

NATIONAL WATER
PROGRAM METRIC
DEFINITIONS

Table of Contents

METRIC DEFINITIONS.....	1
COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEMS OUT OF COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH-BASED STANDARDS	2
COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEMS OUT OF COMPLIANCE WITH HEALTH-BASED STANDARDS IN INDIAN COUNTRY.....	4
SYSTEMS OUT OF COMPLIANCE DUE TO LEAD AND COPPER RULE VIOLATIONS	6
STRENGTHEN THE TECHNICAL, MANAGERIAL, AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY OF DRINKING WATER SYSTEMS.....	8
DRINKING WATER SANITARY SURVEYS.....	9
REVIEWS OF STATE DWSRF.....	11
STATE PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM SUPERVISION (PWSS) RULE PRIMACY APPLICATIONS IN BACKLOG	12
EPA PERMIT BACKLOG - NEW UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL (UIC)	13
EPA PERMIT BACKLOG - EXISTING UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL (UIC).....	14
NUMBER (BILLIONS) OF NON-FEDERAL DOLLARS LEVERAGED BY EPA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE PROGRAMS - CWSRF, DWSRF AND WIFIA	15
REVIEWS OF STATE CWSRF	16
EPA PERMIT BACKLOG - EXISTING NON-TRIBAL NPDES.....	17
EPA PERMIT BACKLOG - EXISTING TRIBAL NPDES.....	19
EPA PERMIT BACKLOG - NEW NON-TRIBAL NPDES	21
EPA PERMIT BACKLOG - NEW TRIBAL NPDES.....	23
AVERAGE PROCESS TIME FOR REQUESTS FOR COVERAGE UNDER NPDES GENERAL PERMITS	25
WATERSHEDS WITH SURFACE WATERS NOT MEETING STANDARDS.....	27
WATERSHEDS WITH SURFACE WATERS NOT MEETING STANDARDS BECAUSE OF NUTRIENTS THAT NOW MEET STANDARDS	29
ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF STATE INTEGRATED REPORTS	31
OUTSTANDING STATE SUBMISSION OF 303(D) LISTS.....	32
PROGRESS IN PUTTING PRIORITY TMDLS, ALTERNATIVE RESTORATION PLANS, AND PROTECTION APPROACHES IN PLACE	33
BACKLOG OF EPA ACTION ON TMDLS.....	35
BACKLOG OF EPA ACTION ON PRIORITY TMDLS	36
BACKLOG OF EPA ACTION ON 303(D) LISTS.....	37
NUMBER OF PRIMARILY NONPOINT SOURCE-IMPAIRED WATERBODIES PARTIALLY OR FULLY RESTORED BY NPS PROGRAM ACTIONS.....	38
REPORT ON THE QUALITY OF THE NATION'S WATERS - NUMBER OF SAMPLES PROCESSED.....	39
WATER QUALITY STANDARDS ACTIONS IN BACKLOG.....	40
NUMBER OF STATES COMPLETING TRIENNIAL REVIEWS ON TIME	41
NUMBER OF STATES AND TERRITORIES WITH A METHODOLOGY FOR NOTIFYING THE PUBLIC WHEN A HARMFUL ALGAL BLOOM IS PRESENT.....	42

Metric Definitions

The National Water Program evaluates the progress it is making in developing and implementing effective programs to monitor, protect, and improve the waters of the United States. As part of this effort, 29 metrics have been developed. This document provides definitions for these metrics including a description of the metric, the associated metric category (long term performance goal, annual performance goal, and/or national water program guidance), EPA reporting office, associated EPA program, tribal status, and technical contact(s) for more information.¹ The document also includes detailed information on the following categories:

- **Related metrics.** Lists the metrics that are topically related.
- **Units.** Standard metric unit.
- **Goal.** Overall long-term goal for the metric.
- **Baseline.** First year of metric data collection, includes the FY baseline year and value.
- **Universe.** The overall “N” for the metric, for example the total number of community water systems in the nation.
- **Direction of positive change.** Indicates if positive change is occurring when the metric is increasing or decreasing.
- **Terms and phrases.** Key terms and phrases used in describing the metric.
- **Calculation of metric.** Indicates if the metric is calculated annually, or cumulatively across years.
- **Methodology.** Full description of the methods used for calculating the metric.
- **Data Source.** Data system name or approach for sourcing the data.
- **Update frequency.** Frequency in which data are updated in the system.
- **Obtaining data.** Indicates what coordination needs to occur to obtain the data.
- **Data limitations and quality.** Notable data limitations or information pertinent to the data quality of the metric.

¹ “N/A” indicates data that are not available.

OBTAINING DATA Data are provided by agencies with primacy (primary enforcement authority) for the Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) program. These agencies are either: States, EPA for non-delegated states or territories, and the Navajo Nation Indian tribe, the only tribe with primacy.

DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY Reference to Quality Assurance Project Plan: The SDWIS/Fed equivalent of a quality assurance project plan is the Drinking Water Data Quality Improvement Plan. This plan includes implementation of the Data Quality Matrix which, on a quarterly basis, assigns numerical data quality scores to each primacy agency. Additionally, the SDWIS Fed Rep 3.5 Requirements document ensures that specific types of data quality are adhered to. For example, the SDWIS/FedRep Validation Tool ensures each document conforms to the business rules established for federally reportable drinking water data. Individual business objects that conform to the established business rules are accepted. Those business objects that do not conform are rejected. For each documented validation that the business object fails to conform, a status message is created containing sufficient information for the user to locate and correct the data in the primacy agency's database. States report data to EPA from their state databases after making a determination of violation. In some cases, an individual state's submission can be incomplete due to technical issues in the data transfer or because the state's violation determination was not loaded into their data system.

