manage the multitude of programs necessary to address water quality on a watershed basis. Federal agency involvement will include the U.S. Department of Agriculture (Natural Resources Conservation Service, Forest Service Agency, and Agriculture Research Service), Department of the Interior (Bureau of Land Management, Office of Surface Mining, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Transportation, and Department of Defense (Navy and US Army Corps of Engineers). At the state level, agencies involved in watershed management typically include departments of natural resources or the environment, public health agencies, and forestry and recreation agencies. Locally, numerous agencies are involved, including regional planning entities such as councils of governments, as well as local departments of environment, health, and recreation who frequently have strong interests in watershed projects.

## *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program*

Since inception of the NPDES program under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the EPA and the authorized states have developed relationships with various federal agencies to implement pollution controls for point sources. The EPA has worked with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service on consultation for protection of endangered species. The EPA has worked with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on National Historic Preservation Act implementation. The EPA and the states rely on monitoring data from the U.S. Geological Survey to help inform pollution control decisions. The agency also has worked closely with the Small Business Administration and the Office of Management and Budget to ensure that regulatory programs are fair and reasonable. The agency has coordinated with NOAA on efforts to ensure that NPDES programs support coastal and national estuary efforts and with the Department of the Interior on mining issues. The agency also has coordinated with the Federal Highway Administration to reduce the impacts of stormwater from roads.

## *Community Water Priorities/Urban Waters*

In response to stakeholder feedback, the EPA has worked with thirteen federal agencies, since 2010, to implement the Urban Waters Federal Partnership. Agencies include:

- Department of the Interior
- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Commerce – National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
- Department of Commerce – Economic Development Administration
- Army Corps of Engineers
- Department of Transportation
- Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Department of Health and Human Services – Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

- Department of Health and Human Services – National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
- Corporation for National and Community Service
- Department of Education
- Department of Energy
- Federal Emergency Management Agency

This partnership seeks to help communities transform overlooked urban waters into treasured centerpieces and drivers of urban revival.

#### *Clean Water State Revolving Fund*

The EPA's State Revolving Fund program has worked with, as appropriate, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to foster collaboration on jointly funded infrastructure projects. In many states, coordination committees have been established with representatives from the three programs.

In implementation of the Indian set-aside grant program under Title VI of the Clean Water Act, the EPA has worked closely with the Indian Health Service to administer grant funds to the various Indian tribes, including determination of the priority ranking system for the various wastewater needs in Indian Country. The EPA and U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development have partnered to provide coordinated financial and technical assistance to tribes.

#### *Federal Agency Partnerships on Impaired Waters Restoration Planning*

The federal government owns about 30 percent of the land in the United States and administers over 90 percent of these public lands through four agencies: Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, and the Bureau of Land Management. In managing these extensive public lands, federal agencies have a substantial influence on the protection and restoration of many waters of the United States. Land management agencies' focus on water issues has increased significantly, with the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Land Management all initiating new water quality and watershed protection efforts. The EPA has been conducting joint national assessments with these agencies to enhance watershed protection and quantify restoration needs on federal lands. The EPA's joint national assessments of Fish and Wildlife Service and Forest Service properties already have documented the extent and type of impaired waters within and near these agencies' lands, developed GIS databases, reported national summary statistics, and developed interactive reference products (on any scale, local to national), accessible to staff throughout the agencies. The Forest Service has worked with the EPA on designating the third national update of the co-occurrence of impaired waters and National Forest lands. These assessments already have influenced the agencies in positive ways. The Forest Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service have performance measures that involve impaired waters. The Forest Service used their national assessment data to institute improvements in a national monitoring and Best Management Practices training program as well as develop a watershed condition framework for proactively implementing restoration on priority National Forest and Grassland watersheds. Also, under a Memorandum of Agreement between the EPA and Forest Service, numerous aquatic restoration projects are being carried out. The Fish and Wildlife Service is using their national

assessment data to inform agency planning on water conservation, quality, and quantity monitoring and management in the National Wildlife Refuge System, and also is using the assessment in National Fish Hatcheries System planning and their Contaminants Program. The EPA assessments and datasets are making significant contributions to the government-wide National Fish Habitat Action Partnership national assessment of fish habitat condition and the restoration and protection efforts of 17 regional Fish Habitat Partnerships.

### *Monitoring and Assessment of Nation's Waters*

The EPA has worked with federal, state, and Tribal partners to strengthen water monitoring programs to support a range of management needs and to develop tools to improve how we manage and share water data and report environmental results. The EPA's Monitoring and Assessment Partnership is a forum for the EPA, states, tribes, and interstate organizations to collaborate on key program directions for assessing the condition of the nation's waters in a nationally consistent and representative manner. The EPA is co-chair, along with U.S. Geological Survey, of the National Water Quality Monitoring Council, a national forum for scientific discussion of strategies and technologies to improve water quality monitoring and data sharing. The council membership includes other federal agencies, state and Tribal agencies, non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, and the private sector.

Under a Memorandum of Understanding, the EPA and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) developed and are now operating the national Water Data Portal, a web portal serving data from the USGS and the EPA ambient water quality data warehouses in a common format through the internet. The EPA has an Interagency Agreement with the USGS for the development of NHDPlus version 2, which is complete for the lower 48 states. The EPA also has collaborated with USGS and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Park Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service on implementation, analysis, and/or on analysis and interpretation of the results of the National Aquatic Resource Surveys.

### *Wetlands*

The EPA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resource Conservation Service and U.S. Forest Service, and Federal Highway Administration have coordinated on a range of wetlands activities. These activities include: studying and reporting on wetlands trends in the United States, diagnosing causes of coastal wetland loss, statistically surveying the condition of the nation's wetlands, and developing methods for better protecting wetland function. Coastal wetlands are a focus area of current interagency wetlands collaboration. The agencies meet and are conducting a series of coastal wetlands reviews to identify causes and prospective tools and approaches to address the 84,100 acre loss over five years in marine and estuarine wetlands that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service documented in the 2011 "Status and Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous United States: 2004 to 2009" report. Additionally, the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have worked very closely together in implementing the regulatory program under Clean Water Act Section 404. Under the regulatory program, the agencies have coordinated closely on overall implementation of the permitting decisions made annually under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, through the headquarters offices as well as

the ten EPA Regional Offices and 38 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District Offices. The agencies also have coordinated closely on policy development, training, development of technical tools for field use, litigation, and implementing the Executive Order on Infrastructure Permitting. The EPA also works with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on regulatory matters involving permits. The EPA and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are committed to achieving the goal of no net loss of wetlands under the Clean Water Act Section 404 program.

### *Research*

While EPA is the federal agency mandated to ensure safe drinking water, other federal and non-federal entities conduct research that complements the EPA's research on priority contaminants in drinking water. For example, the CDC and NIEHS conduct health effects and exposure research. FDA also performs research on children's risks.

Many of these research activities have been conducted in collaboration with EPA scientists. The private sector, particularly the water treatment industry, is conducting research in such areas as analytical methods, treatment technologies, and the development and maintenance of water resources. Cooperative research efforts have been ongoing with the American Water Works Association, Water Research Foundation, and other stakeholders to coordinate drinking water research. The EPA has worked with USGS to evaluate performance of newly developed methods for measuring microbes in potential drinking water sources.

The EPA has developed joint research initiatives with NOAA and USGS for linking monitoring data and field study information with available toxicity data and assessment models for developing sediment criteria.

### **Land and Emergency Management Programs**

#### *Brownfields*

The EPA's Brownfields and Land Revitalization Programs have been key participants in the HUD-DOT-EPA Sustainable Communities Partnership to promote livability and sustainable development. The EPA's Brownfields program also has partnered with the Department of Labor and National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) to support environmental workforce development and fund job training and placement programs in brownfield communities. The Brownfields and Land Revitalization programs have worked with USDA, HHS, and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) to identify ways in which federal programs can increase food access in all communities and ensure access to quality health care. Improved access to healthy food and health care services can catalyze redevelopment that contributes to healthier and more sustainable communities. The Brownfields and Land Revitalization programs also have partnered with the National Park Service and its River and Trails Program to support Groundwork USA and individual Groundwork teams in their efforts to engage youth in community revitalization. The EPA has led the Brownfields Federal Partnership, which includes more than 20 federal agencies dedicated to the cleanup and redevelopment of brownfields properties. Partner agencies have worked together to prevent, assess, safely clean up, and redevelop brownfields.

The EPA has worked with other federal agencies whose decisions, rules, investments, and policies influence where and how development occurs, including working with the General Services Administration (GSA) to assist in the development and inclusion of metrics into GSA tools for evaluating lease opportunities according to each building's level of transit access and proximity to walkable destinations. Additionally, the EPA and GSA have partnered to provide technical assistance to communities to integrate the siting of new federal facilities or reuse of existing facilities into neighborhood-wide efforts to improve community sustainability.

The EPA has provided support to other federal agencies, such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture, for activities including jointly delivering technical assistance to rural Appalachian communities and proposing language that supports both economic development and better environmental outcomes in grant solicitations and other guidance documents. This assistance has helped these agencies and the communities they work with protect the environment and increase resilience through their community development programs, policies, regulations, and resources, while meeting their core agency objectives. The EPA has collaborated with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Federal Emergency Management Agency to expand efforts to deliver targeted assistance to communities recovering from natural disasters.

To improve the accessibility of federal and state resources for communities, the EPA recently launched its Community Resources website ([www.epa.gov/communities](http://www.epa.gov/communities)). This site brings together some of the federal government's best web-based tools for providing environmental information to large and small communities. For example, the National Resource Network, a significant effort by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to help American cities meet economic challenges, is a core component of the Community Resources website. This site also provides a means of disseminating the important work of the Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities, as described above.

The EPA also has co-sponsored the Governor's Institute on Community Design with HUD and DOT. The institute works with governors and their cabinets to help states plan for extreme weather events and improve environmental and public health outcomes of community development.

### *Economically Distressed Communities*

The EPA has brought expertise on the importance of downtown revitalization, the use of green infrastructure strategies, green demolition, and sustainable development strategies to the federal government to help economically distressed communities. The EPA's work has positively impacted the work of HUD, DOT, Commerce, HHS, Homeland Security, the Small Business Administration, Justice, Labor, and many other agencies and departments.

### *Research*

Research in ecosystems protection has been coordinated government-wide through the Committee on Environment, Natural Resources, and Sustainability (CENRS). The EPA has actively participated in the CENRS and all work is fully consistent with, and complementary to, other Committee member activities. EPA scientists have staffed two CENRS Subcommittees: the Subcommittee on Ecological Systems (SES) and the Subcommittee on Water Availability and Quality (SWAQ). The EPA has initiated discussions, within the SES, on the subject of ecosystem



goods and services (EGS) and potential EGS collaborations are being explored with the U.S. Geological Service (USGS) and with USDA Forest Service (USFS). Within SWAQ, the Safe and Sustainable Water Resources (SSWR) research program has contributed to an initiative for a comprehensive census of water availability and quality, including the use of Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program methods and ongoing surveys (National Aquatic Surveys) as data sources. In addition, the EPA has taken a lead role with USGS in preparing a SWAQ document outlining new challenges for integrated management of water resources, including strategic needs for monitoring and modeling methods, and identifying water requirements needed to support the ecological integrity of aquatic ecosystems.

Consistent with the broad scope of the EPA's ecosystem research efforts, the EPA has had complementary and joint programs with USFS, USGS, USDA, NOAA, BLM, NGOs, and many others specifically to minimize duplication, maximize scope, and maintain a real time information flow. For example, all of these organizations have worked together to produce the National Land Cover Data used by all landscape ecologists nationally. Each has contributed funding, services, and research to this uniquely successful effort.

The EPA has expended substantial effort coordinating its research with other federal agencies, including work with DoD in its Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) and the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program, DOE, and its Office of Health and Environmental Research. The EPA also has conducted collaborative laboratory research with DoD, DOE, DOI (particularly USGS), and NASA to improve characterization and risk management options for dealing with subsurface contamination.

The agency has worked with NIEHS, which manages a large basic research program focusing on Superfund issues, to advance fundamental Superfund research. The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) also has provided critical health-based information to assist the EPA in making effective cleanup decisions. The EPA has worked with these agencies on collaborative projects, information exchange, and identification of research issues and has a MOU with each agency. The EPA, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and U.S. Navy signed a MOU to increase collaboration and coordination in contaminated sediments research. Additionally, the Interstate Technology Regulatory Council (ITRC) has been an effective forum for coordinating federal and state activities and for defining continuing research needs through its teams on topics including permeable reactive barriers, radionuclides, and Brownfields. The EPA has developed a MOU<sup>1</sup> with several other agencies (DOE, DoD, NRC, USGS, NOAA, and USDA) for multimedia modeling research and development.

Other research efforts involving coordination include the unique controlled-spill field research facility designed in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation. Geophysical research experiments and development of software for subsurface characterization and detection of contaminants have been conducted with the USGS and DOE's Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information, please go to: Interagency Steering Committee on Multimedia Environmental Models MOU, <http://www.iscmem.org/Memorandum.htm>.

The EPA has coordinated with DoD's SERDP in an ongoing partnership, especially in the areas of sustainability research and of incorporating materials lifecycle analysis into the manufacturing process for weapons and military equipment. The EPA has collaborated with the Army as part of their Net Zero Initiative, to develop and demonstrate innovative waste technologies to accomplish the Army's goal of net zero energy, water, and waste by 2020.

Several federal agencies sponsor research on variability and susceptibility in risks from exposure to environmental contaminants. The EPA has collaborated with a number of the Institutes within the NIH and CDC. For example, NIEHS conducts multi-disciplinary biomedical research programs, prevention and intervention efforts, and communication strategies. The NIEHS program includes an effort to study the effects of chemicals, including pesticides and other toxics, on children. The EPA has collaborated with NIEHS in supporting the Centers for Children's Environmental Health and Disease Prevention, which study whether and how environmental factors play a role in children's health and with the National Institute on Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) on the development and implementation of the National Children's Study. Additionally, the EPA, the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities (NIMHD), NIEHS, and NICHD co-fund the Centers of Excellence for Research on Environmental Health Disparities. This funding has broadened research on disadvantaged communities and the impacts of greater exposures of ambient hazards.

#### *Superfund Remedial Program*

The Superfund Remedial program has coordinated with several other federal agencies, such as ATSDR and NIEHS, in providing numerous Superfund related services in order to accomplish the program's mission.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers substantially contributes to Superfund site cleanups by providing a wide range of technical, management, and acquisition support functions to implement or oversee responsible party Superfund project implementation for the remedial and removal programs. Most notably, this federal partner has the technical design, construction expertise, and contracting capability needed to assist the EPA's regional Superfund programs in implementing complex Superfund remedial action projects.

This agency also provides technical on-site support to the EPA's Regional Offices in the enforcement oversight of numerous construction projects performed by private Potentially Responsible Parties.

#### *Superfund Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Program*

The Superfund Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse program has coordinated with federal agencies, states, tribes, state associations, and others to implement its statutory responsibilities to ensure protective and efficient cleanup and reuse of federally contaminated land on the National Priorities List (NPL). The program has facilitated early transfer of property and provided technical and regulatory oversight at federal facilities to ensure human health and the environment are protected. The program has worked with federal partners to target high priority sites, to consider best practices to develop innovative solutions to emerging and unique contaminants, and

implement strategies to address the remaining Federal Facility Superfund sites that have not reached cleanup completion.

To ensure the long-term protectiveness of remedies, the agency will continue monitoring, overseeing progress, and improving the quality and consistency of five-year reviews being conducted at federal facility NPL sites where waste has been left in place and land use is restricted. Five-year reviews are required under Section 121(c) of CERCLA and the EPA's role is to concur or make its own independent protectiveness finding. The EPA has worked collaboratively with DoD, DOE, and DOI, through a Federal Workgroup, to improve the technical quality, timeliness, and cost of the five-year review reports and to ensure that the community is aware of the protectiveness of the remedy. The workgroup assesses the use of best management practices and evaluates trend data to improve the five-year review process.

The EPA has participated with other federal agencies on the Federal Mining Dialogue (FMD). The FMD is a cooperative initiative among federal environmental and land management agencies. It provides a national level forum for federal agencies to identify and discuss lessons learned and technical mining impact issues associated with the cleanup and reuse of abandoned and inactive hard rock and abandoned uranium mines across the country. The EPA Abandoned Mine Lands Program has coordinated through the agency's National Mining Team (NMT). The EPA's NMT has representatives on each of the FMD workgroups: Data Standards, Best Practices, Cost Recovery, and Watershed Strategy.

The EPA also has participated with other federal agencies on the Munitions Response Dialogue (MRD). The MRD is a multi-agency dialogue with EPA, DoD, Federal Land Managers, and states to identify and discuss issues arising from munitions site cleanups throughout the country.

The EPA and DoD have participated on the Intergovernmental Data Quality Task Force (IDQTF). The IDQTF was established to address real and perceived inconsistencies and deficiencies in quality control for laboratory data within and across governmental organizations which result in greater costs, time delays, and an increase in the potential for risks. The task force is working to ensure that environmental data are of known and documented quality and suitable for their intended uses.

The Superfund Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse program has developed and implemented innovative technologies, processes, and collaboration efforts. By working in concert with other federal agencies, the EPA has promoted the advancement of cleanup technologies, expansion of contaminated land reuse to support renewable energy projects, and multiple initiatives to support sustainability. These projects not only help support the agency's goal to cleanup communities, but they also facilitate the introduction of innovative solutions to both the public and private sector.

#### *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Program*

The RCRA Corrective Action program has coordinated closely with other federal agencies, primarily the DoD and DOE, which have many sites in the corrective action universe. Encouraging federal facilities to meet the RCRA Corrective Action program's goals of investigating and cleaning up hazardous releases remains a top priority. The EPA also has coordinated with other

agencies, primarily DoD, on cleanup and disposal issues posed by polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), under authority of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).

### *Emergency Preparedness and Response*

The EPA plays a major role in reducing the risks that accidental and intentional releases of harmful substances and oil pose to human health and the environment. The EPA implements the Emergency Preparedness program in coordination with the DHS through the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) acting as the chair for the National Response Team and co-chair for each Regional Response Team. These teams, which have member participation from other key federal agencies, deliver federal assistance to state, local, and Tribal governments to plan for and respond to natural disasters and other major environmental incidents. This requires coordination with many federal, state, and local agencies. The agency participates with other federal agencies to develop national planning and implementation policies at the operational level.

The National Response Framework (NRF), under the direction of the DHS, provides for the delivery of federal assistance to states to help them deal with the consequences of terrorist events, acts of malfeasance, as well as natural and other significant disasters. The EPA has maintained the lead responsibility for the NRF's Emergency Support Function #10 covering inland hazardous materials and petroleum releases and participates in the Federal Emergency Support Function Leaders Group which addresses NRF planning and implementation at the operational level.

The EPA has coordinated its preparedness activities with DHS, FEMA, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other federal agencies, states, and local governments. The EPA will continue to clarify its roles and responsibilities to ensure that agency security programs are consistent with the national homeland security strategy.

The EPA also has worked with FEMA on hazard mitigation and recovery through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). This MOA has allowed the EPA and FEMA to collaborate on policies, as well as with other agencies like NOAA, HUD, and DOT, to help communities become more resilient to natural disasters (to date, the EPA has worked in communities in Iowa, North Carolina, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Vermont, and others).

### *Oil Spills*

Under the Oil Spill Program, the EPA has worked with other federal agencies, such as U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), NOAA, FEMA, DOI, DOT, DOE, and other federal agencies and states, as well as with local government authorities to develop Area Contingency Plans. The Department of Justice also has provided assistance to agencies with judicial referrals when enforcement of violations becomes necessary. In addition, the EPA and the USCG work in coordination to address oil spills nationwide.

### *Strengthen Human Health and Environmental Protection in Indian Country*

The EPA has a long history of working with other federal agencies to address shared environmental and human health concerns. The EPA, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Health

and Human Services, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development have worked through several Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) as partners to improve infrastructure on tribal lands.

All five federal partners renewed their commitment to the Infrastructure Task Force in 2013 by signing an MOU to continue federal coordination in delivering services to tribal communities. The Infrastructure Task Force has built on prior partner successes, including improved access to funding and reduced administrative burden for Tribal communities through the review and streamlining of agency policies, regulations, and directives as well as improved coordination of technical assistance to water service providers and solid waste managers through regular coordination meetings and web-based tools.

### **Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention Programs**

The EPA has coordinated with and used information from many federal departments and agencies, as well as many state Departments/Agencies and international organizations, in efforts to protect America's health and environment from unacceptable risks from pesticides and toxic chemicals. The EPA's activities include collaboration with individual government organizations on specific technical or regulatory issues and more broadly with groups of organizations on a range of issues. Many of these activities are described below.

To fulfill the EPA's responsibilities for regulating the sale and use of pesticides, the agency has used a range of outreach and coordination approaches for pesticide users and other stakeholders, government agencies, and the general public. Outreach and coordination activities through field programs have been essential to effective implementation of regulatory decisions governing the sale and use of pesticides. Coordination activities have protected workers and the environment, including endangered species, provided training for pesticide applicators, promoted integrated pest management and environmental stewardship, supported compliance through the EPA's Regional programs and those of the states and tribes, and promoted international cooperation.

The EPA's coordination with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and state lead agencies for pesticides has supported the Certification and Training program for pesticide applicators who use the riskiest pesticides. States also play an important role in developing and implementing Worker Protection programs and are involved in numerous special projects and investigations, including emergency response efforts. The EPA's Regional Offices have provided technical guidance and assistance to the states and tribes in the implementation of all pesticide program activities.

In addition to the training that the EPA provides to farm workers and applicators of restricted use pesticides, the EPA has worked with the USDA's Cooperative Extension Service designing and delivering specialized training for various groups. Such training has included instructing private applicators on the proper use of personal protective equipment and application equipment calibration, handling spill and injury situations, farm family safety, preventing pesticide spray drift, and pesticide and container disposal. Other specialized training has been provided to public works employees on grounds maintenance, to pest control operators on proper insect identification, and on weed control for agribusiness.

The EPA has relied on data from HHS and USDA to supplement data from the pesticide industry to help the agency assess the potential risks of pesticides in the diets of adults and children. The EPA has relied on pesticide residue data in food commodities generated by USDA in its Pesticide Data Program to improve its dietary risk assessment of pesticides. These data and those from other sources, including FDA, have helped the EPA achieve its mission of protecting human health. These data sources have served as a showcase for federal cooperation on pesticide and food safety issues. Other collaborative efforts have included developing and validating methods to analyze domestic and imported food samples for chemicals of concern, such as carcinogens and neurotoxins. The agency also has coordinated with FDA's National Toxicology Program and HHS' Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, and the National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences on a variety of technical and communication issues.

While the EPA is responsible for making pesticide registration and tolerance decisions, primary responsibility for pesticide enforcement activities under FIFRA rests with the states. The FDA enforces tolerances for pesticide residues in most foods and the USDA enforces tolerances for meat, poultry, and some egg products. These joint efforts protect Americans from unhealthy pesticide residue levels.

In addition to a focus on protecting humans from pesticide risks, the EPA has been engaged with other government agencies on many important environmental issues. The agency has collaborated extensively with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service on developing methods for assessing potential risks to endangered and threatened species and in developing approaches to mitigate unacceptable risks. The EPA also has worked with USDA and many other federal agencies, state agencies, and other entities to address risks to honey bees and other pollinators that are critical to our environment and the production of food crops.

The EPA has worked to promote improved health and environmental protection domestically and, when feasible, in other countries. This includes coordination not only with other countries, but also with international organizations such as the North American Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC). The EPA has cooperated with governments in other countries bilaterally or through treaties or other formal agreements.

The EPA has developed a strong network of government, private sector, and non-governmental partners working to achieve reductions in global mercury use and emissions, particularly when adverse U.S. impacts would be likely. The EPA has worked closely with the Department of State in leading the technical and policy engagement for the United States in the Minamata Convention on Mercury. The EPA provided the impetus for UNEP's Global Mercury Partnership and the agency has worked with developing and other developed countries in the context of that program. In addition to the Department of State, the EPA has collaborated closely with several federal agencies including DOE and USGS. As the agency prepares for implementation of the Minamata Convention, the EPA has continued to support the Global Mercury Partnership and sharing of information through the Arctic Council on reducing releases of mercury which disproportionately impact indigenous arctic communities.

The EPA has collaborated with the Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, USDA, FDA, and other federal and state organizations on a variety of technical and policy homeland security issues. These issues focus on protecting the public and food and agriculture sectors from threats associated with use of chemical and biological agents. The EPA has collaborated with these organizations on research pertaining to effective disinfectants for high threat microorganisms, planning for response to various potential incidents, training, and development of policies and guidelines. The EPA has continued to partner with OSHA, NIOSH, and CPSP on risk assessment and risk mitigation activities.

One of the agency's most valuable resources on pesticide issues has been the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC), a representative Federal Advisory Committee, which brings together a broad cross-section of knowledgeable individuals from organizations representing divergent views to discuss pesticide regulatory, policy, and implementation issues. The PPDC consists of members from federal and state government agencies, industry/trade associations, pesticide user and commodity groups, consumer and environmental/public interest groups, and others. The PPDC has provided a structured environment for meaningful information exchanges and consensus building discussions, keeping the public involved in decisions that affect them. Dialogue with outside groups is essential if the agency is to remain responsive to the needs of the affected public, growers, and industry organizations.

To effectively participate in international agreements on chemicals (e.g., persistent organic pollutants (POPs), mercury, and heavy metals), the EPA has continued to coordinate with other federal agencies and external stakeholders, such as Congressional staff, industry, and environmental groups. Similarly, the agency typically coordinates with the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) National Toxicology Program, the Centers for Disease Control/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (CDC/ATSDR), the National Institute of Environmental Health Services (NIEHS), and the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) on matters relating to OECD test guideline harmonization.

As part of the EPA's chemical safety program, the agency is implementing the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), as amended by the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act, signed into law on June 22, 2016. The EPA will conduct existing chemical prioritization and evaluations under the provisions of TSCA, as amended, and address any unreasonable risks identified through such evaluations. In 2016, following enactment of the new law, the agency established a senior leaders forum to consult with other federal agencies on its implementation of prioritization, risk evaluations and management mandates, including data sharing of uses, exposures, and hazard data. Participants include the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Defense (DoD), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) in the Department of Labor, and the Consumer Products Safety Commission (CPSC). These consultations on chemicals of common interest foster improved communication and coordination on scientific, health, and regulatory issues.

In implementing TSCA as amended, the EPA also has been seeking input from other federal agencies to help inform the agency's efforts through the newly formed interagency Committee on Toxicity Assessment (CTA) that operates under the CENRS. Additionally, the EPA frequently consults with these agencies on project design, progress, and the results of chemical testing projects. The EPA also consults with these other agencies on their testing and monitoring programs and incorporates them, as appropriate, into chemical assessment and risk reduction activities. These technical discussions inform and keep current the federal network on cross-agency technical understandings and support the senior leader consultations.

The EPA's Toxics Program is committed to fulfillment of all of EPA's Indian Policies and adhering to the Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention Program's Tribal Strategic Plan. The program has participated in the EPA's meetings with the National Tribal Operations Committee (NTOC) and other Tribal engagement groups on a wide variety of related activities and actions that impact Tribal governments, lands, and communities. Some of the most recent outreach and consultation efforts have focused on proposed regulatory actions for trichloroethylene (TCE), and paint removers methylene chloride and n-methylpyrrolidone (NMP), assessments of TSCA Work Plan chemicals, and other chemical issues such as PCB use. In addition, the National Tribal Toxics Council (NTTC) provides tribes with an opportunity for offering advice on the development of EPA chemical management programs that affect tribes, policies, and activities. The EPA has met with the NTTC in person twice per year and conducts monthly teleconferences with its members.

### *Research*

The EPA's Toxicity Forecaster (ToxCast<sup>TM</sup>) is part of an ongoing multi-agency effort under the Tox21 collaboration MOU. Tox21 has pooled chemical research, data, and screening tools from multiple federal agencies including the EPA, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). ToxCast has utilized existing resources to develop faster, more thorough predictions of how chemicals will affect human and environmental health. Tox21 and ToxCast are currently screening nearly 10,000 environmental chemicals for potential toxicity in high-throughput screening assays at the NIH Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS). The EPA also has an agreement to provide NCATS funding to support the effort.

The EPA recently announced the public release of chemical screening data on 1,800 chemicals that was gathered through advanced techniques, including robotics and high-throughput screening, as part of the ongoing Tox21 federal collaboration to improve chemical screening.

Health Canada and EPA have collaborated to explore approaches for using new data streams to assess chemicals for potential risks to human health. Health Canada is currently under a regulatory mandate to develop Chemical Management Plan 3 (CMP3). The chemicals in CMP3 include chemicals lacking traditional toxicity data. Health Canada is working with EPA CSS to determine how to use high-throughput screening data and other types of non-traditional chemical data to help fill the data gaps for the chemicals in CMP3.



The EPA has coordinated its nanotechnology research with other federal agencies through the National Nanotechnology Initiative (NNI),<sup>2</sup> which is managed under the Subcommittee on Nanoscale Science, Engineering, and Technology (NSET) of the NSTC Committee on Technology (CoT). The EPA has collaborated with many federal agencies in the development of a government-wide approach to nanotechnology research through the Committee on Environment, Natural Resources, and Sustainability Charter (CENRS) at the White House's Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). The EPA and the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) have collaborated to develop protocols to assess the potential release of nanomaterials from consumer products; develop credible rules for consumer product testing to evaluate exposure; and determine potential public health impacts of nanomaterial used in consumer products.

The EPA has coordinated its research on endocrine disruptors with other federal agencies through the interagency working group on endocrine disruptors under the auspices of the Toxics and Risk Subcommittee of the CENRS. The EPA has coordinated its biotechnology research through the interagency biotechnology research working group and the agricultural biotechnology risk analysis working group of the Biotechnology Subcommittee of NSTC's Committee on Science.

The EPA has consulted extensively with other federal agencies about the science of individual IRIS assessments, as well as improvements to the IRIS program, through an interagency working group including public health agencies (e.g., CDC, ATSDR, NIOSH, and NIEHS), many other agencies (e.g., DOD, NASA, SBA, DOT, DOE, DOI, etc.), and White House offices (OMB, OSTP, and CEQ). The EPA also has coordinated with ATSDR through a memorandum of understanding on the development of toxicological reviews and toxicology profiles, respectively. The EPA has contracted with the National Academy of Sciences' National Research Council (NRC) on very difficult and complex human health risk assessments through consultation or review. The NRC currently is conducting a comprehensive review of the IRIS assessment development process, including EPA's recent enhancements.

Homeland Security research has been conducted in collaboration with numerous agencies, leveraging funding across multiple programs to produce synergistic results. The EPA's Homeland Security Research Program has worked closely with the DHS to assure that the EPA, in its role as a supporting agency responsible for cleanup during a Stafford Act declaration under ESF-10 and as the lead agency for water infrastructure, has the science to back decisions. Recognizing that the DoD has significant expertise and facilities related to biological and chemical warfare agents, the EPA has worked closely with the Edgewood Chemical and Biological Center (ECBC), the Technical Support Working Group, the Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Air Force, and other Department of Defense organizations to address areas of mutual interest and concern related to both cleanup and water infrastructure protection. To identify and support these collaborations, the EPA has participated in a tri-agency research partnership (Technical Coordination Working Group – TCWG) with the Departments of Defense (DoD) and Homeland Security (DHS) that focuses on chemical and biological defense needs and gaps as they relate to homeland security. TCWG activities include: information sharing, joint science and technology research projects, and complementing policies. These efforts have improved the preparedness of the U.S. domestic authorities to detect, deter, protect against, respond to, and recover from chemical or biological attack. In conducting biological agent research, the EPA also has collaborated with CDC. The

---

<sup>2</sup> For more information, see <<http://www.nano.gov>>.

program also has conducted joint research with USDA and DOI focusing on addressing homeland security threats at the intersection of the environment/public health and agriculture/natural resources. The EPA has worked with DOE to access and conduct research at the DOE's National Laboratories' specialized research facilities.

The HSRP also has consulted with the Water Sector and Government Coordinating Councils of Department of Homeland Security's Critical Infrastructure Partnership Advisory Council to understand the needs of the water sector and provide the latest research to the community. Other critical stakeholders, like the America Water Works Association and Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials, also can benefit from research. HSRP also has worked with state and local emergency response personnel and public health and environmental agencies to better understand their needs and build relationships, which can enable the quick deployment of research products.

### **Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Programs**

The Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Program has coordinated closely with the Department of Justice (DOJ) on all civil and criminal environmental enforcement matters. In addition, the program has coordinated with other agencies on specific environmental issues as described herein.

The Enforcement and Compliance Assurance program has coordinated with the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, OSHA, and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry in preventing and responding to accidental releases and endangerment situations. Additionally, the program has coordinated with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) on Tribal issues relative to compliance with environmental laws on Tribal lands and with the Small Business Administration (SBA) on the implementation of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA). The program also has shared information with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) on cases that require defendants to pay civil penalties, thereby assisting the IRS in assuring compliance with tax laws. In addition, it has collaborated with the SBA to maintain current environmental compliance information at Business.gov, a website initiated as an e-government initiative in 2004, to help small businesses comply with government regulations. Coordination also has occurred with the United States Army Corps of Engineers on wetlands issues.

The United States Department of Agriculture/Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA/NRCS) has had a major role in determining whether areas on agricultural lands meet the definition of wetlands for purposes of the Food Security Act and civil enforcement works with them as necessary. The EPA's Enforcement and Compliance Assurance program also has coordinated with USDA on the regulation of animal feeding operations and on food safety issues arising from the misuse of pesticides and shares joint jurisdiction with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) on pesticide labeling and advertising. The EPA has worked with Customs and Border Protection on implementing the secure International Trade Data System across all federal agencies and on pesticide imports and on hazardous waste and Cathode Ray Tube exports. The EPA and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) share jurisdiction over general-purpose disinfectants used on non-critical surfaces and some dental and medical equipment surfaces. The

EPA and FDA also have collaborated and shared information on Good Laboratory Program inspections to avoid duplication of inspections and maximize efficient use of limited resources. The agency has entered into an agreement with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) concerning enforcement of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) lead-based paint notification requirements. The agency has coordinated with the U.S. Coast Guard, under the Act, to prevent pollution from Ships and on oil spills under the Clean Water Act.

The Criminal Enforcement program has coordinated with other federal law enforcement agencies (i.e., Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Customs, DOL, U.S. Treasury, USCG, DOI, and DOJ) and with international, state, and local law enforcement organizations in the investigation and prosecution of environmental crimes. The EPA also has actively worked with DOJ to establish task forces that bring together federal, state, and local law enforcement organizations to address environmental crimes. In addition, the program has an Interagency Agreement with the DHS to provide specialized criminal environmental training to federal, state, local, and Tribal law enforcement personnel at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Glynco, GA.

Executive Order 12088 on Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards, directs the EPA to monitor compliance by federal agencies with all environmental laws. The Federal Facility Enforcement program has coordinated with other federal agencies, states, local, and Tribal governments to ensure compliance by federal agencies with all environmental laws. The EPA also has supported the FedCenter, the Federal Facilities Environmental Stewardship and Compliance Assistance Center ([www.fedcenter.gov](http://www.fedcenter.gov)), which is now governed by a board of more than a dozen contributing federal agencies.

The Enforcement and Compliance Assurance program has collaborated closely with the states and tribes. States perform the vast majority of inspections, direct compliance assistance, and enforcement actions for many of the EPA's environmental programs. The core federal environmental statutes envision a partnership between the EPA and the states under which the EPA develops national standards and policies and the states implement the program under authority by the EPA. If a state does not seek approval of a program, the EPA must implement that program in the state. Historically, the level of state approvals has increased as programs mature and state capacity expands. Nearly all states are authorized for the core water, air, and hazardous waste programs. The EPA has coordinated with states on training, compliance assistance, capacity building, and enforcement. The EPA has worked to enhance the network of state and Tribal compliance assistance providers.

The EPA has worked directly with Canada and Mexico bilaterally and in the Trilateral Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC). The EPA's border activities require close coordination with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the DOJ, the Department of State, and the states of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas. The EPA is the lead agency and coordinates U.S. participation in the CEC. The EPA has worked with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the U.S. Geological Survey on CEC projects to promote biodiversity cooperation and with the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative to reduce potential trade and environmental impacts such as invasive species.

The Enforcement and Compliance Assurance program, together with the EPA's International program, has provided training and capacity building to foreign governments to improve their compliance and enforcement programs. This support has helped create a level playing field for U.S. businesses engaged in global competition, helped other countries improve their environmental conditions, and ensured U.S. compliance with obligations for environmental cooperation as outlined in various free trade agreements. In support of these activities, the EPA has worked closely with the Department of State, selected U.S. Embassies, the USAID, the USTR, the DOJ, the International Law Enforcement Academies, the U.S. Forest Service, and the DOI. The EPA also has participated in the OECD Mutual Acceptance of Data program designed to garner international recognition of testing data in support of pesticides and chemical registrations.

### *Superfund Enforcement*

As required by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and Executive Order 12580 on Superfund Implementation, the Enforcement and Compliance Assurance program has coordinated with other federal agencies in their use of CERCLA enforcement authority. This includes the coordinated use of CERCLA enforcement authority at individual hazardous waste sites that are located on both nonfederal land (EPA jurisdiction) and federal lands (other agency jurisdiction). As required by Executive Order 13016, amending Executive Order 12580, the agency also reviews and concurs on the use of CERCLA Section 106 authority by other departments and agencies.

The EPA also has coordinated with Natural Resource Trustees (DOI, USDA, Commerce, DOE, and DOD) to ensure that appropriate and timely notices, required under CERCLA, are sent to the Natural Resource Trustees to commence the Natural Resource Damage Assessment process. The EPA also has coordinated natural resource damage assessments, investigations, and planning with the Trustees. The DOJ also has provided assistance to the EPA with judicial referrals seeking recovery of response costs incurred by the U.S., injunctive relief to implement response actions, or enforcement of other CERCLA requirements.

Under Executive Order 12580, the EPA's Superfund Federal Facilities Enforcement program has assisted federal agencies in complying with CERCLA and ensured that: 1) all federal facility sites on the National Priorities List have interagency agreements, also known as Federal Facility Agreements with enforceable cleanup schedules; 2) FFAs are monitored for compliance; 3) federal sites are transferred to new owners in an environmentally responsible manner; and 4) compliance assistance is available to the extent possible. This program also ensures that federal agencies comply with Superfund cleanup obligations "in the same manner and to the same extent" as private entities. To enable the cleanup and reuse of such sites, the Federal Facilities Enforcement program also has coordinated creative solutions that protect both human health and the environment. These enforcement solutions help restore facilities so they can once again serve an important role in the economy and welfare of local communities and the country.

## Coordination with Other Federal Agencies

### Enabling Support Programs

#### Office of the Administrator (OA)

The OA supports the leadership of the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) programs and activities to protect human health and safeguard the air, water, and land upon which life depends. Several program responsibilities include congressional and intergovernmental relations, regulatory management and economic analysis, program evaluation, intelligence coordination, the Science Advisory Board, children's health, the small business program, environmental training, and outreach.

The EPA's Office of Policy (OP) interacts with a number of federal agencies during its rulemaking activities. Per governing statutes and agency priorities, OP submits "significant" regulatory actions to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for interagency review prior to signature and publication in the *Federal Register*. In addition, OP coordinates the EPA's review of other agency actions submitted to OMB for review. Under the Congressional Review Act, rules are submitted to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. OP reviews, edits, tracks, and submits regulatory actions and other documents that are published by the Office of the Federal Register. For regulations that may have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, OP collaborates extensively with the Small Business Administration and OMB. Finally, OP also leads the EPA's review of draft Executive Orders and Presidential Memoranda.

From time to time, OP collaborates with other federal regulatory and natural resource agencies (e.g., the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Department of Energy (DOE), the Department of the Interior (DOI), and the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)) to collect economic data used in the conduct of economic cost-benefit analyses of environmental regulations and policies and to foster improved interdisciplinary research and reporting of economic information. This is achieved in several ways, such as representing the EPA on interagency workgroups or committees tasked with measuring the economic costs and benefits of federal policies and programs.

OP partners with other federal agencies to improve the quality of federal program evaluation studies that gather empirical evidence to assess whether and why programs achieve outcomes and how programs might be changed to improve results. OP supports forums for experts to share and improve environmental evaluation methodologies and represents the EPA on interagency workgroups geared toward improving federal capacity to conduct or oversee rigorous and objective evaluation studies.

OP supports interagency, government-wide efforts that do not fall within the scope of any single program office. For example, OP is a key participant in government-wide discussions on the application of sustainable purchasing practices in federal acquisitions. In this effort, OP has partnered with acquisition leaders in the USDA, the Department of Defense (DOD), the DOE, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the Department of Homeland Security

(DHS), the General Services Administration (GSA), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and others to ensure that federal spending meets or exceeds federal sustainability requirements. This network of federal procurement professionals is seeking to integrate sustainability into purchasing in a way that makes the process simpler and more effective for all involved.

The Administrator of the EPA and the Secretary of the HHS co-chair the President's Task Force on Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children. The Task Force comprises representatives of 17 federal departments and White House offices. A senior staff steering committee, co-chaired by the Director of the EPA's Children's Health Protection Program, coordinates interagency cooperation on Task Force priority areas. As part of this effort, the program may coordinate with other related agencies to improve federal government-wide support in implementing children's health legislative mandates and children's health outreach. This may include providing children's environmental health expertise on interagency activities and coordinating expertise from program offices.

### **Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO)**

OCFO makes active contributions to standing interagency management committees, including the Chief Financial Officers Council, focusing on improving resources management and accountability throughout the federal government. OCFO actively participates on the Performance Improvement Council, which coordinates and develops strategic plans, performance plans, and performance reports as required by law. In addition, OCFO participates in numerous OMB-led E-Government initiatives such as the Financial Management and Budget Formulation and Execution Lines of Business and has interagency agreements with the DOI's Interior Business Center (IBC) for processing agency payroll.

OCFO provides government-to-government employee relocation services via interagency agreements through the EPA's Federal Employee Relocation Center (FERC) as a Working Capital Fund (WCF) activity. The EPA-FERC provides "one-stop shop" domestic and international relocation services to other federal agencies to increase operational efficiency and save the government money. The EPA-FERC currently provides relocation services internally to all EPA regions and program offices, and externally to the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), Department of Labor (DOL), Office of Personnel Management (OPM), United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Health & Human Services (HHS), and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

OCFO participates with the Bureau of Census in maintaining the Federal Assistance Awards Data System. OCFO also coordinates appropriately with Congress and other federal agencies, such as the Department of Treasury, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and the GSA.

### **Office of Administration and Resources Management (OARM)**

OARM is committed to working with federal partners that focus on improving management and accountability throughout the federal government. OARM provides leadership and expertise to government-wide activities in various areas of human resources, grants management, contracts

management, suspension and debarment, and homeland security. These activities include specific collaboration efforts with federal agencies and departments through:

- Chief Human Capital Officers, a group of senior leaders that discuss human capital initiatives across the federal government.
- The Legislative and Policy Committee, a committee comprised of other federal agency representatives who assist the OPM in developing plans and policies for training and development across the government.
- The Chief Acquisition Officers Council, the principal interagency forum for monitoring and improving the federal acquisition system. The Council also focuses on promoting the President's specific initiatives and policies in all aspects of the acquisition system.
- The Award Committee for E-Government (E-Gov), which provides strategic vision for the portfolio of systems/federal wide supporting both federal acquisition and financial assistance. Support also may be provided to the associated functional community groups, including the Procurement Committee for E-Gov, the Financial Assistance Committee for E-Gov, and the Intergovernmental Transaction Working Group.
- The Interagency Suspension and Debarment Committee (ISDC), a representative committee of federal agency leaders in suspension and debarment. The Committee facilitates lead agency coordination, serves as a forum to discuss current suspension and debarment related issues, and assists in developing unified federal policy. Besides participating in the ISDC, OARM may provide instructors for the National Suspension and Debarment Training Program offered through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.
- The Financial Management Line of Business (FMLoB), which has been expanded to also encompass the Grants Management Line of Business. The combined FMLoB, with the Department of Treasury as the managing partner, will more closely align the financial assistance and financial management communities around effective and efficient management of funds. OARM also participates in the Grants.gov Users' Group, as well as the Federal Demonstration Partnership which is designed to reduce the administrative burdens associated with research grants.
- The Partnership for Sustainable Communities initiative, a collaborative effort with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation, improves the alignment and delivery of grant resources to communities designated under certain environmental programs. It also helps identify cases in the program that may warrant consideration of suspension and debarment.
- The Interagency Committee on Federal Advisory Committee Management (Committee Management Officer Council) provides leadership and coordination on federal advisory committee issues and promotes effective and efficient committee operations government-wide. In addition to serving on the Council, OARM works with the GSA Committee

Management Secretariat to establish and renew advisory committees, conduct annual reviews of advisory committee activities and accomplishments, maintain committee information in a publicly accessible online database, and develop committee management regulations, guidance, and training. Further, OARM participates on the GSA Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) Attorney Council Interagency Workgroup to keep abreast of developments in the statutory language, case law, interpretation, and implementation of the FACA.

In addition, throughout FY 2017 and FY 2018, OARM will continue working with the DOI's IBC, which is an OPM and OMB approved Human Resources Line of Business shared service center. IBC offers HR transactional processing, compensation management and payroll processing, benefits administration, time and attendance, HR reporting, talent acquisition systems, and talent management systems. OARM also continues its charter membership on the OPM HR Line of Business Multi Agency Executive Strategy Committee (MAESC), providing advice and recommendations to the Director of OPM as well as additional government-wide executive leadership, for the implementation of the HR Line of Business vision, goals, and objectives. OARM also is working with OMB, GSA, DHS, and Department of Commerce's National Institute of Standards and Technology to continue to implement the Smart Card program.

### **Office of Environmental Information (OEI)**

To support the EPA's overall mission, OEI collaborates with a number of other federal agencies, states, and Tribal governments on a variety of initiatives, including making government more efficient and transparent, protecting human health and the environment, and assisting in homeland security. OEI is primarily involved in the information technology (IT), information management (IM), and information security aspects of the projects on which it collaborates.

**The Chief Information Officer (CIO) Council:** The CIO Council is the principal interagency forum for improving practices in the design, modernization, use, sharing, and performance of federal information resources. The Council develops recommendations for IT/IM policies, procedures, and standards; identifies opportunities to share information resources; and assesses and addresses the needs of the federal IT workforce.

**eRulemaking:** The EPA serves as the Program Management Office (PMO) for the eRulemaking Program. The eRulemaking Program's mission encompasses two areas: to improve public access, participation in, and understanding of the rulemaking process; and to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of agency partners' notice and comment process when promulgating regulations. The eRulemaking Program maintains a public website, <http://www.regulations.gov/>, which enables the general public to access and submit comments on various documents that are published in the *Federal Register*, including proposed regulations and agency-specific notices. The Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) is the agency side of Regulations.gov. FDMS enables agencies to administer public submissions regarding regulatory and other documents posted by the agencies on the Regulations.gov website. The increased public access to the agencies' regulatory process enables a more informed public to provide supporting technical/legal/economic analyses to strengthen the agencies' rulemaking vehicles. The PMO, located at the EPA, coordinates the operations of the eRulemaking Program through its 40 partner departments and independent



agencies (comprising more than 178 agencies, boards, commissions, and offices). The administrative committee structure works with the PMO on day-to-day operations, ongoing enhancements, and long-range planning for program development. These committees and boards (the Executive Steering Committee and the Advisory Board) have representative members from each partner agency and deal with contracts, budget, website improvements, improved public access, records management, and a host of other regulatory concerns that were formally only agency-specific in nature. Coordination and leadership from the OMB, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, and partner agencies allows for a more uniform and consistent presentation of rulemaking dockets across government. This coordination is further demonstrated by the fact that more than 90 percent of all federal rules promulgated annually are managed through the eRulemaking Program.

**Freedom of Information Act (FOIA):** The EPA serves as the lead for the FOIAonline, a multi-agency solution that enables the EPA and partner agencies to meet their responsibilities under FOIA while creating a repository of publicly released FOIA records for reuse. Through FOIAonline, the public has the ability to submit and track requests, search and download requests and responsive records, correspond with processing staff, and file appeals. Agency users are provided with a secure, login-access web site to receive and store requests, assign and process requests (and refer to other agencies), post responses online, produce the annual FOIA report to the Department of Justice, and manage records electronically. Current federal partners include the EPA, the Department of Commerce, the National Archive and Records Administration, the Merit Systems Protection Board, Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation, Federal Labor Relations Authority, Customs and Border Protection, the Department of the Navy, GSA, Federal Communications Commission, the Small Business Administration, DOJ's Office of Information Policy, the Executive Office of U.S. Attorneys and the Department of Defense's Defense Logistics Agency and its Office of the Inspector General.

**The National Environmental Information Exchange Network (EN):** The EN is a partnership among states, tribes, territories, and the EPA. It revolutionizes the exchange of environmental information by allowing these partners to share data efficiently and securely over the Internet. The EN uses technology, data standards, open-source software, shared services, reusable tools, and applications to provide real-time access to higher quality data. This approach improves data accessibility, streamlines processes, reduces operational costs, and saves time and resources for all of the partners, ultimately leading to improved environmental decision making. Leadership for the EN is provided by the Exchange Network Leadership Council (ENLC), which is co-chaired by the EPA and a state partner. The ENLC works with representatives from the EPA, state, and territorial environmental agencies and Tribal organizations to manage the Exchange Network.