MORE INFORMATION <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-05/documents/dqr-1-2-community-water-systems.pdf>

Community water systems out of compliance with health-based standards in Indian country

Community water system non-compliance with health-based metrics is important to reflect the protection of the Nation's public health associated with the delivery of safe drinking water (meeting the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations) by the 736 tribal community water systems.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OGWDW	Drinking Water	Tribal specific	Eric Bissonette, bissonett.eric@epa.gov; Travis Cummings, cummings.travis@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	Community water systems out of compliance with health-based standards		
UNITS	Community water systems		
GOAL	By September 30, 2020, reduce the number of tribal community water systems out of compliance with health-based standards to 95.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 109		
UNIVERSE	Total number of Tribal community water systems approximately 736.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community water system (CWS). A public water system that supplies water to the same population year-round. • Health-based standard. The Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) or treatment technique (TT) permissible of an enforceable contaminant in water delivered to users of a public water system. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	The EPA Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water calculates this metric using data reported in the Safe Drinking Water System (SDWIS) Federal (Fed) Data Warehouse-FED and provides the results to EPA regions. This metric includes federally regulated contaminants of the following violation types: Maximum Contaminant Level, Maximum Residual Disinfection Limit, and Treatment Technique violations. It includes any violations from currently open and closed CWSs that overlap any part of the most recent four quarters.		
DATA SOURCE	SDWIS Fed Data Warehouse. The SDWIS Fed Data Warehouse contains compliance information about public water systems and their violations of the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (NPDWRs) as reported to EPA by the primacy agencies.		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Quarterly		

OBTAINING DATA Data are provided by agencies with primacy (primary enforcement authority) for the Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) program. These agencies are either: States, EPA for non-delegated states or territories, and the Navajo Nation Indian tribe, the only tribe with primacy.

DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY Reference to Quality Assurance Project Plan: The SDWIS/Fed equivalent of a quality assurance project plan is the Drinking Water Data Quality Improvement Plan. This plan includes implementation of the Data Quality Matrix which, on a quarterly basis, assigns numerical data quality scores to each primacy agency. Additionally, the SDWIS Fed Rep 3.5 Requirements document ensures that specific types of data quality are adhered to. For example, the SDWIS/FedRep Validation Tool ensures each document conforms to the business rules established for federally reportable drinking water data. Individual business objects that conform to the established business rules are accepted. Those business objects that do not conform are rejected. For each documented validation that the business object fails to conform, a status message is created containing sufficient information for the user to locate and correct the data in the primacy agency's database. States report data to EPA from their state databases after making a determination of violation. In some cases, an individual state's submission can be incomplete due to technical issues in the data transfer or because the state's violation determination was not loaded into their data system.

MORE INFORMATION <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-05/documents/dqr-1-2-community-water-systems.pdf>

Systems out of compliance due to Lead and Copper Rule violations

Under the Lead and Copper Rule (LCR), public water systems collect samples from locations with lead service lines and/or leaded plumbing materials. The LCR established action levels of 0.015 mg/L (15 ppb) for lead, based on the 90th percentile sample level. If the lead action level is exceeded in more than ten percent of tap water samples collected during any monitoring period (i.e., if the 90th percentile level is greater than the action level), a water system must take certain actions. The type of action that is triggered depends upon the size of the system and the actions it has taken previously. The type of actions that public water systems must take include installing corrosion control treatment, public education, and lead service line replacement. The violation occurs when appropriate action is not taken.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OGWDW	Drinking Water	Not tribal	Eric Bissonette, bissonett.eric@epa.gov; Travis Cummings, cummings.travis@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	Strengthen the technical, managerial, and financial capacity of drinking water systems		
UNITS	Percent of public water systems		
GOAL	50% decrease by 2022 and 100% decrease by 2028.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 298		
UNIVERSE	Total number of community water systems, approximately 50,000 (fluctuates annually).		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	N/A		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	The count of systems that have a violation of the Lead and Copper Rule.		
DATA SOURCE	Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS) Federal (Fed) Data Warehouse. The SDWIS Fed Data Warehouse contains compliance information about public water systems and their violations of the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (NPDWRs) as reported to EPA by the primacy agencies.		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Quarterly		
OBTAINING DATA	Data are provided by agencies with primacy (primary enforcement authority) for the Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) program. These agencies are either: States, EPA for non-delegated states or territories, and the Navajo Nation Indian tribe, the only tribe with primacy.		

DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY

Reference to Quality Assurance Project Plan: The SDWIS/Fed equivalent of a quality assurance project plan is the Drinking Water Data Quality Improvement Plan. This plan includes implementation of the Data Quality Matrix which, on a quarterly basis, assigns numerical data quality scores to each primacy agency. Additionally, the SDWIS Fed Rep 3.5 Requirements document ensures that specific types of data quality are adhered to. For example, the SDWIS/FedRep Validation Tool ensures each document conforms to the business rules established for federally reportable drinking water data. Individual business objects that conform to the established business rules are accepted. Those business objects that do not conform are rejected. For each documented validation that the business object fails to conform, a status message is created containing sufficient information for the user to locate and correct the data in the primacy agency's database. States report data to EPA from their state databases after making a determination of violation. In some cases, an individual state's submission can be incomplete due to technical issues in the data transfer or because the state's violation determination was not loaded into their data system.

MORE INFORMATION

<https://www.epa.gov/dwreginfo/lead-and-copper-rule-implementation-tools>

Strengthen the technical, managerial, and financial capacity of drinking water systems

This metric aims to strengthen public water system long-term sustainability and public health protection.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OGWDW	Drinking Water	Not tribal	Eric Bissonette, bissonett.eric@epa.gov; Travis Cummings, cummings.travis@epa.gov

RELATED METRICS	Systems out of compliance due to Lead and Copper Rule violations
UNITS	Events
GOAL	N/A
BASELINE	FY 2018: 386
UNIVERSE	Changes annually
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Increase
TERMS AND PHRASES	N/A
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual
METHODOLOGY	The count of engagements with states and water utilities (number of events) including Capacity Development Activities, Region/State Meetings, Area-wide Optimization Field Events, Water System Partnership Activities, Lead & Copper Rule - Action Level Exceedance training events, technical rule compliance assistance events, National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (NPDWR) training and technical assistance, asset management training, and financial and managerial training. For yearly calculation, sum of months reported.
DATA SOURCE	Regions and Headquarters Monthly inventory of activities.
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly
OBTAINING DATA	Collected by Headquarters in coordination with regions.
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/dwcapacity/technical-managerial-and-financial-tmf-capacity-resources-small-drinking-water-systems

Drinking water sanitary surveys

A sanitary survey is a review of a public water system (PWS) to assess the capability to supply safe drinking water. Primacy agencies are responsible for completing a sanitary survey of public water systems every 3 years (5 years for outstanding performers).

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
EPA Reporting Office.	EPA Program.	Not tribal; Includes tribal data.	Eric Bissonette, bissonett.eric@epa.gov; Travis Cummings, cummings.travis@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	None		
UNITS	Drinking water sanitary surveys		
GOAL	N/A		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 91.7%		
UNIVERSE	N/A		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Increase		
TERMS AND PHRASES	N/A		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Percent of Community Water Systems that have undergone a sanitary survey within the past 3 years (five years for outstanding performers or those ground water systems approved by the primacy agency to provide 4-log treatment of viruses). The percent calculation is determined on an annual calendar. The 1/3 required # of annual surveys re-sets each January. By December the percent of surveys completed should be in the 90s increasing annually towards the 2022 goal of 98%. Presumes approximately 1/3 of 3-year total of sanitary surveys are conducted each year. Total percentage re-sets to ~60% each January.		
DATA SOURCE	Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS) Federal (Fed) Data Warehouse. The SDWIS Fed Data Warehouse contains compliance information about public water systems and their violations of the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations (NPDWRs) as reported to EPA by the primacy agencies.		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Quarterly		
OBTAINING DATA	Data are provided by agencies with primacy (primary enforcement authority) for the Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) program. These agencies are either: States, EPA for non-delegated states or territories, and the Navajo Nation Indian tribe, the only tribe with primacy.		

DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY

Reference to Quality Assurance Project Plan: The SDWIS/Fed equivalent of a quality assurance project plan is the Drinking Water Data Quality Improvement Plan. This plan includes implementation of the Data Quality Matrix which, on a quarterly basis, assigns numerical data quality scores to each primacy agency. Additionally, the SDWIS Fed Rep 3.5 Requirements document ensures that specific types of data quality are adhered to. For example, the SDWIS/FedRep Validation Tool ensures each document conforms to the business rules established for federally reportable drinking water data. Individual business objects that conform to the established business rules are accepted. Those business objects that do not conform are rejected. For each documented validation that the business object fails to conform, a status message is created containing sufficient information for the user to locate and correct the data in the primacy agency's database. States report data to EPA from their state databases after making a determination of violation. In some cases, an individual state's submission can be incomplete due to technical issues in the data transfer or because the state's violation determination was not loaded into their data system.

MORE INFORMATION

<https://www.epa.gov/dwreginfo/sanitary-surveys>

Reviews of state DWSRF

This metric counts the number of annual state DWSRF reviews conducted by the EPA Regions. Reviews typically occur from October-June (for the previous state fiscal year).

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OGWDW	Drinking Water	Not tribal	Eric Bissonette, bissonett.eric@epa.gov; Travis Cummings, cummings.travis@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	Reviews of state DWSRF		
UNITS	DWSRF Reviews		
GOAL	The EPA Regions conduct 51 annual reviews every year. The metric aims to ensure the number of annual reviews remains consistent.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 51		
UNIVERSE	50 states + Puerto Rico		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Increase		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Review. Annual review of the state DWSRF. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Count of Reviews from Oct. 1 to June or July 1.		
DATA SOURCE	Regional & Headquarters reporting.		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	Collect from annual review calendar.		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/drinkingwatersrf/program-policy-and-guidance-drinking-water-state-revolving-fund-program		

State Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) rule primacy applications in backlog

Primacy agencies are required to submit a rule primacy package to EPA to seek approval to implement a new or revised NPDWR.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OGWDW	Drinking Water	Not tribal	Eric Bissonette, bissonett.eric@epa.gov; Travis Cummings, cummings.travis@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	None		
UNITS	Primacy applications		
GOAL	Reduce the State Public Water System Supervision (PWSS) rule primacy applications in backlog to 12 by September 30, 2020.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 41		
UNIVERSE	51 (49 states + Puerto Rico + Navajo Nation).		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	N/A		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Number of state drinking water rule primacy packages processed that had been awaiting approval. Backlog primacy packages are defined as those awaiting Agency approval for the last five recently promulgated regulations- RTCR, GWR, Stage 2, LT2 and short-term revisions to LCR.		
DATA SOURCE	Regional & Headquarters reporting.		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	Information is collected from the regions via the national primacy package tracking system.		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/dwreginfo/primacy-enforcement-responsibility-public-water-systems		

EPA permit backlog - New Underground Injection Control (UIC)

More applications for new permits are received than EPA Regions have the capacity to reissue. Factors beyond EPA's control often delay permit issuance (e.g., facility requests pause, consultations, required processes such as NEPA, significant public interest).