**Automated Commercial Environment/International Trade Data System (ACE/ITDS):** ITDS is the electronic information exchange capability, or "single window," through which businesses will transmit data required by participating agencies for the import or export of cargo. ACE is the system being built by Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to ensure that its customs officers and other federal agencies have the information they need to decide how to handle goods and merchandise being shipped into or out of the United States. It also will be the way those agencies provide CBP with information about potential imports/exports. ITDS eliminates the need, burden and cost of paper reporting. It also allows importers and exporters to report the same information

to multiple federal agencies with a single submission, and facilitates movement of cargo by automating processing of the import and exports. ITDS provides the capability for industry to consolidate reporting for commodities regulated by multiple agencies. For these consolidated reports, the industry filers will receive the appropriate status response when their filings meet each agency's reporting requirements. Once all agency reporting requirements have been met, filers can receive a coordinated single U.S. government response to proceed into the commerce of the United States.

The EPA has the responsibility and legal authority to make sure pesticides, toxic chemicals, vehicles, engines, ozone-depleting substances, and other commodities entering and hazardous waste exiting the country meet its human health and environmental standards. The EPA's ongoing collaboration with CBP on the ACE/ITDS effort will improve the efficiency of processing these shipments through information exchange between the EPA and CBP and automated processing of electronic filings. The EPA will continue to work with CBP towards the goal to automate the current manual paper review process for admissibility so that importers and brokers (referred to collectively as Trade) can know before these commodities are loaded onto an airplane, truck, train, or ship if their shipment meets the EPA's reporting requirements. As a result of this automated review, Trade can greatly lower its cost of doing business and customs officers at our nation's ports will have the information on whether shipments comply with our environmental regulations.

**Geospatial Information:** The EPA works with DOI, NOAA, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), NASA, USDA, and DHS on developing and implementing geospatial approaches to support various business areas. It also works with 25 additional federal agencies through the activities of the federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) and the OMB Geospatial Line of Business (Geo LoB), for which the EPA leads several key initiatives. The EPA also participates in the FGDC Steering Committee and Executive Committee. A key component of this work is developing and implementing the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and the National GeoPlatform. The key objective of the NSDI is to make a comprehensive array of national spatial data – data that portrays features associated with a location or tagged with geographic information and can be attached to and portrayed on maps – easily accessible to both governmental and public stakeholders. Use of this data, in tandem with analytical applications, supports several key EPA and government-wide business areas. These include ensuring that human health and environmental conditions are represented in the appropriate contexts for targeting and decision making; enabling the assessment, protection, and remediation of environmental conditions; and aiding emergency first responders and other homeland security activities. The EPA supports geospatial initiatives through efforts such as the EPA Geospatial Platform, the EPA Environmental Dataset Gateway, the National Environmental Information Exchange Network, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Assist, EPA Metadata Editor, Facilities Registry System (FRS) Web Services, and My Environment. The EPA also works closely with its state, Tribal, and international partners in a collaboration that enables consistent implementation of data acquisition and development, standards, and technologies supporting the efficient and cost effective sharing and use of geographically-based data and services.

## **Office of the Inspector General (OIG)**

The EPA Inspector General is a member of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), an organization comprised of federal Inspectors General (IGs), GAO, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The CIGIE coordinates and improves the way IGs conduct audits, investigations, and internal operations. The CIGIE also promotes joint projects of government-wide interest and reports annually to the President on the collective performance of the IG community. The EPA OIG coordinates criminal investigative activities with other law enforcement organizations such as the FBI, Secret Service, and DOJ. In addition, the OIG participates with various inter-governmental audit forums and professional associations to exchange information, share best practices, and obtain or provide training. The OIG also promotes collaboration among the EPA's partners and stakeholders in its participation of Hurricane Sandy oversight and its outreach activities. Additionally, the EPA OIG initiates and participates in collaborative audits, program evaluations, and investigations with OIGs of agencies with an environmental mission such as the DOI, USDA, as well as other federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies as prescribed by the IG Act, as amended. As required by the IG Act, the EPA OIG coordinates and shares information with the GAO. The EPA OIG currently serves as the Inspector General of the U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigations Board. The FY 2018 President's Budget proposes to eliminate the U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

## Major Management Challenges

### Introduction

The Reports Consolidation Act of 2000 requires the Inspector General to identify the most serious management challenges facing the EPA, briefly assess the agency's progress in addressing them, and report annually.

The EPA has established procedures for addressing its major management challenges. The EPA recognizes that management challenges, if not addressed adequately, may prevent the agency from effectively meeting its mission. The EPA remains committed to addressing all management issues in a timely manner and to the fullest extent of its authority.

The following discussion summarizes each of the FY 2016 management challenges identified by the EPA's OIG and the GAO and presents the agency's response.

#### **1. Addressing EPA's Emerging Role in Climate Change**

*Summary of Challenge:* In 2013, the GAO designated climate change as a "High Risk" area, noting that climate change poses management challenges for the federal government at large, and that the EPA will play a role in addressing this challenge. Additionally, GAO states that the federal government is not well positioned to address the fiscal exposure presented by climate change and needs a government-wide strategic approach with strong leadership to manage related risks.

**Agency Response:** The agency continues implementing regulatory programs including the Department of Transportation and the EPA fuel economy and GHG emission standards for light-duty vehicles and heavy-duty vehicles. The agency also implements the GHG Reporting Program and shares information with the public. In order to fulfill U.S. Treaty obligations under Article 4 of the 1992 Framework Convention on Climate Change, which was ratified by the Senate, the EPA prepares the annual *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks*, to provide information on total annual U.S. emissions and removals by source, economic sector, and greenhouse gas.

#### **2. Reducing Pollution in the Nation's Water**

*Summary of Challenge:* According to the GAO, progress has slowed in reducing water pollution and improving water quality. The EPA needs to revise outdated effluent guidelines for many industrial categories and assess new treatment technologies that are available to use to address "end-of-pipe" sources of pollution. Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), which address "non-point source" pollution, can be more effective if they address roles and responsibilities for implementation and challenge the voluntary nature of the approach.

**Agency Response:** The EPA agrees that having improved screening processes for industrial wastewater discharge would improve the agency's ability to implement its effluent guidelines responsibilities under the Clean Water Act (CWA). Thus, the agency has focused efforts on identifying and evaluating additional sources of data on the hazards posed by discharges from industrial categories, going beyond traditional approaches. Further, the EPA is more thoroughly considering information on current and available treatment technologies for industrial categories.

Regarding the cleanup of impaired waters, the EPA acknowledges that there are program management changes needed to improve water quality. The EPA is implementing a series of enhancements in program management to improve the review and approval process for TMDLs. The EPA also continues to improve coordination and collaboration with USDA to increase the effectiveness of federal activities in key impaired waters and watersheds.

The EPA continues to take action to improve program implementation through better guidance, improved non-point source grant conditions, increased oversight of state program implementation, and better data collection on incremental improvements in water quality and TMDL implementation. These actions include:

- Formed a workgroup to improve TMDL review and approval process.
- Completed a study with states on GIS reporting and reached agreement on the need to conduct catchment-based indexing of waters to improve the data which tracks water quality improvements over time.
- Developing new performance measures to show where improvements in water quality are occurring.
- Issued new Non-Point Source Program and Grants Guidelines to improve tracking and reporting of program outcomes for states' non-point source programs.
- Issued guidance to states to assist in updating their non-point source management programs; 100 percent of states will have completed review and revised their programs by end of 2015.
- Reviewed new industrial wastewater hazard data and information sources, which resulted in two detailed studies and one preliminary study under the effluent guidelines program.
- Developed a new Industrial Wastewater Treatment Technologies Database.

### **3. Providing Assurance that Public Drinking Water is Safe**

*Summary of Challenge:* GAO acknowledges that the EPA has made progress on providing assurance that public drinking water is safe. In January 2014, GAO reported that the EPA had implemented three recommendations made in GAO's May 2011 report related to improving the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR) Program. GAO reports that, nevertheless, the UCMR program still faces several outstanding challenges, including uncertainty in true occurrence of certain contaminants because of a fixed monitoring frequency that can miss seasonal or sporadic variations; statutory cap of 30 contaminants every 5 years, which restricts the ability to collect data on additional contaminants that could be monitored for additional little cost; and lag in regulatory determination supported by occurrence data.

**Agency Response:** The EPA is continually working to improve its oversight to ensure protection of underground sources of drinking water. The EPA's Underground Injection Control (UIC) program has a solid oversight process, including a close working relationship with its state partners. Recognizing that geology and hydrology vary across the country and that states have requirements and solutions tailored to their individual circumstances, the EPA worked with its state partners to undertake a number of activities to proactively address areas of emerging concerns. These efforts are designed to ensure regulatory safeguards are in place, improve implementation and understanding of state and the EPA UIC programs across the nation, and

ensure the program is achieving its intended purpose of protecting underground sources of drinking water.

In February 2015, the agency released the EPA-State UIC National Technical Workgroup report, *Minimizing and Managing Potential Impacts of Injection-Induced Seismicity from Class II Disposal Wells: Practical Approaches*. This report was developed cooperatively with states to help protect underground sources of drinking water by reducing the chances for induced seismicity. The report can help UIC managers evaluate the potential for induced seismicity in a planned injection operation and describes permit conditions that can be added to manage the potential for induced seismicity. The EPA continues to work with individual states to implement the recommendations in the report.

The agency will evaluate the potential to expand and validate the use of remote approaches to oversight, recognizing that the objectives of on-site evaluations on an annual basis may be accomplished in other ways or at decreased frequency. The EPA is committed to ongoing improvement of the process to review, approve and codify state regulatory changes so that they are adequately enforced. Additionally, the agency has completed the development of standard operating procedures to document roles and responsibilities and ways to avoid duplicative steps. Recently, the agency completed the development and implementation of several templates for publishing public notices and rules in the *Federal Register*, which will standardize the rulemaking process.

The EPA has made improvements over the first three monitoring cycles (from UCMR 1 to UCMR 2 to UCMR 3) and expects that UCMR 4 will reflect improvements based on lessons learned, stakeholder input, and the GAO recommendations. The EPA also is considering the practicality and appropriateness of a shorter period for contaminant monitoring to address the concern about the availability of UCMR data to support Regulatory Determinations. Working within the statutory authority established by the Safe Drinking Water Act, the EPA will continue to evaluate and select the most appropriate contaminants for UCMR monitoring. The EPA notes that the statutory cap of 30 contaminants identified by the GAO is codified in the Safe Drinking Water Act and is a matter for Congressional consideration.

The EPA utilized a workgroup process to develop options for UCMR 4 to develop the rule. In June 2014 the EPA held a public meeting and webinar to describe efforts to develop UCMR 4. This meeting/webinar exemplifies the agency's commitment to engage our stakeholders earlier in the process (relative to prior UCMR cycles) and complements a March 2013 public meeting/webinar focused on the development of analytical methods for Contaminant Candidate List (CCL) priorities. The EPA managers responsible for the CCL, UCMR, and Regulatory Determination programs meet regularly and have specifically discussed the potential for better aligning the collection of UCMR data with the Regulatory Determination process.

#### **4. Cost and Pace of Cleanup at Superfund and other Hazardous Waste Sites**

***Summary of Challenge:*** According to the GAO, the EPA continues to make progress in identifying hazardous waste sites requiring cleanup. However, recent GAO reports indicate that not only will cleanup costs be substantial, but problems with the accuracy and completeness of data prevent the agency from estimating future cleanup costs. The GAO recommends that the agency assess the

*comprehensiveness and reliability of the data it collects and, if necessary, improve the data to provide aggregated information.*

**Agency Response:** The EPA recognizes the challenges in describing the multiple facets of the Superfund program concisely and realizes that many sites face significant uncertainties regarding future site cleanup requirements as a result of, among other things, unique and oftentimes unknown site conditions. Numerous factors contribute to these uncertainties, including the type and extent of contamination at the site, factors associated with the effectiveness of remedial technologies, evolving cleanup standards, the viability and cooperativeness of responsible parties, states' ability to provide statutorily required cost share assurances, and community acceptance of proposed remedies. Due to these significant uncertainties, aggregate estimates of future costs and performance, especially on an annual basis, are bound by large ranges, which limit the contribution such information provides to annual appropriation decision makers.

Since the inception of the Superfund program, the EPA has provided a mix of site-specific and aggregate data to Congress through the annual budget process and other methods to facilitate annual Superfund appropriation decisions. The agency recognizes the importance of informing and educating partners and stakeholders about the EPA's commitment to, and progress toward, environmental cleanup, and continues to explore options to share information about cleanup plans and progress at sites.

In FY 2010, the EPA introduced a new remedial action project completion measure which responds to GAO's recommendations to provide more data on site progress. Also, in an effort to improve transparency and accountability, the Superfund program has deployed the Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS), which fully integrates site schedules, resource planning and accomplishment reporting with official supporting documentation. The program is better able to plan and report site progress as a result of the enhanced functionality of the new tools.

## **5. Transforming EPA's Processes for Assessing and Controlling Toxic Chemicals/EPA's Framework for Assessing and Managing Chemical Risk**

***Summary of Challenge:** The OIG and GAO believe that the EPA's effectiveness in assessing and managing chemical risks is hampered in part by limitations on the agency's authority to regulate chemicals under the Toxic Substances Control Act and other statutes. Despite those limitations, the EPA could better assess and manage chemical risks by addressing challenges in data collection, toxicity screening and improving public access to chemical data. The GAO also has included the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) in its FY 2013 High Risk Report (GAO-13-283). In FY 2014, GAO completed a third review of the IRIS program.*

**Agency Response:** On June 22, 2016, the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act was signed into law, amending the Toxic Substances Control Act. The new law substantially strengthens the agency's ability to address risks to human health and the environment from exposure to toxic chemicals that are subject to TSCA. Additionally, the new law reduces challenges the agency has faced in obtaining chemical testing data, assessing chemicals, meeting the thresholds for commencing risk reduction actions and addressing unwarranted confidentiality claims.

The EPA has developed an implementation plan for carrying out the law's requirements and has completed or made progress on a considerable number of first-year steps. In accordance with the statutory deadline provided in the 2016 legislation, the agency has identified and begun the risk evaluations for the first 10 chemicals to be reviewed under the new law. In addition, the EPA has identified five mercury compounds to be subject to export restrictions and has proposed several framework rules to implement key provisions of the law, including the TSCA Inventory Notification (Active-Inactive) Requirements, Procedures for Chemical Risk Evaluation under the Amended Toxic Substances Control Act, and Procedures for Prioritization of Chemicals for Risk Evaluation under Toxic Substances Control Act.

The EPA has proposed rules under TSCA Section 6 to address risks identified in three of the five risk assessments completed prior to enactment of the new law. These rulemakings address TCE use in spot cleaning, aerosol degreasing and vapor degreasing; methylene chloride use in paint removers; and NMP use in paint removers. As indicated in the Lautenberg TSCA reform legislation, successful implementation of the new law's provisions is contingent upon adequate resources, including fees.

***Improving IRIS.*** In 2009, GAO identified the EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) program as a high risk area needing broad-based transformation to address issues of transparency, program management, and timeliness. Over the last several years, the agency implemented numerous actions to enable the IRIS program to produce timely, transparent, and credible assessments in support of the EPA's mission to protect public health and the environment.

As GAO acknowledged, the EPA's ability to protect public health and the environment depends on credible and timely assessments of the risks posed by toxic chemicals across the agency's various programs. The agency implemented a number of significant IRIS program actions to improve the scientific foundation of assessments, increase transparency in the program and the process, and allow the agency to produce more assessments. The EPA leadership demonstrated strong management direction and support for approaches designed to increase the IRIS program's productivity and transparency. The EPA received commendation from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) for the significant transformations made to the program in a short period of time and noted a successful future if the agency continued on its trajectory. Efforts to improve the program have transitioned to not just address specific recommendations, but to incorporate long-term goals and planning, consistent with GAO recommendations.

In addition, changes currently being implemented will improve the efficiency of conducting systematic review. In particular, the program will place increased emphasis on tailoring the scope of the assessment to match the underlying program or regional client need. This concept is consistent with the notion of "fit for purpose" assessments that are increasingly being promoted in environmental health, and is necessary to facilitate the feasibility of systematic review methodologies. These changes retain transparency and opportunities for public engagement, while enabling more accurate predictions of the timeframe needed to conduct the assessment. More targeted assessments that focus on the science specific to decision needs will generally be smaller in scope than IRIS assessments have been in the past, which will promote greater throughput. This



foundational activity will allow the IRIS program to provide greater transparency to agency and external stakeholders, as well as inform several of the remaining open GAO recommendations.

GAO recommendations have led to fundamental changes in IRIS program activities. Further, the actions implemented by the IRIS program, the progress made, and the program's continued commitment to excellence have made a difference and have been recognized by GAO, as well as the National Academies of Science, the EPA Science Advisory Board, stakeholders and the public. These changes have improved the quality, transparency, and efficiency of the IRIS program. The agency is developing a strategy to address the remaining open GAO recommendations, with a goal of closing all remaining open recommendations by summer 2018.

## **6. Improving Processes for Conditional Registration of Pesticides and Considering Children's Health**

*Summary of Challenge: The GAO highlights vulnerabilities in the Conditional Registration of Pesticides that could result in human health impacts. Vulnerabilities include inaccurate data and recordkeeping, insufficient tracking of conditional registrations, and limited management oversight to ensure that regulatory actions are not misclassified as conditional or unconditional registrations. The GAO also reports that the EPA has not taken the steps necessary to integrate children's health in the rulemaking process.*

**Agency Response:** The agency is committed to providing a more integrated solution to track conditional registration data requirements and data submission for all pesticides. During 2014 and 2015, the EPA continued to create new codes in the Office of Pesticide Program Information Network (OPPIN) to more clearly distinguish the status of product registrations as conditional or unconditional (refining codes is an ongoing activity). In 2014 the agency's pesticide program held divisional training sessions to discuss the regulatory requirements of conditional registrations in RD, AD, and BPPD. The agency provides refresher training, as well as training for new staff. The agency also developed draft standard operating procedures detailing how to enter data in the OPPIN tracking system for conditional and unconditional registrations.

In April 2014, the agency prepared and posted on its website a table showing all pesticide active ingredients initially registered under conditional registration (2000-2014). The EPA continues to use this table internally as a tool to track and manage the status of submission, review, and acceptance of information required as a condition of registration. The periodically releases updated version of the table to provide the public with up-to-date information on the status of conditional registrations.

The agency will continue to take actions to improve the review of conditional registration of pesticides. This includes conducting monthly meetings to help facilitate cross-divisional coordination, reviewing the status of data submission, developing and standardizing tracking codes, and training staff to support conditional registration activities.

## **7. Oversight of Delegations to States / Diminished Capacity of States to Implement Federal Environmental Programs**

**Summary of Challenge:** *While progress has been made, including a cross-agency strategy in its 2014-2018 Strategic Plan on a new era of partnerships, the EPA's oversight of state programs remains a management challenge. The OIG notes the agency's inadequate and inconsistent oversight of state program implementation across environmental statutes and the absence of national baselines. The GAO has concerns about the consequences of budget cuts and the ability of states to fulfill core program requirements.*

**Agency Response:** The agency continues to make state oversight an agency priority and to improve oversight practices to ensure consistency. An example of the efforts the agency has taken includes establishing the State Program Health and Integrity Workgroup. This inter-agency workgroup, composed of the EPA's national program offices for air, enforcement and water, gathers and analyzes information on oversight of state practices, identifies gaps and develops solutions.

In response to OIG concerns regarding emission fees, the EPA's oversight has been successful in addressing fee program concerns that have arisen over time. Moreover, fee oversight is only one aspect of the EPA's oversight of the complex state operating permit programs, which have been successful in issuing over 15,000 operating permits, furthering the overarching goals of improving compliance with air pollution requirements and public involvement in the permitting process. Over the last two decades, the EPA has provided useful and relevant guidance to implementing authorities and regions to ensure proper administration and oversight, respectively, of fee programs for the operating permits programs.

The EPA agrees that a guidance document that discusses the fee aspect of the oversight program evaluation in additional detail would be useful. The EPA expects to develop such a guidance in part through assessing the 1993 fee schedule guidance, and by either updating that document or issuing a separate fee oversight strategy document. This fee oversight strategy guidance is expected to be responsive to the OIG's recommendations.

The OIG evaluated the underground storage tank (UST) inspection program and recommended that the EPA work with the states to revise their current Memorandums of Agreement to reflect program changes from the 2005 Energy Policy Act and address oversight of municipalities conducting inspections. At the time of the OIG audit, the EPA was in the process of revising the UST regulations, addressing among other things, State Program Approval (SPA) for the UST program. The EPA published the revised UST regulations in July 2015, which the EPA provided states who currently have SPA three years from the rule's effective date to submit their applications for a reinstatement.

In agreeing to the OIG recommendation for all states to revise their current Memorandum of Agreement (MOAs), the EPA agreed to time the revision and updates of the MOAs with the re-SPA timeframe noted in the final UST regulations. The EPA is working with the states and expects to have revised MOAs by October 2018.

Additional efforts by the agency to address concerns raised by the OIG include:

- Continues to use its oversight authority under the Safe Drinking Water Act to work with state primacy programs and the EPA regional permit authorities to communicate

requirements and responsibilities regarding the use of diesel fuels during hydraulic fracturing.

- Promoting consistency across state section 319 grants by developing nationally consistent grant conditions for all the EPA regions.
- Implemented the Nonpoint Source program and Grant Guidelines for States and Territories, which contains specific provisions to strengthen the EPA oversight of state programs.

The agency's strategy for assisting states in meeting their program requirements is focused on identifying programmatic areas of highest priority, reducing administrative burdens where possible, and providing additional time for required activities where allowed while still meeting the intent of all regulatory mandates. To reduce states' administrative burdens and increase efficiencies, the agency has introduced a number of cost-effective, streamlined administrative processes, such as reforming the State Implementation Plan (SIP) process. The regions, with headquarters' oversight, work closely with states in managing STAG resources provided by Congress. The EPA revises requirements where possible to make the best use of available technology and resources to address the most critical air quality issues, such as delaying the deployment of the near-road monitoring network and activating and encouraging use of electronic emissions reporting for sources. The agency meets regularly with representatives of state and local air agencies to identify and resolve issues; routinely suggests budget changes to address funding, programmatic and technology gaps; and solicits state, local and tribal government input in developing the annual national program managers' guidance.

## **8. Improving EPA's Adherence to Guidance for Regulatory Impact Analysis**

*Summary of Challenge:* GAO stated that the EPA did not always adhere to certain aspects of OMB's Circular A-4 guidance for analyzing the economic effects of regulations in its Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA). According to GAO, the EPA considered regulatory alternatives and analyzed uncertainties underlying the RIAs, but the information it included and presented in the RIAs was not always clear. GAO stated that the EPA's review process also does not ensure that the information that should appear in the analyses is transparent or clear, within and across its RIAs, so the agency cannot ensure that its RIAs adhere to OMB's guidance to provide the public with a clear understanding of its decision making. Additionally, GAO stated that the EPA did not monetize certain benefits and costs related to the primary purposes or key impacts of the rules GAO reviewed, such as reducing hazardous air pollutants and water quality effects. GAO concluded that this potentially limits the RIAs' usefulness for helping decision makers and the public understand these important effects.

GAO recommended the EPA take several actions to improve future adherence to OMB guidance and enhance the usefulness of its RIAs, including enhancing the agency's review process for RIAs; improving the accuracy, transparency, and clarity of the RIAs' executive summaries; and prioritizing for research key categories of benefits and costs that the agency cannot currently monetize. GAO provided an update to the agency in 2016 on these management challenges, recognizing the EPA has satisfied the recommendation regarding transparency and clarity of its executive summaries.

**Agency Response:** The EPA's view is that the GAO's findings do not point to systematic deficiencies with respect to the accuracy of the agency's analytical work. The RIA is intended to inform, as appropriate, the development of regulatory standards by providing decision makers with the ability to systematically assess the consequences of various actions in accordance with the requirements of Executive Orders 12866 and 13563 and the guidelines of OMB Circular A-4. The EPA relies on the best available information to calculate both the costs and benefits of rules and further refines these analyses through the interagency and public comment processes. In addition, the EPA maintains a public docket where all of the underlying documentation for each RIA is available.

The EPA agrees that there are challenges to fully monetizing all of the public health and environmental benefits of regulations, including some potentially important effects; however, this is an issue inherent in benefit-cost analysis and is not unique to regulatory actions undertaken by this agency. In the RIAs prepared by the EPA, significant effort is put into clearly and transparently communicating about benefit categories for which the EPA is unable to monetize benefits. In cases where there may be a benefit with impacts that are expected to be significant but cannot be monetized using available science and economics, or where quantifiable effects are expected to be small relative to other benefits, a qualitative assessment may be appropriate. In such cases, qualitative analyses provide the best available information to communicate to the public. Including both quantitative and qualitative assessments is an approach that is consistent with the flexibility provided to agencies in OMB Circular A-4. Each RIA, whether quantitative or qualitative, is based on the most reliable information available at the time. The EPA continues to work to refine these analyses over time, and actively seeks outside expert advice for reviews of significant new scientific information and analytical methodologies.