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OGWDW	UIC	Not tribal	Eric Bissonette, bissonett.eric@epa.gov; Travis Cummings, cummings.travis@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	EPA permit backlog - Existing UIC		
UNITS	UIC permit applications		
GOAL	By September 30, 2022, reach all permitting-related decisions within six months.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 36		
UNIVERSE	All EPA-issued permits that are backlogged and those that have the potential to become backlogged before the end of FY 2022.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease.		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New. Applications for permits for facilities that do not already have EPA-issued UIC permit coverage. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Sum of the applications for new EPA UIC permits (all Classes) that have been pending for over 6 months. This metric only includes those wells that do not already have an EPA UIC permit (for the new well class). This metric includes those applications received more than 180 calendar days from the last day of the previous month for those wells that do not already have an EPA UIC permit (for the new well class). The clock starts with the initial submittal of an application, not submittal of a full and complete application, and ends with final agency decision (issuance or denial). Does not include those permits that have been issued.		
DATA SOURCE	Agency-wide permit tracker.		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	Regional reporting to ePermit Tracker which is aggregated in Bowling Chart.		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/uic		

EPA permit backlog - Existing Underground Injection Control (UIC)

More permits are expiring than EPA Regions have the capacity to reissue. Factors beyond EPA's control often delay permit issuance (e.g., facility requests pause, consultations, required processes such as NEPA, significant public interest).

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OGWDW	UIC	Not tribal	Eric Bissonette, bissonett.eric@epa.gov; Travis Cummings, cummings.travis@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	EPA permit backlog - New UIC		
UNITS	UIC permits		
GOAL	By September 30, 2022, reach all permitting-related decisions within six months.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 36		
UNIVERSE	All existing EPA-issued permits that have passed their expiration date.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing. Permits that have previously been issued and need reissuance. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Sum of the number of existing EPA UIC permits (all Classes) that have passed their expiration date and are awaiting renewal or reissuance. This metric includes permits that have passed their expiration date. Permits are removed from the backlog as soon as the agency takes final action on the permit (issuance or denial).		
DATA SOURCE	Agency-wide permit tracker		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	Regional reporting to ePermit Tracker which is aggregated in Bowling Chart.		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		

MORE INFORMATION <https://www.epa.gov/uic>

Reviews of state CWSRF

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWM	Infrastructure	Not tribal	Lynn Stabenfeldt, stabenfeldt.lynn@epa.gov

RELATED METRICS	Reviews of state DWSRF
UNITS	CWSRF reviews
GOAL	N/A
BASELINE	FY 2018: 0
UNIVERSE	50 states + Puerto Rico
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Increase
TERMS AND PHRASES	N/A
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual
METHODOLOGY	Count of Reviews - during state reviews, EPA Headquarters and the Regions promote national priorities with the state-run programs, including increasing the non-federal dollars leveraged by the EPA federal investment in water infrastructure programs.
DATA SOURCE	Regional & Headquarters reporting
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly
OBTAINING DATA	N/A
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A

MORE INFORMATION <https://www.epa.gov/waterfinancecenter/leading-edge-financing-water-infrastructure>

METHODOLOGY	Sum of the number of existing EPA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Non-Tribal individual permits that have passed their expiration date and are awaiting renewal or reissuance. This metric includes individual permits that have passed their expiration date as of the last day of the previous month. Permits are removed from the backlog as soon as the agency takes final action on the permit (issuance or denial).
DATA SOURCE	ICIS-NPDES
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly
OBTAINING DATA	Data are pulled from ICIS-NPDES by EPA Headquarters and sent to EPA Regional offices for review and quality assurance.
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	Basic permit data are for the most part complete and accurate in ICIS-NPDES. However, for various reasons, some data needed for this metric may not be entered or up to date. To ensure the results reported are as accurate as possible, The EPA Regions review data and make any necessary corrections. Where possible, edits should also be made to the ICIS-NPDES database.
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/npdes/npdes-permit-status-reports

METHODOLOGY	Sum of the number of existing EPA NPDES Tribal individual permits that have passed their expiration date and are awaiting renewal or reissuance. This metric includes individual permits that have passed their expiration date as of the last day of the previous month. Permits are removed from the backlog as soon as the agency takes final action on the permit (issuance or denial).
DATA SOURCE	ICIS-NPDES
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly
OBTAINING DATA	Data are pulled from ICIS-NPDES by EPA Headquarters and sent to EPA Regional offices for review and quality assurance.
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	Basic permit data are for the most part complete and accurate in ICIS-NPDES. However, for various reasons, some data needed for this metric may not be entered or up to date. To ensure the results reported are as accurate as possible, The EPA Regions review data and make any necessary corrections. Where possible, edits should also be made to the ICIS-NPDES database.
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/npdes/npdes-permit-status-reports