The agency continually strives to improve its ability to value the benefits and costs of its regulatory actions and is working on several critical areas of economic valuations. These include:

- Developed and released the Hydrological and Water Quality System (HAWQS) in beta format. HAWQS is a water quality modeling system capable of supporting national and regional level economic and policy analyses.
- Utilizing the human health benefits workgroup to support improvements in the agency's ability to quantify important benefits for hazardous chemicals such as lead, formaldehyde and chlorinated solvents.
- Preparing additional white papers for the Science Advisory Board panel, which began in the summer of 2015. Current efforts include white papers on economic impacts, uncertainty and a memo on competitiveness.
- Planning internal workshops on benefits transfer which will allow more complete benefit estimation.
- Updating the EPA's Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses, to include a revised employment impacts section with an updated literature review, and a description of theoretic models and empirical methods.
- Solicited and began awarding grant proposals under the Science to Achieve Results (STAR) program to support water quality benefits.

The EPA will continue to invest in areas that will support improvement in our ability to value important benefits and costs and apply scientifically reliable, monetized estimates of effects in our rulemaking analyses.

## **9. Enhancing Information Technology Security to Combat Cyber Threats**

***Summary of Challenge:** According to the OIG, the EPA's information security challenges stem from four key areas: 1) risk management planning, 2) security information and event management tool implementation, 3) computer security incident response capability and network operation integration, and 4) computer security incident response capability relationship building. The OIG believes that management oversight underlies all four areas and is needed to ensure comprehensive implementation of the information security program throughout the agency, including offices' execution of the EPA policies, procedures, and practices.*

**Agency Response:** The agency is committed to protecting its information and technology assets. The EPA understands the threat and pervasiveness of cyber-attacks and is aware of the potential impact to the agency's mission if information assets are compromised. The agency published a five-year Information Security Strategic Plan for the Information Security program, as well as Continuous Monitoring and Risk Management Strategic Plan, to provide the vision and focus for and to drive the program where the agency believes it will provide appropriate risk based protection for the EPA's information and information systems. The following summarizes the agency's progress in addressing growing concerns.

- Established a 30-day maximum number of days that an account can remain inactive before the system automatically disables the account's technology function in the agency.
- Developed a process to manage annual security assessments, which includes oversight by the Senior Agency Information Security Official(SAISO).
- Coordinating with the U.S. DHS and the General Services Administration to implement capabilities under the Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation Program, which includes vulnerability management.
- Chartered an Information Security Task Force to identify how best to implement SAISO improvement recommendations for centralizing and consolidating cyber security.

The agency will make every effort to complete corrective actions for all open recommendations by the originally agreed-upon completion dates, where feasible, by utilizing and refining processes already in place.

## **10. EPA Needs to Improve Its Workload Analysis to Accomplish Its Mission Efficiently and Effectively**

***Summary of Challenge:** The OIG has raised concerns about overall agency and specific program workforce and workload planning: specifically, that the agency does a poor job of estimating how many full-time employees are needed to complete particular tasks (workforce planning) and what skills, people and/or organizations are needed to complete the tasks (workload planning). The OIG asserts the EPA has not collected the data nor developed the analytical methods to measure*

*workload and workforce needs. The OIG recommends the EPA strengthen its workforce and workload controls, policies, procedures and methods.*

Agency Response: The agency is initiating a significant workforce planning effort in conjunction with Executive Order 13781 and associated OMB guidance. This effort will seek to align capacity with Administration priorities and identify more efficient practices and organizational structures. Each program is carefully examining the human capital resources necessary to accomplish particular tasks. The agency will analyze workload models as part of this effort where and when we determine such efforts would yield actionable information and offer a good value for the investment. Given limited resources, the agency must carefully consider how to obtain the best value at the least cost from any workload analysis. As the OIG acknowledges, there are inherent difficulties using workload analyses for the highly variable, multi-year, and non-linear activities that comprise most of the EPA's work. These difficulties limit the utility of detailed FTE-based workload analyses for broader agency program estimates. The agency has found greater value using focused analyses, as well as trend and macro-level workload reviews to better understand program needs. These analyses provide more actionable information as the agency manages its programs with fewer resources and fewer FTE.

The agency believes that focused, short turn-around, task-driven analyses such as those performed for grants officer, project officer, IT security officer, and funds control officer duties yield valuable insights at relatively low cost. These focused analyses can yield a clear understanding of how managers and staff invest time to perform major tasks. Past short-turnaround analyses have helped identify major challenges and opportunities, target streamlining and lean efforts, clarify guidance, prioritize training, and structure other support efforts and initiatives. These will continue to support the planning for these crosscutting functions.

The EPA also has found that analyzing workload trends using existing available data provides important insights. For example, during the FY 2016 budget process, the agency examined broad workload trends to identify major challenges. This analysis looked at overall staffing compared to long term trends rather than on individual tasks or FTEs, including using statistics showing increased litigation and legal review requirements. This type of analysis can yield valuable insights into productivity trends and the workforce necessary for a given workload.

Models focused on current operations and analysis of existing data have provided agency decision-makers more useable, actionable information than models that attempt to capture broad set of activities with a finely detailed FTE models. OCFO has found that detailed FTE models created a sense of false precision, quickly became out-of-date due to changing regulations, requirements, and systems, and were overly sensitive to relatively small changes in inputs. Reflecting this experience, the EPA workload analysis guidance in the draft Funds Control Manual provides information about several types of workload analyses rather than solely discussing FTE workload models. The guidance also suggests several strategies on how programs can use workload tools to better understand manage their program, operations and resources. (The updated guidance is currently with OMB for its review.)

The EPA will continue to work with the OIG on its current Superfund workload allocation review and use workload and trend analyses to better understand agency programs, and as one factor to help inform budget decisions. Making difficult trade-offs between many different environmental programs remains one of the agency's senior management's greatest responsibilities and challenges.

#### **11. EPA Continues to Need Improved Management Oversight to Combat Waste, Fraud and Abuse**

***Summary of Challenge:** Recent events and activities indicate a possible “culture of complacency” among some supervisors at the EPA regarding time and attendance controls, employee computer usage, and real property management. As stewards of taxpayer dollars, the EPA managers must emphasize and reemphasize the importance of compliance and ethical conduct throughout the agency and ensure it is embraced at every level of the organization.*

**Agency Response:** The agency believes that enhancements and improved internal controls implemented over the past fiscal year address concerns raised by OIG. Since FY 2013, the EPA has made considerable efforts to strengthen internal controls over time and attendance reporting and employee travel. The agency revised its T&A procedure, which enhanced senior leadership attention and support to ensure that employees report, review, correct, and attest to the accuracy of their time promptly in the agency's payroll system. Additionally, the agency continues to audit 100 percent of its travel vouchers prior to payment to confirm all expenses over \$75 are verified by a receipt and expenses are consistent with regulations and policy.

As for concerns regarding segregation of duties for key financial transactions, OIG states that the agency has not taken steps to ensure the new financial system, Compass, contain an automated control to ensure personnel could not process financial transactions that are inconsistent with the agency's policy. The EPA has a continued need to waive the segregation of duties until a systemic internal control process to prevent the inadvertent processing of financial transactions is developed. The current waiver process includes effective internal controls, which are reviewed routinely by management, to detect and prevent fraudulent transactions.

OIG believes the agency's current mindset toward sprinting allows for the storing of large quantities of printed materials. The agency acknowledges that it has one centralized in-house print plan approved by the Joint Committee on Printing for which decentralized authorization within the regions is not applicable. Currently, the agency is updating the Printing Management Manual (PMM) to provide guidance and direction for printing. The updated manual will outline roles and responsibilities, include efficient and economical methods for printing, and an inventory management concept. Additionally, the agency convened a work group, consisting of printing control officers, to review and recommend updates and/or changes to the PMM roles and responsibilities. The agency anticipates the updates to the PMM will be completed by 4th Quarter FY2017.

## **EPA User Fee Program**

In FY 2018, the EPA will have several user fee programs in operation. These user fee programs and proposals are as follows below.

### **Current Fees: Pesticides**

Fees authorized by the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act of 1988, as amended by Public Law 112-177 (PRIA-3), will expire on September 30, 2017. If the current draft version of PRIA-4 passes, the authority would be extended to September 30, 2023.

- **Pesticides Maintenance Fee**

The Maintenance Fee provides funding for the Reregistration and Registration Review programs and a certain percentage supports the processing of applications involving inert ingredients and expedited processing of similar applications, such as fast track amendments. In FY 2018, the EPA expects to collect approximately \$31.0 million from this fee program.

If PRIA-4 legislation is not enacted, the EPA's authority to collect maintenance fees will terminate on September 30, 2017.

- **Enhanced Registration Services**

Entities seeking to register pesticides for use in the United States pay a fee at the time the registration action request is submitted to the EPA, setting specific timeframes for the registration decision service. This process has introduced new pesticides to the market more quickly. In FY 2018, the EPA expects to collect approximately \$17.0 million from this fee program.

If PRIA-4 is not enacted, after September 30, 2019, the regulations in 40 CFR Part 152 Subpart U that imposes registration fees would apply again and applicants would need to pay these fees. Moneys collected through these regulations would go to the U.S. Treasury and would not be available to the EPA.

### **Current Fees: Other**

- **Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee**

The Pre-Manufacturing Notification (PMN) fee is collected for the review and processing of new chemical pre-manufacturing notifications submitted to the EPA by the chemical industry. These fees are paid at the time of submission of the PMN for review by the EPA's Toxic Substances program. PMN fees are authorized by the Toxic Substances Control Act. Fees collected for this activity are currently deposited in the U.S. Treasury. The EPA estimates that \$0.5 million will be deposited in FY 2018. On June 22, 2016, the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act (P.L. 114-182) was signed into law, amending numerous sections of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), including providing new authority for fees. The rule to require payment of additional fees is expected to be finalized in FY 2018.



- **Lead Accreditation and Certification Fee**

The Toxic Substances Control Act, Title IV, Section 402(a)(3), mandates the development of a schedule of fees to cover the costs of administering and enforcing the standards and regulations for persons operating lead training programs accredited under the Section 402/404 rule and for lead-based paint contractors certified under this rule. The training programs ensure that lead paint abatement and renovation professionals are properly trained and certified. Fees collected for this activity are deposited in the U.S. Treasury. The EPA estimates that \$4.6 million will be deposited in FY 2018.

- **Motor Vehicle and Engine Compliance Program Fee**

This fee is authorized by the Clean Air Act of 1990 and is administered by the Air and Radiation Program. Fee collections began in August 1992. Initially, this fee was imposed on manufacturers of light-duty vehicles, light- and heavy-duty trucks, and motorcycles. In 2004, the EPA promulgated a rule that updated existing fees and established fees for newly-regulated vehicles and engines. The fees established for new compliance programs also are paid by manufacturers of heavy-duty and non-road vehicles and engines, including large diesel and gas equipment (earthmovers, tractors, forklifts, compressors, etc.), handheld and non-handheld utility engines (chainsaws, weed-whackers, leaf-blowers, lawnmowers, tillers, etc.), marine (boat motors, watercraft, jet-skis), locomotive, aircraft and recreational vehicles (off-road motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles) for in-use testing and certification. In 2009, the EPA added fees for evaporative emissions requirements for non-road engines. The EPA intends to apply certification fees to additional industry sectors as new programs are developed. In FY 2018, the EPA expects to collect approximately \$22 million from this fee program based upon a projection of the original rulemaking cost study adjusted for inflation.

- **WIFIA Program Fees**

The FY 2018 Budget requests authorization for the Administrator to collect and obligate fees established in accordance with Title V, Subtitle C, Sections 5029 and 5030, of Public Law 113-121, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014. These funds shall be deposited in the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program Account and remain available until expended. WIFIA fee regulations were promulgated in FY 2017.

### **Fee Proposals: Other**

- **Service Fees for the Administration of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA Fees Rule)**

On June 22, 2016, the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act (P.L. 114-182) was signed into law, amending numerous sections of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). The amendments provide authority to the agency to establish fees for certain activities under Sections 4, 5, and 6 of TSCA, as amended, to defray a portion of the costs of administering these Sections as well as TSCA Section 14. The Act removed the cap that the agency may charge

for a pre-manufacturing notification review and provided the EPA with broader authority to establish a fee designed to collect up to 25 percent of the costs associated with administering TSCA Sections 4, 5, 6, and 14 (or \$25,000,000, whichever is less, during the first three fiscal years following enactment). The EPA expects to propose a draft TSCA Fee rule in calendar year 2017 and anticipates a final TSCA Fee rule in FY 2018. Fees collected under the TSCA Fees Rule will be deposited in the TSCA Service Fee Fund. This fee proposal, once finalized, will replace the existing Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee.

- **FIFRA and PRIA Fee Spending Restrictions**

Current statutory language in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) restricts what activities the EPA can fund from collections deposited in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund and PRIA Fund. The budget proposes new statutory language that would ease spending restrictions related to both the FIFRA pesticide maintenance fees and the PRIA registration fees. Since the FIFRA fees are mandatory, separate language has been prepared that will be transmitted to the authorizing committee at a later date. The PRIA fees are discretionary and the proposed language, similar to the FIFRA mandatory proposal, is included in the Administrative Provisions section.

- **Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest**

The Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest Establishment Act (Public Law 112-195) provides the EPA with the authority to establish a program to finance, develop, and operate a system for the electronic submission of hazardous waste manifests supported by user fees. In accordance with the Act, the EPA established the e-Manifest program, including the e-Manifest 1-Year final rule in 2014 and ongoing development of the e-Manifest system. In FY 2018, the EPA intends to publish the final User Fee rule approximately 90 days before national system deployment. Fees will be implemented once the system is operational (anticipated in June 2018).

The FY 2018 Budget requests an upfront appropriation of \$3.67 million from the general fund for necessary costs to implement the e-Manifest program. In FY 2018, the EPA will collect and deposit e-Manifest system user fees in the Hazardous Waste Electronic Management System Fund in accordance with Section 3024 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6939g). The funds the agency receives in FY 2018 will be credited as offsetting collections and will reimburse the federal government for its initial appropriation so that the appropriation from the General Fund nets to \$0 by the end of the fiscal year. Any excess user fee collections in FY 2018 will be used for necessary program expenses. In FY 2018, the EPA expects to collect approximately \$13.0 million from this fee program.

## Working Capital Fund

In FY 2018, the agency will be in its twenty-second year of operation of the Working Capital Fund (WCF). It is a revolving fund, authorized by law to finance a cycle of operations, where the costs of goods and services provided are charged to users on a fee-for-service basis. The funds received are available without fiscal year limitation, to continue operations and to replace capital equipment. The EPA's WCF was implemented under the authority of Section 403 of the Government Management Reform Act of 1994 and the EPA's FY 1997 Appropriations Act. Permanent WCF authority was contained in the agency's FY 1998 Appropriations Act.

The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) initiated the WCF in FY 1997 as part of an effort to: (1) be accountable to agency offices, the Office of Management and Budget, and Congress; (2) increase the efficiency of the administrative services provided to program offices; and (3) increase customer service and responsiveness. The agency has a WCF board which provides policy and planning oversight and advises the CFO regarding the WCF financial position. The Board, chaired by the Associate Chief Financial Officer, is composed of twenty-three permanent members from the program and regional offices.

In FY 2018, there are ten agency activities provided under the WCF. These are the agency's information technology and telecommunications operations and data services, managed by the Office of Environmental Information; agency postage costs, Cincinnati voice services, certain minor facilities alterations costing less than \$150,000 per project, and background investigations managed by the Office of Administration and Resource Management; financial and administrative systems, employee relocations, and a budget formulation system managed by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer; the agency's continuity of operations site, managed by the Office of Land and Emergency Management; and regional information technology service and support managed by Region 8. A new activity for the Research Triangle Park operations and maintenance service has been proposed for addition in FY 2018.

In FY 2018, the RTP facility operations and maintenance service is being proposed to begin operations within the WCF. A total of \$3.3 million is estimated to be shifted to the WCF, commensurate with what is being spent for FY 2017. These funds will cover preventative maintenance inspections, repairs and service calls.

The agency's FY 2018 budget request includes resources for these ten activities in each National Program Manager's submission, totaling approximately \$270 million. These estimated resources may be adjusted during the year to incorporate any program office's additional service needs during the operating year. To the extent that these increases are subject to Congressional reprogramming notifications, the agency will comply with all applicable requirements. In FY 2018, the agency will continue to market its relocation services to other federal agencies in an effort to deliver high quality services external to the EPA, which will result in lower costs to the EPA customers.

In FY 2018, there are funding increases for several IT improvements. A total of \$26.8 million has been added to the WCF for continuing cyber security requirements, continuous diagnostic and mitigation (CDM) program implementation, scheduled personal computer asset replacement, electronic form workflow enhancements and bandwidth enhancements. These funds are located in the Facilities Infrastructure and Operations and the IT/Data Management programs.

Other funding increases and shifts have been included in the FY 2018 WCF plan that relate to the necessary telecommunications and computer support needed by every employee. The base costs for this package of services has increased over the last four years, and funding has been revised to incorporate these changes, which includes recent increases in cybersecurity investments. As part of an overall review and rebalancing of these costs, funds have been shifted across program projects to reflect FTE changes as well.

**Environmental Protection Agency  
Acronyms For Statutory Authority**

**ADA:** Americans with Disabilities Act

**ADEA:** Age Discrimination in Employment Act

**AEA:** Atomic Energy Act, as amended, and Reorganization Plan #3

**AHERA:** Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act

**AHPA:** Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act

**APA:** Administrative Procedures Act

**ARRA:** American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

**ASHAA:** Asbestos in Schools Hazard Abatement Act

**ASTCA:** Antarctic Science, Tourism, and Conservation Act

**BEACH Act of 2000:** Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act

**BRERA:** Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act

**CAA:** Clean Air Act

**CAAA:** Clean Air Act Amendments

**CAIR:** Clean Air Interstate Rule

**CCA:** Clinger Cohen Act

**CCAA:** Canadian Clean Air Act

**CEPA:** Canadian Environmental Protection Act

**CERCLA:** Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (1980)

**CFOA:** Chief Financial Officers Act

**CFR:** Code of Federal Regulations

**CICA:** Competition in Contracting Act

**CRA:** Civil Rights Act

**CSA:** Computer Security Act

**CWA:** Clean Water Act (1972)

**CWAP:** Clean Water Action Plan

**CWPPR:** Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act of 1990

**CWSRF:** Clean Water State Revolving Fund

**CZARA:** Coastal Zone Management Act Reauthorization Amendments

**CZMA:** Coastal Zone Management Act

**DPA:** Deepwater Ports Act

**DREAA:** Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act

**DWSRF:** Drinking Water State Revolving Fund

**ECRA:** Economic Cleanup Responsibility Act

**EFOIA:** Electronic Freedom of Information Act

**EISA: Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007**

**EPAct:** Energy Policy Act of 2005

**EPAA:** Environmental Programs Assistance Act

**EPAAR:** Environmental Protection Agency Acquisition Regulation

**EPCA:** Energy Policy and Conservation Act

**EPCRA:** Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (1986)

**ERD&DAA:** Environmental Research, Development and Demonstration Authorization Act

**ESA:** Endangered Species Act

**ESECA:** Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act

**FACA:** Federal Advisory Committee Act

**FAIR:** Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act

**FASA:** Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (1994)

**FCMA:** Fishery Conservation and Management Act

**FEPCA:** Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act; enacted as amendments to FIFRA.

**FFDCA:** Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act

**FGCAA:** Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act

**FIFRA:** Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (1972)

**FLPMA:** Federal Land Policy and Management Act

**FMFIA:** Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (1982)

**FOIA:** Freedom of Information Act

**FPA:** Federal Pesticide Act

**FPAS:** Federal Property and Administration Services Act

**FPPA:** Federal Pollution Prevention Act

**FPR:** Federal Procurement Regulation

**FQPA:** Food Quality Protection Act (1996)

**FRA:** Federal Register Act

**FSA:** Food Security Act

**FSMA:** Food Safety Modernization Act

**FTTA:** **Federal Technology Transfer Act**

**FUA:** Fuel Use Act

**FWCA:** Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

**FWPCA:** Federal Water Pollution and Control Act (aka CWA)

**GISRA:** Government Information Security Reform Act

**GMRA:** Government Management Reform Act

**GPRA:** Government Performance and Results Act (1993)

**HMTA:** Hazardous Materials Transportation Act

**HSWA:** Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984

**IGA:** Inspector General Act

**IPA:** Intergovernmental Personnel Act

**IPIA:** Improper Payments Information Act

**ISTEA:** Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act

**ITMRA:** Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1995-aka Clinger/Cohen Act

**LPA-US/MX-BR:** 1983 La Paz Agreement on US/Mexico Border Region

**MPPRCA:** Marine Plastic Pollution, Research and Control Act of 1987

**MPRSA:** Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act

**NAAEC:** North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation

**NAAQS:** National Ambient Air Quality Standard

**NAWCA:** North American Wetlands Conservation Act

**NEPA:** National Environmental Policy Act

**NHPA:** National Historic Preservation Act

**NIPDWR:** National Interim Primary Drinking Water Regulations

**NISA:** National Invasive Species Act of 1996

**ODA:** Ocean Dumping Act

**OMTR:** Open Market Trading Rule

**OPA:** Oil Pollution Act of 1990

**OWBPA:** Older Workers Benefit Protection Act

**PBA:** Public Building Act

**PFCRA:** Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act

**PHSA:** Public Health Service Act

**PLIRRA:** Pollution Liability Insurance and Risk Retention Act



**PR:** Privacy Act

**PRA:** Paperwork Reduction Act

**PRIA:** Pesticide Registration Improvement Act

**PRIEA:** Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012 (known as PRIA 3)

**PRIRA:** Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act

**QCA:** Quiet Communities Act

**RCRA:** Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976

**RFA:** Regulatory Flexibility Act

**RICO:** Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act

**RLBPHRA:** Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act

**SARA:** Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986

**SBLRBREERA:** Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act

**SBREFA:** Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996

**SDWA:** Safe Drinking Water Act

**SICEA:** Steel Industry Compliance Extension Act

**SMCRA:** Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act

**SPA:** Shore Protection Act of 1988

**SWDA:** Solid Waste Disposal Act

**SWTR:** Surface Water Treatment Rule

**TCA:** Tribal Cooperative Agreement

**TSCA:** Toxic Substances Control Act

**UMRA:** Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

**UMTRLWA:** Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Land Withdrawal Act

**USC:** United States Code

**USTCA:** Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act

**WQA:** Water Quality Act of 1987

**WRDA:** Water Resources Development Act

**WSRA:** Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

**WWWQA:** Wet Weather Water Quality Act of 2000

**FY 2018 Stag Categorical Program Grants**

**Statutory Authority and Eligible Uses  
(Dollars in Thousands)**

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Section 103	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA	S/L monitoring and data collection activities in support of the PM <sub>2.5</sub> monitoring network and associated program costs.	\$44,916.0	\$41,875.0	\$41,875.0	\$29,313.0
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Section 103	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA	S/L monitoring and data collection activities in support of air toxics monitoring.	\$6,797.0	\$8,959.0	\$8,959.0	\$6,271.0
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Section 103	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA	S/L monitoring procurement activities in support of the NAAQS.	\$3,971.0	\$3,971.0	\$3,971.0	\$2,780.0

<sup>3</sup> Do not reflect STAG rescissions.