EPA permit backlog - New Non-Tribal NPDES

Historically, the EPA has had a backlog of administratively continued National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) individual permits caused by a number of factors, including multiple priorities, resource constraints, and unresolved technical or legal issues specific to each permit. This issue has been compounded by data sufficiency that impacts effective tracking of the permit backlog. In some EPA Regions, especially those with direct implementation responsibilities, some permits are expiring faster than EPA Regions are reissuing them. In addition, external factors (e.g., facility requests pause, consultations, significant public interest) often delay permit issuance. Recent program authorizations and adoption of LEAN management approaches are improving the long-term outlook for the processing of the backlog. The EPA is committed to speeding up the processing of EPA-issued permits to create certainty for the business community and ensure that permits improve environmental protection by reflecting the most recent environmental and scientific information.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWM	NPDES	Not tribal	Katherine Stebe, stebe.katherine@epa.gov Jackie Clark, clark.jackie@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	EPA permit backlog - Existing Non-Tribal NPDES; EPA permit backlog - Existing Tribal NPDES; EPA permit backlog - New Tribal NPDES; Average process time for requests for coverage under NPDES general permits.		
UNITS	NPDES permits		
GOAL	By September 30, 2022, reach all permitting-related decisions within six months.		
BASELINE	FY 2019: 52		
UNIVERSE	All pending applications for EPA-issued Non-Tribal Individual permits; approximately 31 as of the end of June 2019.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPDES. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. • New. Applications for permits for facilities that do not already have EPA-issued NPDES permit coverage. • Non-Tribal. Not within Indian Country as defined at 18 U.S.C. § 1151. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		

METHODOLOGY	Sum of the applications for new EPA Non-Tribal NPDES individual permits that have been pending for over 6 months. This metric is only for those facilities that do not already have coverage for their discharge. This metric includes those applications received more than 180 calendar days from the last day of the previous month. The clock starts with the initial submittal of an application, not submittal of a full and complete application, and ends with the date of agency decision (issuance or denial).
DATA SOURCE	ICIS-NPDES
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly
OBTAINING DATA	Data are pulled from ICIS-NPDES by EPA Headquarters and sent to EPA Regional offices for review and quality assurance.
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	Basic permit data are for the most part complete and accurate in ICIS-NPDES. However, for various reasons, some data needed for this metric may not be entered or up to date. To ensure the results reported are as accurate as possible, The EPA Regions review data and make any necessary corrections. Where possible, edits should also be made to the ICIS-NPDES database.
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/npdes/npdes-permit-status-reports

EPA permit backlog - New Tribal NPDES

Historically, the EPA has had a backlog of administratively continued National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) individual permits caused by a number of factors, including multiple priorities, resource constraints, and unresolved technical or legal issues specific to each permit. This issue has been compounded by data sufficiency that impacts effective tracking of the permit backlog. In some EPA Regions, especially those with direct implementation responsibilities, some permits are expiring faster than EPA Regions are reissuing them. In addition, external factors (e.g., facility requests pause, consultations, significant public interest) often delay permit issuance. Recent program authorizations and adoption of LEAN management approaches are improving the long-term outlook for the processing of the backlog. The EPA is committed to speeding up the processing of EPA-issued permits to create certainty for the business community and ensure that permits improve environmental protection by reflecting the most recent environmental and scientific information.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWM	NPDES	Tribal specific	Katherine Stebe, stebe.katherine@epa.gov Jackie Clark, clark.jackie@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	EPA permit backlog - Existing Non-Tribal NPDES; EPA permit backlog - Existing Tribal NPDES; EPA permit backlog - New Non-Tribal NPDES; Average process time for requests for coverage under NPDES general permits.		
UNITS	NPDES permits		
GOAL	By September 30, 2022, reach all permitting-related decisions within six months.		
BASELINE	FY 2019: 11		
UNIVERSE	All pending applications for EPA-issued Tribal Individual permits; approximately 12 as of the end of June 2019.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPDES. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. • New. Applications for permits for facilities that do not already have EPA-issued NPDES permit coverage. • Tribal. Within Indian Country as defined at 18 U.S.C. § 1151. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		

METHODOLOGY	Sum of the applications for new EPA Tribal NPDES individual permits that have been pending for over 6 months. This metric is only for those facilities that do not already have coverage for their discharge. This metric includes those applications received more than 180 calendar days from the last day of the previous month. The clock starts with the initial submittal of an application, not submittal of a full and complete application, and ends with the date of agency decision (issuance or denial).
DATA SOURCE	ICIS-NPDES
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly
OBTAINING DATA	Data are pulled from ICIS-NPDES by EPA Headquarters and sent to EPA Regional offices for review and quality assurance.
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	Basic permit data are for the most part complete and accurate in ICIS-NPDES. However, for various reasons, some data needed for this metric may not be entered or up to date. To ensure the results reported are as accurate as possible, The EPA Regions review data and make any necessary corrections. Where possible, edits should also be made to the ICIS-NPDES database.
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/npdes/npdes-permit-status-reports

Average process time for requests for coverage under NPDES general permits

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general permits are written to cover multiple dischargers with similar operations and types of discharges. Dischargers may obtain coverage under a general permit after it is issued, consistent with the permit eligibility and authorization provisions. Obtaining coverage under a general permit is typically quicker than an individual permit with coverage under a general permit often occurring after a short waiting period. However, in some instances, coverage may take longer depending on specific circumstances for a facility and the conditions of the permit they are seeking coverage under.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWM	NPDES	Not tribal	Katherine Stebe, stebe.katherine@epa.gov Jackie Clark, clark.jackie@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	EPA permit backlog - Existing Non-Tribal NPDES; EPA permit backlog - Existing Tribal NPDES; EPA permit backlog - New Non-Tribal NPDES; EPA permit backlog - New Tribal NPDES.		
UNITS	Days		
GOAL	By September 30, 2022, reach all permitting-related decisions within six months.		
BASELINE	FY 2019: 9		
UNIVERSE	All NOIs submitted for EPA-issued General Permits within the reporting timeframe.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOI. Notice of Intent seeking coverage under a general permit. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Average number of days from the initial NOI received date to the effective date for all NOIs under EPA-issued NPDES General Permits that became effective in the reporting month.		
DATA SOURCE	ICIS-NPDES		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	Data are pulled from ICIS-NPDES by EPA Headquarters and sent to EPA Regional offices for review and quality assurance.		