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Sections 103, 105, 106	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA; Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the states); Interstate air quality control region designated pursuant to Section 107 of the CAA or of implementing Section 176A, or Section 184 NOTE: only the Ozone Transport Commission is eligible.	Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program support costs, including all monitoring activities, including PM 2.5 monitoring and associated program costs (Section 103 and/or 105); Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA (Sections 103 and 106); Supporting training for CAA Section 302(b) air pollution control agency staff (Sections 103 and 105); Supporting research, investigative, and demonstration projects (Section 103).	\$171,211.0	\$172,814.0	\$172,380.0	\$120,666.0
				Section 105 grants	Section 105 grants	Section 105 grants	Section 105 grants
				\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
				_____	_____	_____	_____
				\$639.0	\$600.0	\$600.0	\$420.0
				Section 106 grants	Section 106 grants	Section 106 grants	Section 106 grants
				<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>
				<b>\$227,534.0</b>	<b>\$228,219.0</b>	<b>\$227,785.0</b>	<b>\$159,450.0</b>

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
Tribal Air Quality Management	CAA, Sections 103 and 105; Tribal Cooperative Agreements (TCA) in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribes; Intertribal Consortia; State/Tribal College or University	Conducting air quality assessment activities to determine a Tribe's need to develop a CAA program; Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program costs; Supporting CAA training for Federally-recognized Tribes.	\$9,104.5	\$8,829.0	\$8,805.0	\$6,163.0
				Section 103 grants	Section 103 grants	Section 103 grants	Section 103 grants
				\$4,000.0	\$4,000.0	\$4,000.0	\$2,800.0
				Section 105 grants	Section 105 grants	Section 105 grants	Section 105 grants
			<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>
			<b>\$13,104.5</b>	<b>\$12,829.0</b>	<b>\$12,805.0</b>	<b>\$8,963.0</b>	
Radon	TSCA, Sections 10 and 306	State Agencies, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in the development and implementation of programs for the assessment and mitigation of radon.	\$8,114.2	\$8,051.0	\$8,036.0	\$0.0
Multipurpose Grants	P.L. 114-113	State Agencies, Tribes	Implementation of environmental programs and projects that complement existing environmental program grants.	\$20,642.7	\$21,000.0	\$20,960.0	\$0.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
Water Pollution Control (Section 106)	FWPCA, as amended, Section 106; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Interstate Agencies	Develop and carry out surface and ground water pollution control programs, including NPDES permits, TMDLs, WQ standards, monitoring, and NPS control activities.	\$233,154.4	\$230,806.0	\$230,367.0	\$161,257.0
Nonpoint Source (NPS – Section 319)	FWPCA, as amended, Section 319(h); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement EPA-approved State and Tribal nonpoint source management programs and fund priority projects, as selected by the state.	\$166,177.0	\$164,915.0	\$164,601.0	\$0.0
Wetlands Program Development	FWPCA, as amended, Section 104 (b)(3); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Interstate Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, Non-Profit Organizations	To develop new wetland programs or enhance existing programs for the protection, management, and restoration of wetland resources.	\$13,562.2	\$14,661.0	\$14,633.0	\$10,243.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	SDWA, Section 1443(a); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assistance to implement and enforce National Primary Drinking Water Regulations to ensure the safety of the Nation's drinking water resources and to protect public health.	\$100,104.1	\$101,963.0	\$101,769.0	\$71,238.0
Underground Injection Control (UIC)	SDWA, Section 1443(b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement and enforce regulations that protect underground sources of drinking water by controlling Class I-V underground injection wells.	\$10,053.6	\$10,506.0	\$10,486.0	\$7,340.0
Beaches Protection	BEACH Act of 2000; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Local Governments	Develop and implement programs for monitoring and notification of conditions for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public.	\$9,487.0	\$9,549.0	\$9,531.0	\$0.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	RCRA, Section 3011; FY 1999 Appropriations Act (PL 105-276); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Development & Implementation of Hazardous Waste Programs	\$98,994.1	\$99,693.0	\$99,503.0	\$69,652.0
Brownfields	CERCLA, as amended by the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act, Section 128(a) (42 U.S.C. 9628); GMRA (1990)a; FGCAA.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Establish and enhance state and tribal response programs which will timely survey and inventory brownfields sites; develop oversight and enforcement authorities to ensure response actions are protective of human health and the environment; develop ways for communities to provide meaningful opportunities for public participation; and develop mechanisms for approval of a cleanup plan and verification and certification that cleanup is complete.	\$48,466.0	\$47,745.0	\$47,654.0	\$33,358.0



Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
Underground Storage Tanks (UST)	SWDA, Section 2007(f), 42 U.S.C. 6916(f)(2); EPCRA of 2005, Title XV – Ethanol and Motor Fuels, Subtitle B – Underground Storage Tank Compliance, Sections 1521-1533, P.L. 109-58, 42 U.S.C. 15801.	States	Provide funding for States' underground storage tanks and to support direct UST implementation programs.	\$1,495.4	\$1,498.0	\$1,495.0	\$0.0
Pesticides Program Implementation	FIFRA, Sections 20 and 23; the FY 1999 Appropriations Act (P.L. 105-276); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement the following programs through grants to States, Tribes, partners, and supporters for implementation of pesticide programs, including: Certification and Training Worker Protection; Endangered Species Protection Program (ESPP) Field Activities; Pesticides in Water; and Tribal Programs.	\$12,285.0 – States formula <hr/> \$556.3  HQ Programs: - Tribal - PREP <hr/> <b>Total:</b> <b>\$12,841.3</b>	\$11,423.0 – States formula <hr/> \$1,278.0  HQ Programs: - Tribal - PREP <hr/> <b>Total:</b> <b>\$12,701.0</b>	\$11,401.0 – States formula <hr/> \$1,276.0  HQ Programs: - Tribal - PREP - Pollinator Protection <hr/> <b>Total:</b> <b>\$12,677.0</b>	\$7,712.0 – States formula <hr/> \$1,162.0  HQ Programs: - Tribal - PREP - Pollinator Protection <hr/> <b>Total:</b> <b>\$8,874.0</b>

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
Lead	TSCA, Section 404 (g); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Provide assistance to states, territories, the District of Columbia, and tribes to develop and implement authorized lead-based paint abatement programs and authorized Renovation, Repair, and Painting (RRP) programs. The EPA directly implements these programs in all areas of the country that are not authorized to do so and will continue to operate the Federal Lead-based Paint Program Database (FLPP) of trained and certified lead-based paint professionals.	\$12,864.0	\$12,067.0	\$12,044.0	\$0.0
				404(g) State/Tribal Certification	404(g) State/Tribal Certification	404(g) State/Tribal Certification	404(g) State/Tribal Certification
				\$1,830.6	\$1,982.0	\$1,978.0	\$0.0
				404(g) Direct Implementation	404(g) Direct Implementation	404(g) Direct Implementation	404(g) Direct Implementation
			<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>Total:</b>
			<b>\$14,694.6</b>	<b>\$14,049.0</b>	<b>\$14,022.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
Toxic Substances Compliance	TSCA, Sections 28(a) and 404 (g); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, federally recognized Indian Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, and Territories of the U.S.	Assist in developing, maintaining, and implementing compliance monitoring programs for PCBs, asbestos, and Lead Based Paint. In addition, enforcement actions by: 1) the Lead Based Paint program and 2) States that obtained a "waiver" under the Asbestos program.	\$5,220.0	\$4,919.0	\$4,910.0	\$3,437.0
Pesticide Enforcement	FIFRA § 23(a)(1); FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Federally recognized Indian Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, and Territories of the U.S.	Assist with implementation of cooperative pesticide enforcement programs.	\$17,845.0	\$18,050.0	\$18,016.0	\$11,050.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN, aka "the Exchange Network")	Consolidated Appropriations Act 2016; P.L. 114-113, EPA Annual appropriations; Paperwork Reduction Act Section 3520  The E-Government Act of 2002 ( <a href="#">Pub.L. 107-347</a> , 116 <a href="#">Stat. 2899</a> , <a href="#">44 U.S.C. § 101</a> , H.R. 2458/S. 803)  As appropriate, CAA, Section 103; CWA, Section 104; RCRA, Section 8001; FIFRA, Section 20; TSCA, Sections 10 and 28; MPRSA, Section 203; SDWA, Section 1442; Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992, as amended; Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, Section 6605.	States, U.S. Territories, Federally Recognized Tribes and Native Villages, Interstate Agencies, Tribal Consortia, Other Agencies with Related Environmental Information Activities.	Helps States, U.S. Territories, Tribes, and intertribal consortia develop the information management and technology (IM/IT) capabilities they need to participate in the Exchange Network, to continue and expand data-sharing programs, and to improve access to environmental information.	\$9,696.4	\$9,646.0	\$9,628.0	\$6,739.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2016 Actuals Dollars (X1000)	FY 2016 Enacted Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2017 Annualized CR Dollars <sup>3</sup> (X1000)	FY 2018 President's Request (X1000)
Pollution Prevention	Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, Section 6605; TSCA Section 10; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Provides assistance to States and State entities (i.e., colleges and universities) and Federally-recognized Tribes and intertribal consortia to deliver pollution prevention technical assistance to small and medium-sized businesses. A goal of the program is to assist businesses and industries with identifying improved environmental strategies and solutions for reducing waste at the source.	\$5,417.7	\$4,765.0	\$4,756.0	\$0.0
Tribal General Assistance Program	Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act (42 U.S.C. 4368b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribal Governments, Intertribal Consortia	Plan and develop Tribal environmental protection programs.	\$67,888.7	\$65,476.0	\$65,352.0	\$45,746.0

**Environmental Protection Agency  
FY 2018 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification**

**Program Projects By Program Area  
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	<b>FY 2016 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2017 Annualized CR</b>	<b>FY 2018 Pres Bud</b>	<b>2018 Pres Bud vs. 2017 Annualized CR</b>
<b>Science &amp; Technology</b>				
<b>Clean Air</b>				
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	\$8,149.6	\$7,793.0	\$5,739.0	(\$2,054.0)
GHG Reporting Program	\$8,824.2	\$8,003.0	\$0.0	(\$8,003.0)
Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$6,234.3	\$7,453.0	\$3,959.0	(\$3,494.0)
Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification	\$85,613.6	\$93,070.0	\$76,010.0	(\$17,060.0)
<b>Subtotal, Clean Air</b>	<b>\$108,821.7</b>	<b>\$116,319.0</b>	<b>\$85,708.0</b>	<b>(\$30,611.0)</b>
<b>Indoor Air and Radiation</b>				
Indoor Air: Radon Program	\$378.9	\$172.0	\$0.0	(\$172.0)
Radiation: Protection	\$2,064.5	\$1,831.0	\$0.0	(\$1,831.0)
Radiation: Response Preparedness	\$3,716.5	\$3,774.0	\$3,339.0	(\$435.0)
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	\$260.4	\$209.0	\$0.0	(\$209.0)
<b>Subtotal, Indoor Air and Radiation</b>	<b>\$6,420.3</b>	<b>\$5,986.0</b>	<b>\$3,339.0</b>	<b>(\$2,647.0)</b>
<b>Enforcement</b>				
Forensics Support	\$13,949.7	\$13,643.0	\$10,444.0	(\$3,199.0)
<b>Homeland Security</b>				
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	\$9,807.2	\$10,497.0	\$0.0	(\$10,497.0)
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	\$26,800.2	\$26,004.0	\$22,597.0	(\$3,407.0)
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$551.0	\$551.0	\$500.0	(\$51.0)
<b>Subtotal, Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$37,158.4</b>	<b>\$37,052.0</b>	<b>\$23,097.0</b>	<b>(\$13,955.0)</b>
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>				
IT / Data Management	\$2,892.6	\$3,083.0	\$2,725.0	(\$358.0)
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$71,332.8	\$68,209.0	\$68,339.0	\$130.0
Workforce Reshaping	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$10,995.0	\$10,995.0
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$71,332.8</b>	<b>\$68,209.0</b>	<b>\$79,334.0</b>	<b>\$11,125.0</b>

	<b>FY 2016 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2017 Annualized CR</b>	<b>FY 2018 Pres Bud</b>	<b>2018 Pres Bud vs. 2017 Annualized CR</b>
<b>Pesticides Licensing</b>				
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	\$3,772.1	\$3,122.0	\$2,274.0	(\$848.0)
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	\$1,737.5	\$2,324.0	\$2,195.0	(\$129.0)
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	\$427.4	\$570.0	\$527.0	(\$43.0)
<b>Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing</b>	<b>\$5,937.0</b>	<b>\$6,016.0</b>	<b>\$4,996.0</b>	<b>(\$1,020.0)</b>
<b>Research: Air and Energy</b>				
Research: Air and Energy	\$104,407.9	\$91,731.0	\$30,592.0	(\$61,139.0)
<b>Research: Safe and Sustainable Water Resources</b>				
Research: Safe and Sustainable Water Resources	\$114,874.9	\$107,230.0	\$68,520.0	(\$38,710.0)
<b>Research: Sustainable Communities</b>				
Research: Sustainable and Healthy Communities	\$154,349.4	\$139,709.0	\$54,211.0	(\$85,498.0)
<b>Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability</b>				
Human Health Risk Assessment	\$36,007.0	\$37,530.0	\$22,516.0	(\$15,014.0)
Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability				
<i>Endocrine Disruptors</i>	\$15,980.1	\$0.0	\$10,122.0	\$10,122.0
<i>Computational Toxicology</i>	\$23,937.4	\$0.0	\$17,165.0	\$17,165.0
<i>Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability (other activities)</i>	\$53,405.9	\$89,158.0	\$34,386.0	(\$54,772.0)
Subtotal, Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability	\$93,323.4	\$89,158.0	\$61,673.0	(\$27,485.0)
<b>Subtotal, Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability</b>	<b>\$129,330.4</b>	<b>\$126,688.0</b>	<b>\$84,189.0</b>	<b>(\$42,499.0)</b>
<b>Water: Human Health Protection</b>				
Drinking Water Programs	\$3,975.8	\$3,512.0	\$3,657.0	\$145.0
<b>Congressional Priorities</b>				
Water Quality Research and Support Grants	\$10,378.5	\$14,073.0	\$0.0	(\$14,073.0)
<b>Total, Science &amp; Technology</b>	<b>\$763,829.4</b>	<b>\$733,251.0</b>	<b>\$450,812.0</b>	<b>(\$282,439.0)</b>
<b>Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>				
<b>Clean Air</b>				
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	\$17,343.4	\$16,112.0	\$12,791.0	(\$3,321.0)
GHG Reporting Program	\$106,864.3	\$95,255.0	\$13,580.0	(\$81,675.0)
Federal Stationary Source Regulations	\$21,958.0	\$22,899.0	\$16,653.0	(\$6,246.0)
Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$138,050.2	\$124,506.0	\$96,456.0	(\$28,050.0)
Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic Programs	\$5,195.6	\$4,906.0	\$3,687.0	(\$1,219.0)

	<b>FY 2016 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2017 Annualized CR</b>	<b>FY 2018 Pres Bud</b>	<b>2018 Pres Bud vs. 2017 Annualized CR</b>
Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund	\$8,907.0	\$8,911.0	\$0.0	(\$8,911.0)
<b>Subtotal, Clean Air</b>	<b>\$298,318.5</b>	<b>\$272,589.0</b>	<b>\$143,167.0</b>	<b>(\$129,422.0)</b>
<b>Indoor Air and Radiation</b>				
Indoor Air: Radon Program	\$2,759.3	\$2,904.0	\$0.0	(\$2,904.0)
Radiation: Protection	\$8,371.0	\$8,427.0	\$0.0	(\$8,427.0)
Radiation: Response Preparedness	\$2,047.1	\$2,545.0	\$2,257.0	(\$288.0)
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	\$12,972.9	\$13,707.0	\$0.0	(\$13,707.0)
<b>Subtotal, Indoor Air and Radiation</b>	<b>\$26,150.3</b>	<b>\$27,583.0</b>	<b>\$2,257.0</b>	<b>(\$25,326.0)</b>
<b>Brownfields</b>				
Brownfields	\$24,718.6	\$25,544.0	\$16,082.0	(\$9,462.0)
<b>Compliance</b>				
Compliance Monitoring	\$103,713.4	\$101,472.0	\$86,431.0	(\$15,041.0)
<b>Enforcement</b>				
Civil Enforcement	\$174,120.9	\$171,051.0	\$140,470.0	(\$30,581.0)
Criminal Enforcement	\$47,844.7	\$46,225.0	\$40,341.0	(\$5,884.0)
Environmental Justice	\$7,347.6	\$6,724.0	\$0.0	(\$6,724.0)
NEPA Implementation	\$15,761.3	\$16,179.0	\$13,496.0	(\$2,683.0)
<b>Subtotal, Enforcement</b>	<b>\$245,074.5</b>	<b>\$240,179.0</b>	<b>\$194,307.0</b>	<b>(\$45,872.0)</b>
<b>Geographic Programs</b>				
Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay	\$77,543.8	\$72,861.0	\$0.0	(\$72,861.0)
Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico	\$5,392.3	\$4,473.0	\$0.0	(\$4,473.0)
Geographic Program: Lake Champlain	\$4,395.0	\$4,391.0	\$0.0	(\$4,391.0)
Geographic Program: Long Island Sound	\$3,935.6	\$3,932.0	\$0.0	(\$3,932.0)
Geographic Program: Other				
<i>Lake Pontchartrain</i>	\$947.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>S.New England Estuary (SNEE)</i>	\$4,975.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<i>Geographic Program: Other (other activities)</i>	\$1,460.0	\$7,379.0	\$0.0	(\$7,379.0)
Subtotal, Geographic Program: Other	\$7,382.0	\$7,379.0	\$0.0	(\$7,379.0)
Great Lakes Restoration	\$288,091.8	\$299,430.0	\$0.0	(\$299,430.0)
Geographic Program: South Florida	\$1,733.0	\$1,701.0	\$0.0	(\$1,701.0)
Geographic Program: San Francisco Bay	\$4,600.7	\$4,810.0	\$0.0	(\$4,810.0)
Geographic Program: Puget Sound	\$28,046.3	\$27,947.0	\$0.0	(\$27,947.0)
<b>Subtotal, Geographic Programs</b>	<b>\$421,120.5</b>	<b>\$426,924.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$426,924.0)</b>



	<b>FY 2016 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2017 Annualized CR</b>	<b>FY 2018 Pres Bud</b>	<b>2018 Pres Bud vs. 2017 Annualized CR</b>
<b>Homeland Security</b>				
Homeland Security: Communication and Information	\$4,025.3	\$3,870.0	\$3,512.0	(\$358.0)
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	\$627.1	\$970.0	\$0.0	(\$970.0)
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$4,987.0	\$5,336.0	\$4,986.0	(\$350.0)
<b>Subtotal, Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$9,639.4</b>	<b>\$10,176.0</b>	<b>\$8,498.0</b>	<b>(\$1,678.0)</b>
<b>Information Exchange / Outreach</b>				
State and Local Prevention and Preparedness	\$15,044.1	\$15,289.0	\$10,011.0	(\$5,278.0)
TRI / Right to Know	\$13,292.4	\$13,856.0	\$8,680.0	(\$5,176.0)
Tribal - Capacity Building	\$14,056.3	\$14,358.0	\$11,731.0	(\$2,627.0)
Executive Management and Operations	\$47,798.4	\$46,930.0	\$37,106.0	(\$9,824.0)
Environmental Education	\$10,138.8	\$8,685.0	\$0.0	(\$8,685.0)
Exchange Network	\$17,066.5	\$16,984.0	\$11,784.0	(\$5,200.0)
Small Minority Business Assistance	\$1,464.0	\$1,667.0	\$0.0	(\$1,667.0)
Small Business Ombudsman	\$2,378.0	\$1,995.0	\$1,965.0	(\$30.0)
Children and Other Sensitive Populations: Agency Coordination	\$6,252.7	\$6,535.0	\$2,018.0	(\$4,517.0)
<b>Subtotal, Information Exchange / Outreach</b>	<b>\$127,491.2</b>	<b>\$126,299.0</b>	<b>\$83,295.0</b>	<b>(\$43,004.0)</b>
<b>International Programs</b>				
US Mexico Border	\$2,913.7	\$3,057.0	\$0.0	(\$3,057.0)
International Sources of Pollution	\$6,345.0	\$6,418.0	\$4,051.0	(\$2,367.0)
Trade and Governance	\$6,231.3	\$5,896.0	\$0.0	(\$5,896.0)
<b>Subtotal, International Programs</b>	<b>\$15,490.0</b>	<b>\$15,371.0</b>	<b>\$4,051.0</b>	<b>(\$11,320.0)</b>
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>				
Information Security	\$27,152.6	\$28,132.0	\$11,997.0	(\$16,135.0)
IT / Data Management	\$83,883.2	\$83,790.0	\$70,069.0	(\$13,721.0)
<b>Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security</b>	<b>\$111,035.8</b>	<b>\$111,922.0</b>	<b>\$82,066.0</b>	<b>(\$29,856.0)</b>
<b>Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>				
Integrated Environmental Strategies	\$13,429.0	\$11,469.0	\$9,151.0	(\$2,318.0)
Administrative Law	\$4,984.0	\$4,765.0	\$4,141.0	(\$624.0)
Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$1,442.1	\$1,043.0	\$0.0	(\$1,043.0)
Civil Rights Program	\$11,216.7	\$10,052.0	\$8,266.0	(\$1,786.0)
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	\$49,227.0	\$48,473.0	\$42,565.0	(\$5,908.0)
Legal Advice: Support Program	\$14,692.6	\$15,450.0	\$15,548.0	\$98.0
Regional Science and Technology	\$1,602.1	\$1,529.0	\$0.0	(\$1,529.0)

	<b>FY 2016 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2017 Annualized CR</b>	<b>FY 2018 Pres Bud</b>	<b>2018 Pres Bud vs. 2017 Annualized CR</b>
Science Advisory Board	\$4,203.8	\$3,875.0	\$3,567.0	(\$308.0)
Regulatory/Economic-Management and Analysis	\$15,218.6	\$14,546.0	\$15,208.0	\$662.0
<b>Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>	<b>\$116,015.9</b>	<b>\$111,202.0</b>	<b>\$98,446.0</b>	<b>(\$12,756.0)</b>
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$70,707.8	\$72,047.0	\$64,709.0	(\$7,338.0)
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$304,456.9	\$310,948.0	\$301,001.0	(\$9,947.0)
Acquisition Management	\$30,174.3	\$30,406.0	\$24,978.0	(\$5,428.0)
Human Resources Management	\$40,756.0	\$43,185.0	\$40,512.0	(\$2,673.0)
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	\$27,202.6	\$25,248.0	\$18,564.0	(\$6,684.0)
Workforce Reshaping	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$46,719.0	\$46,719.0
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$473,297.6</b>	<b>\$481,834.0</b>	<b>\$496,483.0</b>	<b>\$14,649.0</b>
<b>Pesticides Licensing</b>				
Science Policy and Biotechnology	\$1,362.5	\$1,172.0	\$0.0	(\$1,172.0)
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	\$57,708.1	\$57,699.0	\$48,568.0	(\$9,131.0)
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	\$39,651.4	\$37,222.0	\$31,930.0	(\$5,292.0)
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	\$7,727.5	\$6,074.0	\$5,028.0	(\$1,046.0)
<b>Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing</b>	<b>\$106,449.5</b>	<b>\$102,167.0</b>	<b>\$85,526.0</b>	<b>(\$16,641.0)</b>
<b>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)</b>				
RCRA: Corrective Action	\$37,967.0	\$36,860.0	\$31,947.0	(\$4,913.0)
RCRA: Waste Management	\$57,022.8	\$58,986.0	\$41,146.0	(\$17,840.0)
RCRA: Waste Minimization & Recycling	\$8,510.8	\$8,832.0	\$0.0	(\$8,832.0)
<b>Subtotal, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)</b>	<b>\$103,500.6</b>	<b>\$104,678.0</b>	<b>\$73,093.0</b>	<b>(\$31,585.0)</b>
<b>Toxics Risk Review and Prevention</b>				
Endocrine Disruptors	\$6,035.4	\$7,539.0	\$0.0	(\$7,539.0)
Pollution Prevention Program	\$11,982.4	\$13,115.0	\$0.0	(\$13,115.0)
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction	\$56,030.4	\$58,443.0	\$65,036.0	\$6,593.0
Toxic Substances: Lead Risk Reduction Program	\$13,051.2	\$13,250.0	\$0.0	(\$13,250.0)
<b>Subtotal, Toxics Risk Review and Prevention</b>	<b>\$87,099.4</b>	<b>\$92,347.0</b>	<b>\$65,036.0</b>	<b>(\$27,311.0)</b>
<b>Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)</b>				
LUST / UST	\$11,083.4	\$11,273.0	\$5,612.0	(\$5,661.0)
<b>Water: Ecosystems</b>				

	<b>FY 2016 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2017 Annualized CR</b>	<b>FY 2018 Pres Bud</b>	<b>2018 Pres Bud vs. 2017 Annualized CR</b>
National Estuary Program / Coastal Waterways	\$25,862.3	\$26,672.0	\$0.0	(\$26,672.0)
Wetlands	\$21,065.5	\$21,025.0	\$18,115.0	(\$2,910.0)
<b>Subtotal, Water: Ecosystems</b>	<b>\$46,927.8</b>	<b>\$47,697.0</b>	<b>\$18,115.0</b>	<b>(\$29,582.0)</b>
<b>Water: Human Health Protection</b>				
Beach / Fish Programs	\$1,779.8	\$1,978.0	\$0.0	(\$1,978.0)
Drinking Water Programs	\$96,372.2	\$96,341.0	\$80,044.0	(\$16,297.0)
<b>Subtotal, Water: Human Health Protection</b>	<b>\$98,152.0</b>	<b>\$98,319.0</b>	<b>\$80,044.0</b>	<b>(\$18,275.0)</b>
<b>Water Quality Protection</b>				
Marine Pollution	\$10,757.8	\$10,142.0	\$0.0	(\$10,142.0)
Surface Water Protection	\$202,080.5	\$199,875.0	\$174,975.0	(\$24,900.0)
<b>Subtotal, Water Quality Protection</b>	<b>\$212,838.3</b>	<b>\$210,017.0</b>	<b>\$174,975.0</b>	<b>(\$35,042.0)</b>
<b>Congressional Priorities</b>				
Water Quality Research and Support Grants	\$12,678.0	\$12,676.0	\$0.0	(\$12,676.0)
<b>Total, Environmental Program &amp; Management</b>	<b>\$2,650,794.7</b>	<b>\$2,630,269.0</b>	<b>\$1,717,484.0</b>	<b>(\$912,785.0)</b>
<b>Inspector General</b>				
<b>Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations</b>				
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	\$39,802.3	\$41,410.0	\$37,475.0	(\$3,935.0)
<b>Total, Inspector General</b>	<b>\$39,802.3</b>	<b>\$41,410.0</b>	<b>\$37,475.0</b>	<b>(\$3,935.0)</b>
<b>Building and Facilities</b>				
<b>Homeland Security</b>				
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$7,366.2	\$6,664.0	\$6,176.0	(\$488.0)
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$37,184.2	\$35,573.0	\$33,377.0	(\$2,196.0)
<b>Total, Building and Facilities</b>	<b>\$44,550.4</b>	<b>\$42,237.0</b>	<b>\$39,553.0</b>	<b>(\$2,684.0)</b>
<b>Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>				
<b>Indoor Air and Radiation</b>				
Radiation: Protection	\$2,194.2	\$1,981.0	\$0.0	(\$1,981.0)
<b>Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations</b>				
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	\$8,975.4	\$9,920.0	\$3,900.0	(\$6,020.0)

	<b>FY 2016 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2017 Annualized CR</b>	<b>FY 2018 Pres Bud</b>	<b>2018 Pres Bud vs. 2017 Annualized CR</b>
<b>Compliance</b>				
Compliance Monitoring	\$844.1	\$993.0	\$605.0	(\$388.0)
<b>Enforcement</b>				
Criminal Enforcement	\$6,883.7	\$7,110.0	\$4,161.0	(\$2,949.0)
Environmental Justice	\$681.7	\$544.0	\$0.0	(\$544.0)
Forensics Support	\$1,739.3	\$1,087.0	\$708.0	(\$379.0)
Superfund: Enforcement	\$154,117.5	\$150,342.0	\$94,418.0	(\$55,924.0)
Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement	\$6,217.9	\$6,976.0	\$0.0	(\$6,976.0)
<b>Subtotal, Enforcement</b>	<b>\$169,640.1</b>	<b>\$166,059.0</b>	<b>\$99,287.0</b>	<b>(\$66,772.0)</b>
<b>Homeland Security</b>				
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	\$36,411.9	\$35,209.0	\$16,457.0	(\$18,752.0)
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$833.6	\$1,084.0	\$542.0	(\$542.0)
<b>Subtotal, Homeland Security</b>	<b>\$37,245.5</b>	<b>\$36,293.0</b>	<b>\$16,999.0</b>	<b>(\$19,294.0)</b>
<b>Information Exchange / Outreach</b>				
Exchange Network	\$1,291.4	\$1,325.0	\$838.0	(\$487.0)
<b>IT / Data Management / Security</b>				
Information Security	\$6,008.0	\$6,071.0	\$3,186.0	(\$2,885.0)
IT / Data Management	\$14,968.1	\$13,776.0	\$8,213.0	(\$5,563.0)
<b>Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security</b>	<b>\$20,976.1</b>	<b>\$19,847.0</b>	<b>\$11,399.0</b>	<b>(\$8,448.0)</b>
<b>Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>				
Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$486.5	\$674.0	\$0.0	(\$674.0)
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	\$652.4	\$577.0	\$349.0	(\$228.0)
<b>Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review</b>	<b>\$1,138.9</b>	<b>\$1,251.0</b>	<b>\$349.0</b>	<b>(\$902.0)</b>
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$21,331.2	\$22,084.0	\$12,226.0	(\$9,858.0)
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$69,168.0	\$74,137.0	\$59,072.0	(\$15,065.0)
Acquisition Management	\$22,129.0	\$22,418.0	\$14,036.0	(\$8,382.0)
Human Resources Management	\$4,908.5	\$6,333.0	\$4,580.0	(\$1,753.0)
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	\$2,845.0	\$2,889.0	\$1,591.0	(\$1,298.0)
Workforce Reshaping	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$10,437.0	\$10,437.0
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$120,381.7</b>	<b>\$127,861.0</b>	<b>\$101,942.0</b>	<b>(\$25,919.0)</b>

	<b>FY 2016 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2017 Annualized CR</b>	<b>FY 2018 Pres Bud</b>	<b>2018 Pres Bud vs. 2017 Annualized CR</b>
<b>Research: Sustainable Communities</b>				
Research: Sustainable and Healthy Communities	\$13,622.3	\$14,005.0	\$5,655.0	(\$8,350.0)
<b>Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability</b>				
Human Health Risk Assessment	\$2,751.4	\$2,838.0	\$5,305.0	\$2,467.0
<b>Superfund Cleanup</b>				
Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal	\$210,668.5	\$180,961.0	\$147,212.0	(\$33,749.0)
Superfund: EPA Emergency Preparedness	\$8,148.1	\$7,622.0	\$7,216.0	(\$406.0)
Superfund: Federal Facilities	\$21,799.4	\$21,085.0	\$19,553.0	(\$1,532.0)
Superfund: Remedial	\$539,387.1	\$500,048.0	\$341,803.0	(\$158,245.0)
<b>Subtotal, Superfund Cleanup</b>	<b>\$780,003.1</b>	<b>\$709,716.0</b>	<b>\$515,784.0</b>	<b>(\$193,932.0)</b>
<b>Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund</b>	<b>\$1,159,064.2</b>	<b>\$1,092,089.0</b>	<b>\$762,063.0</b>	<b>(\$330,026.0)</b>
<b>Leaking Underground Storage Tanks</b>				
<b>Enforcement</b>				
Civil Enforcement	\$758.0	\$619.0	\$559.0	(\$60.0)
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$426.0	\$423.0	\$423.0	\$0.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$785.2	\$782.0	\$785.0	\$3.0
Acquisition Management	\$152.5	\$145.0	\$138.0	(\$7.0)
<b>Subtotal, Operations and Administration</b>	<b>\$1,363.7</b>	<b>\$1,350.0</b>	<b>\$1,346.0</b>	<b>(\$4.0)</b>
<b>Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)</b>				
LUST / UST	\$9,159.3	\$9,222.0	\$6,364.0	(\$2,858.0)
LUST Cooperative Agreements	\$55,832.9	\$54,935.0	\$38,840.0	(\$16,095.0)
LUST Prevention	\$26,273.2	\$25,321.0	\$0.0	(\$25,321.0)
<b>Subtotal, Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)</b>	<b>\$91,265.4</b>	<b>\$89,478.0</b>	<b>\$45,204.0</b>	<b>(\$44,274.0)</b>
<b>Research: Sustainable Communities</b>				
Research: Sustainable and Healthy Communities	\$315.5	\$319.0	\$320.0	\$1.0
<b>Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks</b>	<b>\$93,702.6</b>	<b>\$91,766.0</b>	<b>\$47,429.0</b>	<b>(\$44,337.0)</b>
<b>Inland Oil Spill Programs</b>				
<b>Compliance</b>				
Compliance Monitoring	\$143.3	\$139.0	\$124.0	(\$15.0)

	<b>FY 2016 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2017 Annualized CR</b>	<b>FY 2018 Pres Bud</b>	<b>2018 Pres Bud vs. 2017 Annualized CR</b>
<b>Enforcement</b>				
Civil Enforcement	\$2,444.0	\$2,408.0	\$2,266.0	(\$142.0)
<b>Oil</b>				
Oil Spill: Prevention, Preparedness and Response	\$14,553.9	\$14,382.0	\$12,144.0	(\$2,238.0)
<b>Operations and Administration</b>				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$679.6	\$583.0	\$680.0	\$97.0
<b>Research: Sustainable Communities</b>				
Research: Sustainable and Healthy Communities	\$862.0	\$663.0	\$503.0	(\$160.0)
<b>Total, Inland Oil Spill Programs</b>	<b>\$18,682.8</b>	<b>\$18,175.0</b>	<b>\$15,717.0</b>	<b>(\$2,458.0)</b>
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>				
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)</b>				
Infrastructure Assistance: Alaska Native Villages	\$19,499.9	\$19,962.0	\$0.0	(\$19,962.0)
Brownfields Projects	\$88,874.4	\$79,848.0	\$69,000.0	(\$10,848.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water SRF	\$1,350,884.4	\$1,391,237.0	\$1,393,887.0	\$2,650.0
Infrastructure Assistance: Drinking Water SRF	\$853,752.7	\$961,592.0	\$863,233.0	(\$98,359.0)
Infrastructure Assistance: Mexico Border	\$10,345.6	\$9,981.0	\$0.0	(\$9,981.0)
Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program	\$53,750.5	\$49,905.0	\$10,000.0	(\$39,905.0)
Targeted Airshed Grants	\$9,934.4	\$19,962.0	\$0.0	(\$19,962.0)
<b>Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)</b>	<b>\$2,387,041.9</b>	<b>\$2,532,487.0</b>	<b>\$2,336,120.0</b>	<b>(\$196,367.0)</b>
<b>Categorical Grants</b>				
Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)	\$166,177.0	\$164,601.0	\$0.0	(\$164,601.0)
Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	\$100,104.1	\$101,769.0	\$71,238.0	(\$30,531.0)
Categorical Grant: State and Local Air Quality Management	\$227,533.6	\$227,785.0	\$159,450.0	(\$68,335.0)
Categorical Grant: Radon	\$8,114.2	\$8,036.0	\$0.0	(\$8,036.0)
Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)				
<i>Monitoring Grants</i>	\$18,838.3	\$0.0	\$12,470.0	\$12,470.0
<i>Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106) (other activities)</i>	\$214,316.1	\$230,367.0	\$148,787.0	(\$81,580.0)
Subtotal, Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)	\$233,154.4	\$230,367.0	\$161,257.0	(\$69,110.0)
Categorical Grant: Wetlands Program Development	\$13,562.2	\$14,633.0	\$10,243.0	(\$4,390.0)
Categorical Grant: Underground Injection Control (UIC)	\$10,053.6	\$10,486.0	\$7,340.0	(\$3,146.0)
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Program Implementation	\$12,841.3	\$12,677.0	\$8,874.0	(\$3,803.0)

	<b>FY 2016 Actuals</b>	<b>FY 2017 Annualized CR</b>	<b>FY 2018 Pres Bud</b>	<b>2018 Pres Bud vs. 2017 Annualized CR</b>
Categorical Grant: Lead	\$14,694.6	\$14,022.0	\$0.0	(\$14,022.0)
Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	\$98,994.1	\$99,503.0	\$69,652.0	(\$29,851.0)
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Enforcement	\$17,845.0	\$18,016.0	\$11,050.0	(\$6,966.0)
Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention	\$5,417.7	\$4,756.0	\$0.0	(\$4,756.0)
Categorical Grant: Toxics Substances Compliance	\$5,220.0	\$4,910.0	\$3,437.0	(\$1,473.0)
Categorical Grant: Tribal General Assistance Program	\$67,888.7	\$65,352.0	\$45,746.0	(\$19,606.0)
Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks	\$1,495.4	\$1,495.0	\$0.0	(\$1,495.0)
Categorical Grant: Tribal Air Quality Management	\$13,104.5	\$12,805.0	\$8,963.0	(\$3,842.0)
Categorical Grant: Environmental Information	\$9,696.4	\$9,628.0	\$6,739.0	(\$2,889.0)
Categorical Grant: Beaches Protection	\$9,487.0	\$9,531.0	\$0.0	(\$9,531.0)
Categorical Grant: Brownfields	\$48,465.8	\$47,654.0	\$33,358.0	(\$14,296.0)
Categorical Grant: Multipurpose Grants	\$20,642.7	\$20,960.0	\$0.0	(\$20,960.0)
<b>Subtotal, Categorical Grants</b>	<b>\$1,084,492.3</b>	<b>\$1,078,986.0</b>	<b>\$597,347.0</b>	<b>(\$481,639.0)</b>
<b>Congressional Priorities</b>				
Congressionally Mandated Projects	\$13,302.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
<b>Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants</b>	<b>\$3,484,836.2</b>	<b>\$3,611,473.0</b>	<b>\$2,933,467.0</b>	<b>(\$678,006.0)</b>
<b>Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund</b>				
<b>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)</b>				
RCRA: Waste Management	\$2,910.2	\$3,667.0	\$0.0	(\$3,667.0)
<b>Total, Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund</b>	<b>\$2,910.2</b>	<b>\$3,667.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$3,667.0)</b>
<b>Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Fund</b>				
<b>Water Quality Protection</b>				
Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation	\$0.0	\$20,000.0	\$20,000.0	\$0.0
<b>Total, Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Fund</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$20,000.0</b>	<b>\$20,000.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
<b>Cancellation of Prior Year Funds</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>(\$40,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$369,000.0)</b>	<b>(\$329,000.0)</b>
<b>SUB-TOTAL, EPA</b>	<b>\$8,258,172.8</b>	<b>\$8,244,337.0</b>	<b>\$5,655,000.0</b>	<b>(\$2,589,337.0)</b>
<b>Hurricane Sandy Supplemental</b>	<b>\$238.8</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>
<b>TOTAL, EPA</b>	<b>\$8,258,411.6</b>	<b>\$8,244,337.0</b>	<b>\$5,655,000.0</b>	<b>(\$2,589,337.0)</b>

\*For ease of comparison, Superfund transfer resources for the audit and research functions are shown in the Superfund account.

## Eliminated/Discontinued Programs

### Eliminated Program Projects

#### **Alternative Dispute Resolution** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$1.720 million, 6.7 FTE)

This program provides alternative dispute resolution (ADR) services to the EPA Headquarters, the EPA Regional Offices, and external stakeholders. This funding level eliminates the centralization of conflict prevention and ADR program. Programs across the agency may pursue ADR support services and training individually.

#### **Beach / Fish Programs** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$1.982 million, 3.8 FTE)

This program provides science, guidance, technical assistance and nationwide information to state, Tribal, and federal agencies on the human health risks associated with eating locally caught fish/shellfish or wildlife with excessive levels of contaminants, as well as beach monitoring and notification programs. The agency will encourage states to continue this work within ongoing core programs.

#### **Categorical Grant: Beaches Protection** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$9.549 million, 0.0 FTE)

Grants authorized under the Beach Act support continued development and implementation of coastal recreational water monitoring and public notification programs. After over 17 years of technical guidance and financial support, state and local governments now have the technical expertise and procedures to continue beach monitoring without federal support.

#### **Categorical Grant: Lead** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$14.049 million, 0.0 FTE)

The program provides support to authorized state and Tribal programs that administer training and certification programs for lead paint professionals and contractors. Lead paint certification will continue under the Chemical Risk Review Reduction program.

#### **Categorical Grant: Multipurpose Grants** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$21.000 million, 0.0 FTE)

This program provides grants to states and tribes to assist with the implementation activities that complement environmental programs. States can continue to fund work through the EPA's core grant programs and statutes. The agency will work with states to target funds to address their priorities.

#### **Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$164.915 million, 0.0 FTE)

This program provides grants to assist states and tribes in implementing approved elements of Nonpoint Source Programs including: regulatory and non-regulatory programs, technical assistance, financial assistance, education, training, technology transfers, and demonstration projects. The agency will continue to coordinate with the United States Department of Agriculture on targeting funding where appropriate to address nonpoint sources.

#### **Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$4.765 million, 0.0 FTE)

The Pollution Prevention (P2) program is a tool for advancing environmental stewardship by federal, state and Tribal governments, businesses, communities and individuals. In FY 2018 the EPA will focus its resources on core environmental work.



**Categorical Grant: Radon** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$8.051 million, 0.0 FTE)

The program provides funding for the development of state radon programs and disseminates public information and educational materials. The program also provides information on equipment training, data storage and management, and toll-free hotlines. For over 29 years the EPA's radon program has provided important guidance and significant funding to help states establish their own programs.

**Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$1.498 million, 0.0 FTE)

The program provides funding for petroleum and hazardous substance release prevention and detection activities including: compliance assistance, state program approvals, and technical equipment reviews and approvals. States could elect to maintain core program work with state resources rather than federal.

**Endocrine Disruptors** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$7.553 million, 8.9 FTE)

The program develops and validates scientific test methods for the routine, ongoing evaluation of pesticides and other chemicals to determine their potential interference with normal endocrine system function. The ongoing functions of the program can be absorbed into the pesticides program.

**Environmental Education** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$8.702 million, 11.1 FTE)

This program promotes delivery of environmental education through science-based methodologies that promote public engagement. In recognition of the significant guidance and financial support the EE program has provided to non-profit organizations, local education agencies, universities, community colleges, and state and local environmental agencies, funding for some of the environmental stewardship activities could be leveraged at the state or local level.

**Environmental Justice** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$7.282 million, 40.3 FTE)

The program provides support to address environmental and human health concerns in minority, low-income, Tribal, and other communities. Environmental Justice will continue to be supported in the work done at the EPA, when applicable. EJ work impacting the entire agency will be incorporated into future policy work within the Integrated Environmental Strategy program, which is a part of the EPA's Office of the Administrator

**Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$73.000 million, 39.9 FTE)

The program includes the States of Delaware, Maryland, New York, Virginia, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, the District of Columbia, the Chesapeake Bay Commission, the EPA, and other federal partners working together to protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay's ecosystem. The EPA will encourage the six Chesapeake Bay states and Washington D.C. to continue to make progress in restoring the Bay from within core water programs.

**Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$4.482 million, 14.3 FTE)

The program is a partnership of the five Gulf states, Gulf coastal communities, citizens, nongovernmental organizations, and federal agencies working together to initiate cooperative actions by public and private organizations to achieve specific environmental results. The EPA will encourage the five Gulf of Mexico states to continue to make progress in restoring the Gulf of Mexico from within core water programs.

**Geographic Program: Lake Champlain** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$4.399 million, 0.0 FTE)

The program creates a pollution prevention, control, and restoration plan for protecting the Lake Champlain Basin. The EPA will encourage New York and Vermont to continue to make progress in restoring Lake Champlain from within core water programs.

**Geographic Program: Long Island Sound** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$3.940 million, 0.0 FTE)

The program supports the implementation of the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan for the Long Island Sound National Estuary Program. The EPA will encourage Long Island Sound states and local entities to continue to make progress in restoring the Sound from within core water programs.

**Geographic Program: Other** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$7.393 million, 4.9 FTE)

The program provides funding to develop and implement community-based approaches to mitigate diffuse sources of pollution and cumulative risk for geographic areas including: Lake Pontchartrain, Southeastern New England Estuary (SNEE), and the Columbia River Basin. The EPA will encourage states and local entities to continue to make progress in restoring these major aquatic ecosystems from within core water programs.

**Geographic Program: Puget Sound** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$28.000 million, 6.0 FTE)

The program works to protect and restore the Puget Sound, focusing on environmental activities consistent with the State of Washington's 2020 Puget Sound Action Agenda. The EPA will encourage state, tribal, and local entities to continue to make progress in restoring the Puget Sound from within core water programs.

**Geographic Program: San Francisco Bay** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$4.819 million, 1.9 FTE)

The program is aimed at protecting and restoring water quality and ecological health of the San Francisco Bay estuary through partnerships, interagency coordination, and project grants. The EPA will encourage the state of California and local entities to continue to make progress in restoring the San Francisco Bay from within core water programs.

**Geographic Program: South Florida** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$1.704 million, 1.4 FTE)

The program leads special initiatives and planning activities in the South Florida region, which includes the Everglades and Florida Keys coral reef ecosystem. The EPA will encourage state, tribal, and local entities to continue to make progress in protecting and restoring sensitive aquatic ecosystems in South Florida from within core water programs.

**Great Lakes Restoration** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$300.000 million, 71.7 FTE)

The EPA and 16 federal agencies develop and implement a Great Lake Restoration Initiative to restore and maintain the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem. The EPA will encourage the eight Great Lakes states and tribal and local entities to continue to make progress in restoring the Great Lakes from within core water programs.

**Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$11.489 million, 23.1 FTE)

This program involves the EPA activities that help protect the nation's public infrastructure from threats and intentional acts. Scientific exposure, hazard and risk data on hazardous chemicals is also provided to local communities to directly support chemical emergency planning, response, and prevention programs. The most critical program work will be performed in the S&T Preparedness, Response, and Recovery program.

**Indoor Air: Radon Program** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$3.082 million, 10.6 FTE)

Within this program, the EPA studies the health effects of radon, assesses exposure levels, sets an action level, provides technical assistance, and advises the public of steps they can take to reduce exposure to radon. For over 29 years the EPA's radon program has provided important guidance and significant funding to help states establish their own programs.

**Infrastructure Assistance: Alaska Native Villages** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$20.000 million, 0.0 FTE)

The program supports wastewater and drinking water infrastructure projects in Alaska Native and rural villages. The State Revolving Funds are a source of infrastructure funding that can continue to fund water system improvements in Alaska.

**Infrastructure Assistance: Mexico Border** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$10.000 million, 0.0 FTE)

The program provides for the planning, design, and construction of water and wastewater treatment facilities along the U.S. Mexico border. The State Revolving Funds are a source of infrastructure funding that can continue to fund water system improvements in U.S. communities along the border.

**LUST Prevention** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$25.369 million, 0.0 FTE)

The program provides resources to states, tribes, territories, and intertribal consortia for their Underground Storage Tank (UST) programs, with a focus on inspections, enforcement, development of leak prevention regulations, and other program infrastructure. States could elect to maintain core program work with state resources rather than federal.

**Marine Pollution** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$10.161 million, 37.4 FTE)

The program funds the implementation of regulatory and support activities relating to ocean discharges and related marine ecosystem protection activities. The EPA will seek opportunities to continue to meet statutory mandates through the core national water program.

**National Estuary Program / Coastal Waterways** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$26.723 million, 43.6 FTE)

The program works to restore the physical, chemical, and biological integrity of estuaries and coastal watersheds. The EPA will encourage states to continue this work and continue to implement conservation management plans.

**Pollution Prevention Program** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$13.140 million, 58.1 FTE) The program promotes environmentally sound business practices and the development of safer (green) chemicals, technologies, and processes. Partners can continue the best practices that have been shared through this program and continue efforts aimed at reducing pollution.

**Radiation: Protection** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$12.263 million, 59.1 FTE)

This program includes activities for radiation clean up; federal guidance; risk modeling; radiation air toxics; naturally-occurring radioactive material; radiation waste management; radioactive and mixed waste operations and measurements, and radiation lab-related infrastructure expenses. The EPA will explore alternatives to continue to meet its statutory obligation to implement its regulatory oversight responsibilities for Department of Energy (DOE) activities at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) facility. The EPA also will explore alternatives for its requirement under the Atomic Energy Act to establish health and environmental protection standards for exposures to radiation.

**RCRA: Waste Minimization & Recycling** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$8.849 million, 51.0 FTE)

The program establishes a framework for redirecting materials away from disposal and towards beneficial uses, such as composting food waste, increasing the recycling of electronics, and reducing waste from federal facilities. The EPA will focus its resources on core environmental work.

**Reduce Risks from Indoor Air** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$13.942 million, 40.7 FTE)

This program addresses indoor environmental asthma triggers, such as secondhand smoke, dust mites, mold, cockroaches and other pests, household pets, and combustion byproducts through a variety of outreach, education, training and guidance activities. This is a mature program where states have technical capacity to continue this work.

**Regional Science and Technology** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$1.532 million, 2.0 FTE)

The program supplies laboratory analysis, field monitoring and sampling, and builds Tribal capacity for environmental monitoring and assessment. Central approach will be replaced with ad hoc efforts.

**Science Policy and Biotechnology** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$1.174 million, 5.4 FTE)

The Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) organizes and conducts reviews (typically six to ten each year) by independent, outside scientific experts of science documents, science policies, and/or science programs that relate to the EPA's pesticide and toxic program activities. Statutory requirements will be absorbed by the pesticides and toxics programs.

**Small Minority Business Assistance** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$1.670 million, 8.9 FTE)

This program provides technical assistance to small businesses, headquarters, and regional office employees to ensure that small minority businesses, and minority academic institutions receive a fair share of the EPA's procurement dollars and grants, where applicable. The agency will integrate its resources for Small and Disadvantaged Business activities under the Small Business Ombudsman program.

**Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$8.928 million, 0.0 FTE) This program promotes international compliance with the Montreal Protocol by financing the incremental cost of converting existing industries in developing countries to cost-effective ozone friendly technology. The EPA will continue domestic ozone-depleting substances reduction work.

**Targeted Airshed Grants** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$20.000 million, 0.0 FTE)

This program offers competitive grants to reduce air pollution in the top five most polluted nonattainment areas relative to annual ozone or PM2.5. This program is regional in nature, and affected states can continue to fund work through the EPA's core air grant programs and statutes.

**Toxic Substances: Lead Risk Reduction Program** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$13.275 million, 72.8 FTE)

The program addresses exposure to lead from lead-based paint through regulations, certification, and training programs and public outreach efforts. Lead paint certifications will continue under Chemical Risk Review Reduction program. Other forms of lead exposure are addressed through other targeted programs such as SRF's to replace lead pipes.

**Trade and Governance** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$5.907 million, 18.0 FTE)

This program promotes trade related activities focused on sustaining environmental protection while growing the economy. In FY 2018 the EPA will focus its resources on core statutory work.

**U.S. Mexico Border** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$3.063 million, 14.7 FTE)

The program addresses environmental protection of the U.S Mexico border in partnership with the ten (10) Border States, U.S. Tribal government, and the Government of Mexico. This program is eliminated as part of the effort to limit federal investment in lower priority activities and to focus resources on core environmental work under core statutes.

**Water Quality Research and Support Grants** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$26.800 million, 4.0 FTE)

The program focuses on the development and application of water quality criteria, the implementation of watershed management approaches, and the application of technological options to restore and protect water bodies. States have the ability to develop technical assistance plans for their water systems using Public Water System Supervision funds and set-asides from the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF).