**DATA LIMITATIONS
AND QUALITY**

Basic permit data are for the most part complete and accurate in ICIS-NPDES. However, for various reasons, some data needed for this metric may not be entered or up to date. To ensure the results reported are as accurate as possible, The EPA Regions review data and make any necessary corrections. Where possible, edits should also be made to the ICIS-NPDES database.

**MORE
INFORMATION**

<https://www.epa.gov/npdes/npdes-permit-status-reports>

Watersheds with surface waters not meeting standards

The purpose of this metric is to track the progress of water quality standards attainment in waters previously identified as impaired by in the EPA-approved Section 303(d) list as of October 1, 2018. Progress will be evident by a trend in previously impaired waters now attaining water quality standards.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWOW	Water Quality	Not tribal	Istanbul Yusuf, yusuf.istanbul@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	Watersheds with surface waters not meeting standards because of nutrients that now meet standards		
UNITS	Square miles		
GOAL	By September 30, 2022, reduce the number of square miles of watershed with surface water not meeting standards by 37,000 square miles.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 506,728		
UNIVERSE	The universe is calculated by using the most recent electronic integrated reports along with their corresponding geospatial representation of their waters. This information is translated to the National Hydrography Dataset plus (NHDPlus) catchments, using an automated approach that provides a corresponding watershed area for each state defined assess unit.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catchment-based indexing. An automated process that corresponds state geospatial information (e.g., streams, lakes, HUCs, basins) with NHDPlus Version 2 catchments. Catchments (i.e. watershed area) represent the local drainage area for the individual stream segments of a specific stream network. The process to correspond the state's geospatial information to catchments varies depending on the type of input file: linear files (representing rivers and streams), area files (representing lakes, ponds, or reservoirs), or boundary files (representing Watershed Boundary Dataset Hydrologic Units). The EPA will be responsible for the Catchment Indexing Process (CIP) Tool. For more information about NHDPlus V2 catchments, see https://www.epa.gov/waterdata/nhdplus-national-hydrography-dataset-plus. • Water Quality Standards Attainment. 1) the impairments have been effectively removed by corrective actions (i.e., restoration efforts) and 2) the waterbody now either fully supports the use or meets the water quality criterion for that particular pollutant or stressor for which it had been impaired. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		

METHODOLOGY	Sum of square miles of watershed area that were not meeting standards but as of the latest state report are now meeting standards. Watershed area with multiple causes of impairment will receive partial credit for the impairments removed.
DATA SOURCE	ATTAINS
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly
OBTAINING DATA	States submit to the EPA their Integrated Report on April 1 of every even numbered year. The EPA-approved Section 303(d) list includes information on the impairment status of the states' waters, which is used to report on this metric.
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	<p>The information reported under this performance metric reflects the status of the states' waters as reported in the Integrated Report. This metric tracks high-level reasons for WQS attainment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicable WQS attained, according to new assessment method. • Applicable WQS attained, due to change in WQS. • Applicable WQS attained, due to restoration activities. • Applicable WQS attained; original basis for listing was incorrect. • Applicable WQS attained; reason for recovery unspecified. • Applicable WQS attained; threatened water no longer threatened. • Applicable WQS attained; based on new data. <p>This metric does not measure incremental improvement for individual waters as they progress towards meeting water quality standards. For example, if a water is impaired for sediment, and after some restoration activity, the sediment issues are improving, but not yet meeting Water Quality Standards, this would not be counted under this metric until the water actually meets standards.</p>
MORE INFORMATION	<p>https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-12/documents/fl_section62-302.pdf</p> <p>https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-05/documents/dqr-1-2-water-quality.pdf</p>

METHODOLOGY	Sum of square miles of watershed area that were not meeting standards for nutrient-related parameters but as of the latest state report are now meeting standards. Watershed area with multiple causes of nutrient-related impairments will receive partial credit for the impairments removed.
DATA SOURCE	ATTAINS
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly
OBTAINING DATA	States submit to the EPA their Integrated Report on April 1 of every even numbered year. The EPA-approved Section 303(d) list information on the impairment status of the states' waters, which is used to report on this metric.
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	<p>The information reported under this performance metric reflects the status of the states' waters as reported in the Integrated Report. This metric tracks high-level reasons for WQS attainment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicable WQS attained, according to new assessment method. • Applicable WQS attained, due to change in WQS. • Applicable WQS attained, due to restoration activities. • Applicable WQS attained; original basis for listing was incorrect. • Applicable WQS attained; reason for recovery unspecified. • Applicable WQS attained; threatened water no longer threatened. • Applicable WQS attained; based on new data. <p>This metric does not measure incremental improvement for individual waters as they progress towards meeting water quality standards. For example, if a water is impaired for sediment, and after some restoration activity, the sediment issues are improving, but not yet meeting Water Quality Standards, this would not be counted under this metric until the water actually meets standards.</p>
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-12/documents/fl_section62-302.pdf

Electronic submission of state Integrated Reports

The EPA will use state Integrated Report data in ATTAINS as the data source to automate the calculation of the clean water strategic plan metric. States are being encouraged to submit their data electronically.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWOW	Impaired Waters	Not tribal	Istanbul Yusuf, yusuf.istanbul@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	Outstanding state submission of 303(d) lists		
UNITS	Integrated reports (IR)		
GOAL	At least one IR submitted electronically by every state and territory.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 34		
UNIVERSE	56 states and territories.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Increase		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Report (IR). The combined submission of a state's 305(b) assessed waters list and its 303(d) impaired waters list. This report is due on April 1 of even-numbered years. States are being encouraged to submit their 305(b) and 303(d) lists as an integrated report electronically through ATTAINS. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Count of electronic Integrated Reports submitted by states into ATTAINS. since April 1, 2018. Establishes most current baseline for the watersheds with surface waters not meeting standards metric.		
DATA SOURCE	ATTAINS		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	N/A		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/tmdl/integrated-reporting-guidance-under-cwa-sections-303d-305b-and-314		