**Eliminated Sub-Program Projects**

**Greenhouse Gas Reporting** (FY 2016 Enacted: Estimated \$66.000 M)

Eliminated 15 voluntary partnership programs as part of the Administration's commitment to return EPA to its core work. Certification programs like Energy Star have been and continue to be successfully administered by non-governmental entities like industry associated and consumer groups. The eliminated sub-programs are as follows:

AgSTAR, Center for Corporate Climate Leadership, Coalbed Methane Outreach Program (CMOP), Combined Heat & Power Partnership (CHPP), ENERGY STAR, Global Methane Initiative, GreenChill Partnership, Green Power Partnership (GPP), Landfill Methane Outreach Program (LMOP), Natural Gas STAR, Responsible Appliance Disposal Program (RAD), SF6 Reduction Partnership for Electric Power Systems (EPS), SmartWay, State and Local Climate Energy Program, and Voluntary Aluminum Industrial Partnership (VAIP).

**Global Change Research (Research: AE)** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$19.405 million, 47.3 FTE) The program develops scientific information that supports policy makers, stakeholders, and society at

large as they respond to climate change. This elimination prioritizes activities that support decision-making related to core environmental statutory requirements.

**Office of Public Engagement (Executive Management)** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$1.795 million, 12.0 FTE)

The Office of Public Engagement leads and coordinates EPA programs to promote environmental literacy.

**STAR Research Grants (Research: AE, CSS, SSWR, SHC)** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$39.058 million, 0.0 FTE)

The Science to Achieve Results, or STAR, funds research grants and graduate fellowships in environmental science and engineering disciplines through a competitive solicitation process and independent peer review. The EPA will prioritize activities that support decision-making related to core environmental statutory requirements, as opposed to extramural activities. Note that this total includes \$3.533 million of Global Change Research funding.

**WaterSense (Surface Water Protection)** (FY 2016 Enacted: \$3.075 million, 8.0 FTE)

WaterSense is a voluntary partnership program to label water-efficient products as a resource for helping to reduce water use.

## Expected Benefits Of E-Government Initiatives

### Grants.gov

The Grants.gov initiative benefits the EPA and its grant programs by providing a single location to publish grant opportunities and application packages, and by providing a single site for the grants community to apply for grants using common forms, processes and systems. The EPA believes that the central site raises the visibility of its grants opportunities to a wider diversity of applicants.

The grants community benefits from savings in postal costs, paper and envelopes. Applicants save time in searching for agency grant opportunities and in learning the application systems of various agencies. In order to streamline the application process, the EPA offers *Grants.gov* application packages for mandatory State grants (i.e., Continuing Environmental Program Grants).

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2016	020-00-04-00-04-0160-24	\$272.0
2017	020-00-04-00-04-0160-24	\$217.0
2018	020-00-04-00-04-0160-24	\$307.0

### Integrated Acquisition Environment

The Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) is currently comprised of multiple government-wide automated applications and/or databases that GSA expects to consolidate into a central repository called the System for Award Management (SAM) by FY 2021. Until the consolidation is complete, the EPA continues to leverage both SAM and the legacy systems. Some of the IAE systems are not linked directly to the EPA's acquisition system, but benefit the agency's contracting staff and vendor community as stand-alone resources.

The EPA's acquisition system uses data provided by SAM to replace internally maintained vendor data. Contracting officers can download vendor-provided representation and certification information allowing vendors to submit this information in one place. Further, the agency utilizes SAM to comply with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) which requires agencies to unambiguously identify contract, grant, and loan recipients and determine parent/child relationship and address information.

The agency also uses SAM to access information essential for contracting actions;

- The Excluded Parties List (EPLS);
- Wage Determination Online (WDOL);
- Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS);
- The Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS); and
- The Federal Business Opportunities (FBO) website.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2016	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	\$245.0
2017	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	\$857.0
2018	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	\$874.0

### **USA Jobs**

U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) USA Jobs simplifies the process of locating and applying for federal jobs. USA Jobs is a standard job announcement and resume builder website. It is the one-stop for federal job seekers to search for and apply to positions on-line. This integrated process benefits citizens by providing a more efficient process to locate and apply for jobs, and assists federal agencies in hiring top talent in a competitive marketplace. The OPM USA Jobs initiative has increased job seeker satisfaction with the federal job application process and is helping the agency to locate highly-qualified candidates and improve response times to applicants.

The agency's integration with USA Jobs eliminates the need for applicants to maintain multiple user IDs to apply for federal jobs across agencies. The vacancy announcement format has been improved for easier readability. The system can maintain up to five resumes per applicant, which allows them to create and store resumes tailored to specific skills. In addition, USA Jobs has a notification feature that keeps applicants updated on the current status of the application, and provides a link to the agency website for detailed information. This self-help USA Jobs feature allows applicants to obtain up-to-date information on the status of their application upon request.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2016	020-00-01-16-04-1218-24	\$97.0
2017	020-00-01-16-04-1218-24	\$116.0
2018	020-00-01-16-04-1218-24	\$125.0

### **Human Resources Line of Business**

The U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Human Resources Line of Business (HR LoB) provides the federal government the infrastructure to support pay-for-performance systems, modernized HR systems, and the core functionality necessary for the strategic management of human capital.

The OPM HR LoB offers common solutions that will enable federal departments and agencies to work more effectively, and provide managers and executives across the federal government an improved means to meet strategic objectives. The EPA will benefit by supporting an effective program management activity which evaluates provider performance, customer satisfaction, and compliance with program goals, on an ongoing basis.



<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2016	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$65.0
2017	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$65.0
2018	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$68.0

### **Geospatial Line of Business**

The Geospatial Line of Business is an intergovernmental project to improve the ability of the public and government to use geospatial information to support the business of government and facilitate decision-making. This initiative will reduce costs and improve agency operations in several areas.

With increased access to implement the National Spatial Data Infrastructure Strategic Plan (NDGA) and many national geospatial data and analytical services into the Geospatial Platform for federal agencies, their partners, and stakeholders, the EPA uses the Geospatial Platform to obtain data and services for internal analytical purposes as well as to publish outward-facing geospatial capabilities to the public.

While the Department of Interior is the managing partner, the EPA continues to be a leader in developing the vision and operational plans for the implementation of OMB guidance on Coordination of Geographic Information and Related Spatial Data Activities and the National Geospatial Platform which incorporates many national geospatial data and analytical services for federal agencies, their partners, and stakeholders. The EPA is expected to contribute to operation of the National Geospatial Platform in FY 2018. The intent is to reduce base costs by providing an opportunity for the EPA and other agencies to share approaches on procurement consolidation and include shared services for hosting geospatial data, services and applications.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2016	020-00-01-16-04-3100-24	\$225.0
2017	020-00-01-16-04-3100-24	\$225.0
2018	020-00-01-16-04-3100-24	\$225.0

### **eRulemaking**

The eRulemaking Line of Business is designed to enhance public access and participation in the regulatory process through electronic systems; reduce the burden on citizens and businesses in finding relevant regulations and commenting on proposed rulemaking actions; consolidate redundant docket systems; and improve agency regulatory processes and the timeliness of regulatory decisions. The EPA is the managing partner for this Line of Business.

The eRulemaking program's Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) currently supports more than 178 federal entities including all Cabinet-level Departments and independent rulemaking agencies, which collectively promulgate approximately 90 percent of all federal regulations each year. FDMS has simplified the public's participation in the rulemaking process and made the EPA's rulemaking business processes more accessible as well as transparent. FDMS provides the EPA's approximately 1,372 active users with a secure, centralized electronic

repository for managing the agency’s rulemaking development via distributed management of data and robust role-based user access. The EPA posts regulatory and non-regulatory documents in *Regulations.gov* for public viewing, downloading, bookmarking, email notification and commenting. In FY 2016, the EPA posted 1,176 rules and proposed rules, 1,087 Federal Register notices, and 31,126 public submissions in *Regulations.gov*. The EPA also posted 20,753 documents that consisted of supporting and related materials associated with other postings. Overall, the EPA currently provides public access to 999,131 documents in *Regulations.gov*.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Service Fee (in thousands)</b>
2016	020-00-01-16-01-0060-24	\$941.0
2017	020-00-01-16-01-0060-24	\$1,000.0
2018	020-00-01-16-01-0060-24	\$1,000.0

**Financial Management Line of Business**

The Financial Management Line of Business (FM LoB) is a multi-agency effort whose goals include: achieving process improvements and cost savings in the acquisition, development, implementation, and operation of financial management systems. By incorporating the same FM LoB-standard processes as those used by central agency systems, interfaces among financial systems will be streamlined and the quality of information available for decision-making will be improved.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2016	020-00-01-16-04-1100-24	\$96.0
2017	020-00-01-16-04-1100-24	\$96.0
2018	020-00-01-16-04-1100-24	\$96.0

**Budget Formulation and Execution Line of Business**

The Budget Formulation and Execution Line of Business (BFELoB) allows the EPA and other agencies to access budget-related resources and services. The agency has the option to implement LoB-sponsored tools, training and services.

The EPA has benefited from the BFELoB by sharing valuable information on how systems and software being developed by the LoB have enhanced work processes. This effort has created a government-only capability for electronic collaboration (*Wiki*) in which the Budget Community website allows the EPA to share budget information internally, with OMB, and with other federal agencies. The agency also made contributions to the Human Capital Workgroup, participating in development of on-line training modules for budget activities – a valuable resource to all agency budget staff. The LoB has developed the capability to have secure, virtual on-line meetings where participants can view budget-related presentations from their workspace and participate in the discussion through a conference line. The LoB provides regularly scheduled symposia as an additional training forum for EPA budget employees.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2016	020-00-01-01-04-3200-24	\$105.0
2017	020-00-01-01-04-3200-24	\$110.0
2018	020-00-01-01-04-3200-24	\$110.0

**Federal PKI Bridge**

Federal Public Key Infrastructure (FPKI) provides the government with a common infrastructure to administer digital certificates and public-private key pairs, including the ability to issue, maintain, and revoke public key certificates. FPKI leverages a security technique called Public Key Cryptography to authenticate users and data, protect the integrity of transmitted data, and ensure non-repudiation and confidentiality. The EPA uses this tool to connect agency and commercial PKIs via a trust framework to then authenticate Personal Identity Verification (PIV) cards for both physical access into the EPA controlled space and logical access into the agency's data systems and networks.

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Account Code</b>	<b>EPA Contribution (in thousands)</b>
2016	020-00-01-16-04-0090-24	\$28.0
2017	020-00-01-16-04-0090-24	\$30.0
2018	020-00-01-16-04-0090-24	\$32.0

### FY 2018 Administrator's Priorities

The Administrator's priorities are allocated by program project in the FY 2018 President's Budget with a total of \$2.375 million in the Environmental and Program Management Account and \$125 thousand in the Science and Technology Account.

These funds which are set aside for the Administrator's priorities are used to address unforeseen issues that may arise during the year. These funds are used by the Administrator to support critical unplanned issues. The amounts shown in the below table will be reallocated as needed, in accordance with reprogramming limits, to addresses unforeseen issues.

#### FY 2018 President's Budget Funding for Administrator's Priorities

Appropriation	Program Project	Dollars in Thousands
EPM	Acquisition Management	\$150
EPM	Brownfields	\$25
EPM	Civil Enforcement	\$150
EPM	Civil Rights Program	\$75
EPM	Compliance Monitoring	\$100
EPM	Criminal Enforcement	\$145
EPM	Drinking Water Programs	\$100
EPM	Exchange Network	\$75
EPM	Federal Stationary Source Regulations	\$100
EPM	Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$130
EPM	Human Resources Management	\$25
EPM	International Sources of Pollution	\$50
EPM	IT / Data Management	\$175
EPM	Legal Advice: Environmental Program	\$100
EPM	Legal Advice: Support Program	\$75
EPM	NEPA Implementation	\$100
EPM	Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	\$150
EPM	Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	\$150
EPM	Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	\$100
EPM	RCRA: Waste Management	\$25
EPM	Science Advisory Board	\$100
EPM	State and Local Prevention and Preparedness	\$100
EPM	Surface Water Protection	\$50
EPM	TRI / Right to Know	\$75
EPM	Tribal - Capacity Building	\$50
S&T	Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$25
S&T	Research: Air, Climate and Energy	\$50
S&T	Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability	\$50
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$2,500</b>

## Proposed FY 2018 Administrative Provisions

To further clarify proposed Administrative Provisions that involve more than a simple annual extension or propose a modification to an existing provision, the following information is provided.

### **Petroleum Set-Aside for Brownfields Projects Grants**

Per the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114-113), the EPA appreciates the flexibility to use no more than 25 percent of its CERCLA Section 104 (k) funding to address petroleum contaminated sites. In FY 2018, the EPA continues to request the flexibility to use up to 25 percent of its CERCLA 104 (k) funding to address petroleum contaminated sites versus an exact 25 percent identified by statute. Current statutory language requires that exactly 25 percent of Brownfields Projects grants be provided for petroleum cleanups. The proposed language gives the agency more flexibility to award grants to the highest-ranking proposals, regardless of the type of funding requested, while still setting aside money for petroleum cleanups.

*\$69,000,000 shall be to carry out section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including grants, interagency agreements, and associated program support costs: Provided, That not more than 25 percent of the amount appropriated to carry out section 104(k) of CERCLA shall be used for site characterization, assessment, and remediation of facilities described in section 101(39)(D)(ii)(II) of CERCLA.*

### **Issuing Grants for PM<sub>2.5</sub> Monitoring Network Under Clean Air Act Sections 103 and 105**

Per the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114-113), the EPA is directed to use Section 103 of the Clean Air Act to provide grants to states for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring network. Accordingly, the EPA continues to issue grants to states for the network exclusively under Section 103. The EPA requests the flexibility to use both Sections 103 and 105 authority under the Clean Air Act to issue grants to states for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring network.

*\$597,347,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to states, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, Tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control, and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in [Public Law 104-134](#), and for making grants under Sections 103 and 105 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator.*

Current statutory language directs the EPA to issue grants in support of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring under Section 103 of the Clean Air Act. However, given the maturity of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring network, it is appropriate for the EPA to provide grants to states to fund the network under Section 105 of the Clean Air Act. The PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring network is a continuing activity in support of air quality management, which aligns with authorized activities under Section 105, whereas Section 103 is intended to fund research, demonstration, and other similar activities. The proposed language gives the agency more flexibility to award grants under Section 103 and 105 authority. The Clean Air

Act Section 105 authority provides for cost-sharing between the EPA and the states with up to 60 percent of costs provided by the EPA.

### **FIFRA and PRIA Fee Spending Restrictions**

Current statutory language in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) restricts what activities the EPA can fund from collections deposited in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund and PRIA Fund. The budget proposes language to clarify the agency's authority to utilize resources in the Funds to review existing pesticide registrations for their compliance with current FIFRA standards, ensuring market access for pesticide registrants. Specifically, fees collected would be available for the following activities as they relate to pesticide licensing: processing and review of data submitted in association with a registration, information submitted pursuant to Section 6(a)(2) of FIFRA, supplemental distributor labels, transfers of registrations and data compensation rights, additional uses registered by states under Section 24(c) of FIFRA, data compensation petitions, review of minor amendments and notifications; laboratory support and audits; administrative support; development of policy and guidance; rulemaking support; information collection activities; and the portions of salaries related to work in these areas.

The Budget proposes new statutory language that would ease spending restrictions related to both the FIFRA pesticide maintenance fees and the PRIA registration fees. Since the FIFRA fees are mandatory, separate language has been prepared that will be transmitted to the authorizing committee at a later date. The PRIA fees are discretionary and the accompanying proposed language is as follows:

*Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in addition to the activities specified in section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136w-8), fees collected in this and prior fiscal years, under such section, shall be available for the following activities as they relate to pesticide licensing: processing and review of data submitted in association with a registration, information submitted pursuant to section 6(a)(2) of FIFRA, supplemental distributor labels, transfers of registrations and data compensation rights, additional uses registered by States under section 24(c) of FIFRA, data compensation petitions, review of minor amendments, and notifications; laboratory support and audits; administrative support; development of policy and guidance; rulemaking support; information collection activities; and the portions of salaries related to work in these areas.*

**Attorney Fee And Cost Payments Obligated In FY 2016 Under Equal Access For Justice Act (EAJA)  
as a Result of Defensive Environmental Litigations under Environmental Statutes**

<b>Date of Final Fee Agreement or Court Disposition</b>	<b>Case Name</b>	<b>Court</b>	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>Judge</b>	<b>Case Disposition</b>	<b>Amount of Fees and/or Costs Paid</b>	<b>Source of Funds</b>	<b>Was Amount Negotiated or Court Ordered?</b>	<b>Recipients</b>	<b>Nature of Case</b>
03/07/2016	Hall & Associates v. EPA	US District Court for the District of Columbia	15-286 RBW	Reggie B. Walton	Settlement Ordered	\$41,447	EPA Appropriations	Court ordered after litigation of fees	Hall & Associates	Alleged violation of Freedom of Information Act
06/02/2016	Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa v. EPA	US District Court for the District of Minnesota	13-1324 (JRT/LIB)	John R. Tunheim	Settlement Agreement	\$11,875	EPA Appropriations	Negotiated Settlement Agreement	Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	Plaintiff challenged the EPA's approval of site specific revisions to Minnesota's water quality standards for works relating to discharges from a facility in Hoyt Lakes Minnesota.
06/02/2016	Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy v. EPA	US District Court for the District of Minnesota	13-1393 (JRT/LIB)	John R. Tunheim	Settlement Agreement	\$12,080	EPA Appropriations	Negotiated Settlement Agreement	Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy	Plaintiff challenged the EPA's approval of site specific revisions to Minnesota's water quality standards for works relating to discharges from a facility in Hoyt Lakes Minnesota.
06/02/2016	WaterLegacy v. EPA	US District Court for the District of Minnesota	13-1323 (JRT/LIB)	John R. Tunheim	Settlement Agreement	\$19,800	EPA Appropriations	Negotiated Settlement Agreement	WaterLegacy	Plaintiff challenged the EPA's approval of site specific revisions to Minnesota's water quality standards for works relating to discharges from a facility in Hoyt Lakes Minnesota.

Date of Final Fee Agreement or Court Disposition	Case Name	Court	Case Number	Judge	Case Disposition	Amount of Fees and/or Costs Paid	Source of Funds	Was Amount Negotiated or Court Ordered?	Recipients	Nature of Case
06/02/2016	Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa v. EPA	US District Court for the District of Minnesota	13-1324 (JRT/LIB)	John R. Tunheim	Settlement Agreement	\$9,660	EPA Appropriations	Negotiated Settlement Agreement	Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	Plaintiff challenged the EPA's approval of site specific revisions to Minnesota's water quality standards for works relating to discharges from a facility in Hoyt Lakes Minnesota.
06/07/2016	Northwest Environmental Advocates v. EPA	US District Court, for the District of Oregon	C-3:15-cv-01151-HZ	Marco A. Hernandez	Settlement Agreement	\$26,000	EPA Appropriations	Court Ordered Settlement	Earthrise Law Center	Plaintiff challenged the EPA's approval of Idaho's water quality criteria for arsenic.
08/08/2016	Pesticide Action Network North America, et al v. EPA	US Court of Appeals for the 9 <sup>th</sup> Circuit	14-72794	O'Scannlain, Tashima and McKeown	Mandamus petition granted	\$75,000	EPA Appropriations	Negotiated Settlement Agreement	Pesticide Action Network North America, et al	Plaintiffs petitioned to revoke all tolerances and cancel all registrations for the pesticide chlorpyrifos.
09/23/2016	In re Idaho Conservation League, et al	US Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit Court	14-1149	Millett Rogers	Settlement Agreement	\$127,981	EPA Appropriations	Negotiated Settlement Agreement	Idaho Conservation League, Earthworks, Sierra Club, Amigos Bravos, Great Basin Resource Watch and Communities for a Better Environment	Petition for Writ of Mandamus



**Fiscal Year 2018: Consolidations, Realignment, Or Other Transfers Of Resources**

This table shows consolidations, realignments, or other transfers of resources and personnel from one program/project to another in order to clearly illustrate a transfer of FY 2018 resources (Dollars in Thousands).

<b>Program/ Project</b>	<b>Total Fund Transferred From:</b>	<b>FTE Transferred From:</b>	<b>Total Fund Transferred To:</b>	<b>FTE Transferred To:</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
SF: Audits, Evaluation, and Investigations	(\$1,000)	(6.4)			This realignment is a shift in resources from the Superfund account to the IG Management account in order to ensure adequate resources for the OIG’s high risk audits, evaluations, and investigations.
IG: Audits, Evaluation, and Investigations			\$1,000	6.4	
SF: Superfund Federal Facilities Enforcement	(\$4,450)	(26.7)			This transfer merges the Superfund Federal Facility Enforcement program into the Superfund Enforcement program to optimize resources of the two programs.
SF: Superfund Enforcement			\$4,450	26.7	
S&T: Human Health Risk Assessment	(\$2,964)	(15.2)			This realignment shifts resources for the Integrated Risk Information System into the Superfund program to support site characterization and cleanup.
SF: Human Health Risk Assessment			\$2,964	15.2	

## EPA Budget By National Program Manager And Major Office

		FY 2017 Annualized Continuing Resolution				FY 2018 President Budget				
NPM	Major Office	Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FT	Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE	
<b>OA</b>	Immediate Office	\$3,555.4	\$547.1	\$4,102.5	23.8	\$2,803.2	\$515.0	\$3,318.2	17.1	
	Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations	\$7,227.6	\$219.3	\$7,446.8	51.6	\$6,622.2	\$206.0	\$6,828.2	40.3	
	Office of Public Affairs	\$5,715.6	\$156.5	\$5,872.1	38.9	\$5,011.9	\$147.0	\$5,158.9	30.5	
	Office of Public Engagement	\$1,763.4	\$0.0	\$1,763.4	12.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	-	
	Office of Policy	\$23,424.5	\$3,973.7	\$27,398.2	140.9	\$23,515.4	\$3,358.0	\$26,873.4	124.5	
	Children's Health Protection	\$2,470.8	\$2,951.8	\$5,422.6	15.4	\$936.0	\$539.0	\$1,475.0	4.9	
	Environmental Education	\$859.6	\$7,597.2	\$8,456.8	6.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	-	
	Office of Civil Rights	\$5,175.3	\$1,085.8	\$6,261.1	36.6	\$2,987.1	\$413.0	\$3,400.1	18.5	
	Executive Secretariat	\$2,145.6	\$44.7	\$2,190.3	14.6	\$1,806.1	\$42.0	\$1,848.1	11.0	
	Executive Services	\$2,779.2	\$3,094.4	\$5,873.7	18.9	\$2,502.3	\$170.0	\$2,672.3	14.9	
	Homeland Security	\$1,910.8	\$431.1	\$2,341.9	9.7	\$2,039.5	\$305.0	\$2,344.5	9.3	
	Science Advisory Board	\$3,129.9	\$685.5	\$3,815.5	21.6	\$3,521.0	\$104.0	\$3,625.0	18.7	
	Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	\$1,713.3	\$1,131.5	\$2,844.9	11.3	\$475.3	\$650.0	\$1,125.3	2.4	
	Regional Resources	\$26,694.9	\$2,845.4	\$29,540.3	190.9	\$21,142.9	\$1,712.0	\$22,854.9	130.6	
	<b>TOTA</b>		<b>\$88,566.0</b>	<b>\$24,764.0</b>	<b>\$113,330.0</b>	<b>592.3</b>	<b>\$73,363.0</b>	<b>\$8,161.0</b>	<b>\$81,524.0</b>	<b>422.7</b>
	<b>OAR</b>	Immediate Office	\$10,150.6	\$11,621.6	\$21,772.2	62.5	\$7,741.0	\$5,509.3	\$13,250.4	42.7
		Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards	\$51,036.3	\$18,751.4	\$69,787.7	349.6	\$39,829.9	\$8,553.6	\$48,383.5	240.7
Office of Atmospheric Programs		\$36,572.2	\$75,752.7	\$112,324.9	233.7	\$21,226.1	\$12,488.2	\$33,714.4	117.4	
Office of Transportation and Air Quality		\$52,459.0	\$55,481.2	\$107,940.2	353.2	\$50,858.3	\$25,253.6	\$76,111.9	304.3	
Office of Radiation and Indoor Air		\$22,482.1	\$15,718.1	\$38,200.2	144.8	\$7,938.8	\$3,743.6	\$11,682.4	47.0	
Regional Resources		\$83,900.9	\$342,186.9	\$426,087.8	604.8	\$63,762.9	\$182,434.7	\$246,197.5	405.3	
<b>TOTA</b>			<b>\$256,601.0</b>	<b>\$519,512.0</b>	<b>\$776,113.0</b>	<b>1,748.6</b>	<b>\$191,357.0</b>	<b>\$237,983.0</b>	<b>\$429,340.0</b>	<b>1,157.4</b>
<b>OARM</b>	Immediate Office	\$5,900.9	\$24,365.3	\$30,266.2	45.0	\$6,387.3	\$18,609.4	\$24,996.7	37.0	
	Administrative Law Judges	\$2,302.0	\$231.3	\$2,533.3	13.5	\$2,209.5	\$33.0	\$2,242.6	12.5	
	Environmental Appeals Board	\$2,102.8	\$205.5	\$2,308.3	12.3	\$1,998.1	\$29.0	\$2,027.1	11.3	
	Office of Acquisition Management	\$30,968.8	\$10,065.0	\$41,033.8	216.0	\$24,979.6	\$6,474.5	\$31,454.1	158.8	
	Office of Administration	\$17,744.2	\$331,955.8	\$349,700.1	98.8	\$18,528.4	\$317,469.5	\$335,997.9	85.6	
	Office of Human Resources	\$19,251.5	\$10,474.0	\$29,725.5	100.9	\$19,923.1	\$6,919.0	\$26,842.0	88.6	
	Office of Grants & Debarment	\$10,477.4	\$5,845.6	\$16,323.0	73.0	\$8,062.5	\$3,917.5	\$11,980.0	49.0	
	OARM RTP	\$9,969.3	\$30,589.2	\$40,558.4	84.9	\$9,561.3	\$30,841.5	\$40,402.8	78.9	
	OARM Cincinnati Office	\$9,479.4	\$15,493.6	\$24,973.0	76.7	\$9,883.1	\$15,600.0	\$25,483.1	70.5	
	Regional Resources	\$53,985.8	\$42,957.5	\$96,943.3	358.2	\$45,571.1	\$33,543.6	\$79,114.7	267.0	
	<b>TOTA</b>		<b>\$162,182.0</b>	<b>\$472,183.0</b>	<b>\$634,365.0</b>	<b>1,079.3</b>	<b>\$147,104.0</b>	<b>\$433,437.0</b>	<b>\$580,541.0</b>	<b>859.2</b>