Outstanding state submission of 303(d) lists

The state Integrated Reports (IRs) are a key source of water quality information. The purpose of this metric is to track state-submitted 303(d) lists due April 1 of every even year.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWOW	Impaired Waters	Not tribal	Istanbul Yusuf, yusuf.istanbul@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	Electronic submission of state Integrated Reports (IRs)		
UNITS	303(d) lists		
GOAL	Timely submission of 303(d) lists.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 50		
UNIVERSE	56 states' and territories' 303(d)/IRs April 1 of every even year (can be above 56 when lists from earlier cycles are late).		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list of impaired water. The term "303(d) list" or "list" is short for a state's list of impaired and threatened waters (e.g. stream/river segments, lakes). States are required to submit their list for EPA approval every two years. For each water on the list, the state identifies the pollutant causing the impairment, when known. In addition, the state assigns a priority for development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) taking into account the severity of the pollution and the sensitivity of the uses to be made of the waters, among other factors (40 C.F.R. §130.7(b)(4)). 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Count of outstanding state 303(d) lists due to be submitted to the EPA. Lists are due April 1 of every even year. Begins with all outstanding 303(d) lists due to the EPA. Ends once all outstanding state 303(d) lists are submitted.		
DATA SOURCE	ATTAINS		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	N/A		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/tmdl/integrated-reporting-guidance-under-cwa-sections-303d-305b-and-314		

METHODOLOGY This metric looks at the extent of priority catchment area activities leading to a completed TMDL approved by the EPA, or alternative restoration plan or protection approach agreed to by the EPA. It begins when states identify their priorities, and ends once a TMDL, alternative restoration approach or protection approach is in place. It is measured as percent of corresponding catchment area of priority waters that have a completed TMDL approved by the EPA, or alternative restoration plan or protection approach agreed to by the EPA. The EPA provides 0.5 credit for priority plans under development and full credit when a plan is approved/accepted.

- **Algorithm.** $[(\text{priority waters w/ TMDL/Plan in place} * 1) + (\text{priority waters w/ TMDL/plan started} * 0.5) + (\text{Priority waters with no TMDL/Plan started/in place} * 0)] / (\text{total priority waters})$.

DATA SOURCE ATTAINS

UPDATE FREQUENCY Monthly

OBTAINING DATA N/A

DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY N/A

MORE INFORMATION

<https://www.epa.gov/tmdl/overview-total-maximum-daily-loads-tmdls>

Backlog of EPA action on TMDLs

A key step in restoring water quality is to develop plans, like TMDLs, that will lead to a water meeting water quality standards. The purpose of this metric is to track the timeliness of the EPA's action on incoming TMDL submissions..

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWOW	TMDL	Not tribal	Istanbul Yusuf, yusuf.istanbul@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	Backlog of EPA action on priority TMDLs		
UNITS	TMDLs		
GOAL	The EPA has 30 days to review TMDL submissions.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 95		
UNIVERSE	Rolling, dependent on the number of incoming TMDL submissions.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). A TMDL is the calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant allowed to enter a waterbody so that the waterbody will meet and continue to meet water quality standards for that particular pollutant. A TMDL determines a pollutant reduction target and allocates load reductions necessary to the source(s) of the pollutant. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Count of the number of TMDLs that have been submitted to EPA where EPA has taken longer than 30 days to take action. Begins when a state submits a TMDL for EPA action and EPA has not taken action within 30 days. Ends once EPA has acted on the TMDL.		
DATA SOURCE	ATTAINS		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	N/A		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/tmdl/overview-total-maximum-daily-loads-tmdls		

Backlog of EPA action on priority TMDLs

A key step in restoring water quality is to develop plans, like TMDLs, that will lead to a water meeting water quality standards. The purpose of this metric is to track the timeliness of the EPA's action on incoming 303(d) Vision priority TMDL submissions.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWOW	TMDL	Not tribal	Istanbul Yusuf, yusuf.istanbul@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	Backlog of EPA action on TMDLs		
UNITS	Priority TMDLs		
GOAL	The EPA has 30 days to review TMDL submissions.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 79		
UNIVERSE	Rolling, dependent on the number of incoming 303(d) Vision priority TMDL submissions.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). A TMDL is the calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant allowed to enter a waterbody so that the waterbody will meet and continue to meet water quality standards for that particular pollutant. A TMDL determines a pollutant reduction target and allocates load reductions necessary to the source(s) of the pollutant. • Priority TMDLs. TMDLs developed for waters associated with state-identified 303(d) Vision priorities. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Count of the number of TMDLs in vision priority waters that have been submitted to EPA where EPA has taken longer than 30 days to take action. Begins when a state submits a TMDL in one of their priority waters for EPA approval and EPA has not taken action within 30 days. Ends once EPA has acted on the TMDL.		
DATA SOURCE	ATTAINS		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	N/A		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/tmdl/overview-total-maximum-daily-loads-tmdl		