		FY 2017 Annualized Continuing Resolution				FY 2018 President Budget			
NPM	Major Office	Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FT	Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE
					<b>E</b>	<b>)</b>			
<b>OCFO</b>	Immediate Office	\$1,475.6	\$2,412.3	\$3,887.9	10.5	\$1,731.0	\$553.9	\$2,284.9	11.4
	Center for Environmental Finance	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	-	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	-
	Office of Budget	\$5,579.3	\$2,493.9	\$8,073.2	39.7	\$5,770.7	\$1,779.2	\$7,549.9	38.0
	Office of Planning, Analysis and Accountability	\$3,401.0	\$453.5	\$3,854.5	24.2	\$3,264.4	\$356.2	\$3,620.7	21.5
	Office of Financial Management	\$6,155.5	\$724.3	\$6,879.9	43.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	-
	Office of Technology Solutions	\$5,045.3	\$22,979.9	\$28,025.2	35.9	\$5,999.0	\$21,506.1	\$27,505.1	39.5
	Office of Financial Services	\$19,014.7	\$2,408.8	\$21,423.5	135.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	-
	Office of Resource and Information Management	\$1,784.8	\$1,564.4	\$3,349.2	12.7	\$1,366.7	\$858.0	\$2,224.7	9.0
	Office of the Controller					\$18,284.7	\$2,028.1	\$20,312.8	120.4
	OCFO eEnterprise	\$758.6	\$300.5	\$1,059.1	4.0	\$621.2	\$300.0	\$921.3	3.5
	Regional Resources	\$27,706.1	\$1,692.5	\$29,398.6	215.7	\$24,928.3	\$1,238.3	\$26,166.6	168.2
	<b>TOTA</b>	<b>\$70,921.0</b>	<b>\$35,030.0</b>	<b>\$105,951.0</b>	<b>521.8</b>	<b>\$61,966.0</b>	<b>\$28,620.0</b>	<b>\$90,586.0</b>	<b>411.5</b>
<b>OCSPP</b>	Immediate Office	\$5,500.5	\$2,197.4	\$7,697.8	37.2	\$5,618.1	\$771.1	\$6,389.2	30.5
	Office of Pesticide Programs	\$80,954.0	\$15,498.7	\$96,452.6	509.9	\$73,856.8	\$3,201.2	\$77,058.0	436.9
	Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics	\$48,303.1	\$27,070.0	\$75,373.1	293.0	\$33,266.0	\$35,234.9	\$68,501.0	197.8
	Office of Science Coordination and Policy	\$3,307.0	\$6,232.3	\$9,539.2	19.7	\$950.1	\$13.1	\$963.2	4.9
	Regional Resources	\$20,208.5	\$33,014.8	\$53,223.2	151.2	\$11,576.9	\$8,583.7	\$20,160.7	77.2
	<b>TOTA</b>	<b>\$158,273.0</b>	<b>\$84,013.0</b>	<b>\$242,286.0</b>	<b>1,011.0</b>	<b>\$125,268.0</b>	<b>\$47,804.0</b>	<b>\$173,072.0</b>	<b>747.3</b>
<b>OECA</b>	Immediate Office	\$7,913.1	\$2,661.6	\$10,574.7	52.9	\$6,618.2	\$1,234.4	\$7,852.7	35.7
	Office of Civil Enforcement	\$22,848.8	\$3,083.7	\$25,932.5	129.3	\$18,832.3	\$4,379.2	\$23,211.5	98.9
	Office of Criminal Enforcement, Forensics, and Training	\$56,699.6	\$7,383.2	\$64,082.8	325.1	\$48,050.8	\$9,687.0	\$57,737.7	240.1
	Office of Compliance	\$19,902.4	\$18,006.5	\$37,909.0	127.9	\$18,153.5	\$28,081.2	\$46,234.7	104.6
	Office of Environmental Justice	\$2,735.6	\$1,861.5	\$4,597.2	20.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	-
	Office of Federal Activities	\$3,915.0	\$611.1	\$4,526.1	24.2	\$3,315.3	\$613.7	\$3,929.1	18.3
	Federal Facilities Enforcement Office	\$2,559.5	\$574.3	\$3,133.9	14.7	\$793.0	\$207.6	\$1,000.6	4.6
	Office of Site Remediation Enforcement	\$11,685.6	\$26,183.5	\$37,869.1	69.0	\$8,857.2	\$2,794.8	\$11,652.0	48.3
	Regional Resources	\$312,094.2	\$43,886.6	\$355,980.8	2,123.9	\$252,270.7	\$15,111.1	\$267,381.8	1,580.6
	<b>TOTA</b>	<b>\$440,354.0</b>	<b>\$104,252.0</b>	<b>\$544,606.0</b>	<b>2,887.7</b>	<b>\$356,891.0</b>	<b>\$62,109.0</b>	<b>\$419,000.0</b>	<b>2,131.1</b>
<b>OEI</b>	Office of the Chief Information Officer	\$2,667.0	\$3,633.0	\$6,300.0	16.1	\$2,519.5	\$1,466.9	\$3,986.5	13.8
	Office of Business Operations & Services	\$6,236.0	\$3,575.0	\$9,811.0	38.4	\$5,890.9	\$2,033.9	\$7,924.8	32.8
	Office of Digital Services & Technical Architecture	\$4,317.0	\$2,521.0	\$6,838.0	26.9	\$4,077.5	\$1,729.8	\$5,807.3	22.7
	Office of Enterprise Information Programs	\$7,495.0	\$8,411.0	\$15,906.0	48.0	\$7,079.4	\$5,770.5	\$12,849.8	39.4
	Office of Information Management	\$10,746.0	\$34,345.0	\$45,091.0	64.8	\$10,727.8	\$21,078.1	\$31,806.0	58.5
	Office of Customer Advocacy, Policy & Portfolio Management	\$5,877.0	\$3,166.0	\$9,043.0	36.7	\$5,551.2	\$2,172.3	\$7,723.5	30.9
	Office of Information Security & Privacy	\$2,497.0	\$31,473.0	\$33,970.0	15.3	\$2,580.1	\$13,155.4	\$15,735.5	13.9
	Office of Information Technology Operations	\$820.0	\$3,621.0	\$4,441.0	4.6	\$791.3	\$2,483.4	\$3,274.7	4.0
	Regional Resources	\$21,850.0	\$17,493.0	\$39,343.0	153.4	\$19,565.3	\$12,056.7	\$31,622.0	126.2
	<b>TOTA</b>	<b>\$62,505.0</b>	<b>\$108,238.0</b>	<b>\$170,743.0</b>	<b>404.2</b>	<b>\$58,783.0</b>	<b>\$61,947.0</b>	<b>\$120,730.0</b>	<b>342.2</b>

		FY 2017 Annualized Continuing Resolution				FY 2018 President Budget			
NPM	Major Office	Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FT E	Pay (\$K )	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE
OGC	Immediate Office	\$2,382.7	\$26.5	\$2,409.1	12.8	\$1,674.0	\$38.0	\$1,712.0	8.7
	Air and Radiation Law Office	\$8,839.6	\$11.8	\$8,851.5	50.3	\$6,551.7	\$17.0	\$6,568.7	33.8
	Pesticides and Toxic Substances Law Office	\$3,806.4	\$11.1	\$3,817.5	20.4	\$3,430.3	\$16.0	\$3,446.3	17.7
	Solid Waste and Emergency Response Law Office	\$2,598.8	\$17.4	\$2,616.2	13.7	\$2,039.4	\$25.0	\$2,064.4	10.4
	Water Law Office	\$4,002.2	\$142.8	\$4,145.0	21.7	\$3,371.6	\$10.0	\$3,381.6	17.4
	Civil Rights - Title VI					\$1,418.6	\$341.0	\$1,759.6	9.0
	Other Legal Support	\$15,936.9	\$1,110.4	\$17,047.3	98.9	\$15,818.2	\$2,170.0	\$17,988.2	84.0
	Regional Resources	\$27,437.3	\$535.0	\$27,972.3	158.0	\$23,745.3	\$953.0	\$24,698.3	127.4
	<b>TOTA</b>	<b>\$65,004.0</b>	<b>\$1,855.0</b>	<b>\$66,859.0</b>	<b>375.8</b>	<b>\$58,049.0</b>	<b>\$3,570.0</b>	<b>\$61,619.0</b>	<b>308.4</b>
	OIG	Immediate Office	\$577.5	\$234.7	\$812.2	3.2	\$659.0	\$135.0	\$794.0
Office of Audit		\$12,262.6	\$876.6	\$13,139.2	92.2	\$10,321.0	\$506.0	\$10,827.0	61.9
Office of Congressional, Public Affairs and Management		\$2,887.9	\$96.6	\$2,984.6	19.1	\$2,431.0	\$56.0	\$2,487.0	12.8
Office of Counsel		\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	-	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	-
Office of Chief of Staff		\$3,018.6	\$1,580.7	\$4,599.3	22.3	\$2,540.0	\$912.0	\$3,452.0	15.0
Office of Investigations		\$10,307.5	\$1,905.3	\$12,212.9	66.8	\$8,675.0	\$1,100.0	\$9,775.0	44.7
Office of Mission Systems		\$3,421.1	\$1,297.8	\$4,719.0	22.3	\$2,706.0	\$749.0	\$3,455.0	14.1
Office of Program Evaluation		\$11,951.7	\$911.2	\$12,862.9	92.2	\$10,059.0	\$526.0	\$10,585.0	61.9
<b>TOTA</b>		<b>\$44,427.0</b>	<b>\$6,903.0</b>	<b>\$51,330.0</b>	<b>318.1</b>	<b>\$37,391.0</b>	<b>\$3,984.0</b>	<b>\$41,375.0</b>	<b>213.4</b>
OITA		Immediate Office	\$1,058.9	\$54.8	\$1,113.7	6.0	\$368.4	\$46.0	\$414.4
	Office of Regional and Bilateral Affairs	\$3,725.8	\$2,639.6	\$6,365.4	23.7	\$922.6	\$1,080.6	\$2,003.1	5.0
	Office of Global Affairs and Policy	\$3,029.3	\$219.1	\$3,248.5	18.6	\$922.6	\$85.0	\$1,007.6	5.0
	Office of Management and International Services	\$1,896.5	\$861.6	\$2,758.1	13.0	\$737.8	\$504.3	\$1,242.1	4.0
	American Indian Environmental Office	\$2,803.8	\$853.6	\$3,657.4	19.0	\$2,570.7	\$259.1	\$2,829.8	14.3
	Regional Resources	\$11,290.6	\$66,647.2	\$77,937.8	78.5	\$9,318.0	\$46,118.0	\$55,436.0	55.9
	<b>TOTA</b>	<b>\$23,805.0</b>	<b>\$71,276.0</b>	<b>\$95,081.0</b>	<b>158.8</b>	<b>\$14,840.0</b>	<b>\$48,093.0</b>	<b>\$62,933.0</b>	<b>86.2</b>
	OLEM	Immediate Office	\$7,855.3	\$5,021.9	\$12,877.3	45.2	\$5,505.1	\$3,643.3	\$9,148.3
Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office		\$2,235.6	\$880.3	\$3,116.0	13.2	\$2,202.0	\$799.3	\$3,001.3	12.5
Office of Communication, Partnership, and Analysis		\$2,184.4	\$1,531.2	\$3,715.6	15.3	\$1,979.1	\$1,045.4	\$3,024.5	10.8
Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation		\$25,094.3	\$69,055.7	\$94,150.0	147.0	\$23,894.2	\$39,039.5	\$62,933.7	134.9
Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery		\$25,428.0	\$11,705.6	\$37,133.6	165.9	\$15,641.2	\$6,796.4	\$22,437.6	92.3
Office of Underground Storage Tanks		\$4,079.2	\$2,840.8	\$6,920.0	25.5	\$2,971.8	\$261.1	\$3,232.9	16.3
Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization		\$2,819.1	\$12,570.2	\$15,389.2	19.5	\$2,089.6	\$11,128.9	\$13,218.4	12.1
Office of Emergency Management		\$11,816.8	\$30,928.8	\$42,745.6	69.1	\$10,198.0	\$16,333.7	\$26,531.7	55.1
Regional Resources		\$269,016.3	\$749,822.3	\$1,018,838.6	1,814.8	\$234,550.0	\$494,702.6	\$729,252.6	1,486.8
<b>TOTA</b>		<b>\$350,529.0</b>	<b>\$884,357.0</b>	<b>\$1,234,886.0</b>	<b>2,315.5</b>	<b>\$299,031.0</b>	<b>\$573,750.0</b>	<b>\$872,781.0</b>	<b>1,850.3</b>

		FY 2017 Annualized Continuing Resolution				FY 2018 President Budget			
NPM	Major Office	Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FT	Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE
					<b>E</b>	)			
<b>ORD</b>	ORD Headquarters	\$35,537.3	\$55,737.5	\$91,274.8	318.3	\$35,582.1	\$36,582.0	\$72,164.1	212.9
	National Center for Environmental Research	\$9,177.4	\$54,257.8	\$63,435.2	52.7	\$648.5	\$2,162.0	\$2,810.5	3.9
	National Exposure Research Laboratory	\$51,597.5	\$28,697.2	\$80,294.7	310.8	\$34,164.7	\$11,869.0	\$46,033.7	204.4
	National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory	\$73,782.6	\$44,962.6	\$118,745.2	473.7	\$53,065.3	\$21,129.0	\$74,194.3	317.8
	National Homeland Security Research Center	\$7,093.1	\$12,389.4	\$19,482.5	41.7	\$4,240.6	\$5,372.0	\$9,612.6	25.5
	National Risk Management Research Laboratory	\$43,184.3	\$28,955.2	\$72,139.5	272.0	\$29,161.5	\$11,121.0	\$40,282.5	175.4
	Office of the Science Advisor	\$3,469.0	\$3,274.3	\$6,743.2	18.0	\$2,112.4	\$1,484.0	\$3,596.4	12.7
	National Center for Computational Toxicology	\$5,477.3	\$9,657.2	\$15,134.5	35.5	\$4,108.6	\$3,091.0	\$7,199.6	24.7
	National Center for Environmental Assessment	\$30,575.4	\$15,037.9	\$45,613.3	181.2	\$17,036.4	\$3,872.0	\$20,908.4	102.5
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>\$259,894.0</b>	<b>\$252,969.0</b>	<b>\$512,863.0</b>	<b>1,703.9</b>	<b>\$180,120.0</b>	<b>\$96,682.0</b>	<b>\$276,802.0</b>	<b>1,079.8</b>
<b>OW</b>	Immediate Office	\$10,952.9	\$6,127.9	\$17,080.8	66.4	\$10,317.6	\$3,658.3	\$13,975.9	59.1
	Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water	\$25,881.0	\$41,262.2	\$67,143.1	167.0	\$21,952.4	\$14,555.1	\$36,507.5	128.7
	Office of Science and Technology	\$19,052.2	\$17,027.1	\$36,079.4	114.0	\$17,502.5	\$9,489.7	\$26,992.2	101.5
	Office of Wastewater Management	\$18,239.8	\$17,247.0	\$35,486.9	119.7	\$19,655.8	\$24,375.9	\$44,031.7	115.6
	Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds	\$18,352.1	\$23,571.2	\$41,923.3	114.8	\$13,039.1	\$9,505.7	\$22,544.8	73.2
	Regional Resources	\$193,628.0	\$3,347,580.5	\$3,541,208.5	1,351.8	\$159,241.6	\$2,510,403.2	\$2,669,644.8	1,034.3
	<b>TOT</b>	<b>\$286,106.0</b>	<b>\$3,452,816.0</b>	<b>\$3,738,922.0</b>	<b>1,933.8</b>	<b>\$241,709.0</b>	<b>\$2,571,988.0</b>	<b>\$2,813,697.0</b>	<b>1,512.4</b>
	<b>Subtotal Agency Resources</b>	<b>\$2,269,167.0</b>	<b>\$6,018,168.0</b>	<b>\$8,287,335.0</b>	<b>15,050.8</b>	<b>\$1,845,872.0</b>	<b>\$4,178,128.0</b>	<b>\$6,024,000.0</b>	<b>11,121.9</b>
	Less Rescission of Prior Year Funds			(\$40,000.0)				(\$369,000.0)	
	Reimbursable FTE				365.0				489.5
	<b>Total Agency Resources</b>	<b>\$2,269,167.0</b>	<b>\$6,018,168.0</b>	<b>\$8,247,335.0</b>	<b>15,415.8</b>	<b>\$1,845,872.0</b>	<b>\$4,178,128.0</b>	<b>\$5,655,000.0</b>	<b>11,611.4</b>

## IG's Comments On The FY 2018 President's Budget



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

**APR 14 2017**

The Honorable Mick Mulvaney  
Director  
The Office of Management and Budget  
725 17th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20503

Dear Director Mulvaney:

As you are aware, the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, 5 U.S.C. app. 3, § 6(g)(3)(E), states the following:

The President shall include in each budget of the United States Government submitted to Congress any comments of the affected Inspector General with respect to the proposal if the Inspector General concludes that the budget submitted by the President would substantially inhibit the Inspector General from performing the duties of the office.

The proposed fiscal year 2018 budget creates a significant challenge for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Office of Inspector General (OIG) and its ability to accomplish its agency oversight mission. The President's budget proposes a 30-percent reduction to the OIG's payroll account. A budget cut of this magnitude would destabilize the OIG and have an immediate negative impact on the OIG's production capacity. As such, I do not agree with the proposed OIG appropriations cut, and argue that such a cut would substantially inhibit the OIG from performing the duties of the office, including mandatory OIG responsibilities explicitly required by federal law.

The OIG's primary deliverables are audits, program evaluations, and criminal and employee misconduct investigations. All these activities are labor intensive. A 30-percent reduction to the OIG's payroll account will virtually eliminate the OIG's ability to perform discretionary audits and program evaluations. These services assist EPA leadership, taxpayers and Congress; help to hold the agency accountable; and are valuable management tools that represent a substantial source of the OIG's ability to produce a positive return on investment to taxpayers.

Moreover, a 30-percent budget reduction would deprive the OIG's investigative team of its ability to timely respond to criminal activity subject to the OIG's jurisdiction, and impair our ability to comply with the Inspector General Act. The IG Act requires each Inspector General to report expeditiously to the U.S. Attorney General whenever the Inspector General has reasonable grounds to believe that there has been a violation of federal criminal law. Further, the OIG's mandatory investigations and audit activities are not performed by any other entity within the EPA. As such, if the OIG is not able to timely respond, there will be no timely response. This creates an unacceptable risk to the agency and to taxpayers' investment.

Additionally, the proposed budget will negatively impact the OIG's ability to retain and recruit highly skilled staff. As highlighted above, the OIG's work is labor intensive. In the long run, not being able to retain and recruit highly skilled staff will undermine the effectiveness of the EPA OIG. This outcome may manifest itself by negatively impacting the OIG's ability to serve as an effective deterrent to potential mismanagement and misconduct. In short, less oversight may lead to less concern about being discovered, and encourage behavior that otherwise would not have been contemplated.

The OIG historically produces a significant positive dollar return on investment. For example, the OIG had a return on investment of 734 percent in fiscal year 2014; 1,656 percent in 2015; and 2,098 percent in 2016. This return on investment saved taxpayers millions of dollars compared to the amount appropriated and spent by the OIG to carry out its functions; most of which are statutorily mandated.


In addition to the significant return on dollar investment, the OIG makes critical recommendations to assist the EPA in implementing its statutory mandate to protect human health and the environment. During times of significant budget pressures, we believe that OIG oversight is most needed and produces the greatest results. Taking money away from the OIG will have a negative impact on taxpayers' return on investment, as well as significantly reduce oversight of EPA programs that protect human health and the environment. If the OIG is not able to fully perform this important oversight role, who will?

The President's budget proposes an adjusted EPA appropriation that exceeds \$5 billion dollars, and a workforce exceeding 13,000 full-time equivalents. Neither of these numbers suggest any substantial risk reduction to EPA resources, or justify decreased oversight by the OIG. In short, both revised budget numbers are substantial and will require adequate OIG resources to assure taxpayers that their investment is being used as intended.

I respectfully request that the President's budget recognize the vulnerability to the agency that any reduction of OIG funding would create, along with the loss of return on investment it represents. I also request that the President's budget restore the OIG request to the fiscal year 2016 level. If this is not possible, consistent with the provisions of the IG Act, I respectfully request that the President include my above comments with the budget that is submitted to Congress.

If you or your staff have any questions, or if you would like to meet and discuss this matter, please contact me at (202) 566-0847 or [elkins.arthur@epa](mailto:elkins.arthur@epa).

Sincerely,



Arthur A. Elkins Jr.

cc: The Honorable Michael Horowitz, Chairman, Council of the Inspectors General  
on Integrity and Efficiency  
David Bloom, Acting Chief Financial Officer, EPA

## Physicians' Comparability Allowance (PCA) Worksheet For By 2018

### Environmental Protection Agency Table 1

	PY 2016 (Actual)	CY 2017 (Estimates)	BY 2018 (Estimates)
1) Number of Physicians Receiving PCAs	4	4	4
2) Number of Physicians with One-Year PCA Agreements			
3) Number of Physicians with Multi-Year PCA Agreements	4	4	4
4) Average Annual PCA Physician Pay (without PCA payment)	\$138,606	\$143,326	\$144,759
5) Average Annual PCA Payment	\$24,917	\$24,419	\$24,419
6) Number of Physicians Receiving PCAs by Category (non-add)	Category I Clinical Position		
	Category II Research Position	4	4
	Category III Occupational Health		
	Category IV-A Disability Evaluation		
	Category IV-B Health and Medical Admin.		

- 7) If applicable, list and explain the necessity of any additional physician categories designated by your agency (for categories other than I through IV-B). Provide the number of PCA agreements per additional category for the PY, CY and BY.

The EPA expects no additional categories to be applicable in the foreseeable future.

- 8) Provide the maximum annual PCA amount paid to each category of physician in your agency and explain the reasoning for these amounts by category.

The maximum allowance being paid to a Category II Research Position is \$30,000.

- 9) Explain the recruitment and retention problem(s) for each category of physician in your agency (this should demonstrate that a current need continues to persist).

*(Please include any staffing data to support your explanation, such as number and duration of unfilled positions and number of accessions and separations per fiscal year.)*

Historically, the number of the EPA Research Physicians is between five and seven positions. This small population experiences modest turnover. The value of the physicians' comparability allowance to the EPA is as a retention tool.

- 10) Explain the degree to which recruitment and retention problems were alleviated in your agency through the use of PCAs in the prior fiscal year.

*(Please include any staffing data to support your explanation, such as number and duration of unfilled positions and number of accessions and separations per fiscal year.)*

We are told regularly that absent the allowance, some EPA research physicians would seek employment at federal agencies that provide the allowance.

- 11) Provide any additional information that may be useful in planning PCA staffing levels and amounts in your agency.

An agency with a very small number of physician positions and a low turn-over rate among them still needs the allowance authority to maintain the stability of the small population. Those who opt for federal employment in opposition to private sector employment still want the maximum pay available in the federal sector. Were it not for the PCA, the EPA would regularly lose some of its physicians to other federal agencies that offer the allowance, requiring the EPA to refill vacant positions. Turn-over statistics should be viewed in this light.