Backlog of EPA action on 303(d) Lists

The state Integrated Reports (IRs) are a key source of water quality information. The purpose of this metric is to track the timeliness of the EPA's action on state-submitted 303(d) lists.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWOW	Impaired Waters	Not tribal	Istanbul Yusuf, yusuf.istanbul@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	None		
UNITS	303(d) lists		
GOAL	The EPA has 30 days to review 303(d) lists.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 18		
UNIVERSE	Rolling, dependent on the number of incoming IR/303(d) submissions.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list of impaired water. The term "303(d) list" or "list" is short for a state's list of impaired and threatened waters (e.g. stream/river segments, lakes). States are required to submit their list for EPA approval every two years. For each water on the list, the state identifies the pollutant causing the impairment, when known. In addition, the state assigns a priority for development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) taking into account the severity of the pollution and the sensitivity of the uses to be made of the waters, among other factors (40 C.F.R. §130.7(b)(4)). • Integrated Report (IR). The combined submission of a state's 305(b) assessed waters list and its 303(d) impaired waters list. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Count of the number of 303(d) lists that have been submitted to the EPA and are awaiting EPA action where the EPA has taken longer than 30 days to take action. Begins when a state submits a 303(d) list for EPA approval and EPA has not taken action within 30 days. Ends once the EPA has acted on the list.		
DATA SOURCE	ATTAINS		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	N/A		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		

MORE INFORMATION <https://www.epa.gov/tmdl/integrated-reporting-guidance-under-cwa-sections-303d-305b-and-314>

Number of primarily nonpoint source-impaired waterbodies partially or fully restored by NPS program actions

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWOW	Water Quality	Not tribal	Istanbul Yusuf, yusuf.istanbul@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	None		
UNITS	Waterbodies		
GOAL	N/A		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 751		
UNIVERSE	N/A		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Increase		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impairment. A pollutant or stressor preventing a water from meeting the water quality standard/criteria adopted by states to protect designated uses. A qualifying de-listing in one where: 1) the waterbody now either fully supports the use or meets the water quality criterion for which it had been impaired, and 2) the cause of impairment can be removed from the state's Section 303(d) list. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Cumulative across years		
METHODOLOGY	<p>This metric tracks the number of water quality impairments removed from nonpoint source (NPS)-impaired waterbodies through NPS program restoration work. An impairment cannot be counted simply through a state 303(d) de-listing action; specific management activities must have been taken within the watershed to demonstrably improve the waterbody. For example, if a water was inappropriately assessed/listed for pathogens, correction of this error does not satisfy requirements to be counted in this metric. However, if a waterbody impaired for pathogens is restored through NPS restoration work eliminating the source and the waterbody/pollutant is subsequently removed from the 303(d) list, this would qualify for the metric.</p>		
DATA SOURCE	GRTS		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	N/A		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		

MORE INFORMATION

<https://www.epa.gov/nps>

Report on the Quality of the nation's waters - number of samples processed

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OWOW	Water Quality	Not tribal	Istanbul Yusuf, yusuf.istanbul@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	None		
UNITS	Percent processed samples		
GOAL	N/A		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 0		
UNIVERSE	N/A		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Increase		
TERMS AND PHRASES	N/A		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	This metric tracks the progress of implementing a national survey that supports reporting on the quality of the Nation's waters. Progress will be based on the lab analysis and will track the number of samples analyzed. Percentage based on sum of the number of sample results delivered to the EPA divided by the total number collected.		
DATA SOURCE	EPA TOCORs		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	N/A		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	N/A		
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/waterdata/national-water-quality-inventory-report-congress		

Water Quality Standards actions in backlog

To ensure that water quality protections under the Clean Water Act programs are continuously aimed at the right objectives, it is important that the EPA act within timelines established in the Act to approve (or disapprove and replace) new and revised water quality standards submitted by states and tribes.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OST	Water Quality Standards	Includes tribal data	Lenny Backster, bankester.lenny@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	None		
UNITS	Number of backlogged EPA approval and disapproval actions		
GOAL	Act upon state and tribal standards submissions within statutory timelines.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 148		
UNIVERSE	Number of state and tribal standards submissions varies year to year.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Decrease		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revision actions. New and revised state and tribal water quality standards requiring EPA approval to become effective under the Clean Water Act. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	The number of state and tribal Water Quality Standards (WQS) revision actions that have been submitted to the EPA since May 2000 that the EPA neither approved nor disapproved within the first 60 days after submittal to the EPA, and that have yet to be so acted upon. The Clean Water Act requires the EPA to review state and tribal WQS revisions and either approve within 60 days or disapprove within 90 days.		
DATA SOURCE	Regional files of required state and tribal WQS submissions to EPA; WQS Action Tracking Application (WATA).		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	Regional administrative files.		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	Regional administrative files contain copies of the formal state, tribal, and EPA documents that document the submission, approval, and disapproval dates used in this metric.		
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/wqs-tech		

Number of states completing triennial reviews on time

Under the Clean Water Act, states bear the primary responsibility to keep water quality standards up to date, attuned to public expectations and based on the latest scientific information. The Act's requirement for triennial standards reviews ensures that states carry out this responsibility regularly.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OST	Water Quality Standards	Not tribal	Lenny Backster, bankester.lenny@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	None		
UNITS	Number of states and territories		
GOAL	States and territories fulfill their statutory obligation to review water quality standards and revise them as appropriate not less than once every three years.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 28.56		
UNIVERSE	56 states and territories; California has nine water districts conducting triennial reviews that are each represented in the metric as one-ninth of a state.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Increase		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key element #1. Conducting at least one public hearing to review all Clean Water Act Water Quality Standard applying to state waters. • Key element #2. Adopting – or providing an explanation for not adopting – revised water quality criteria for each parameter for which EPA has published updated recommendations for national water quality criteria. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	This metric tracks the number of states that have completed the two key elements of a triennial review in the past 36 months.		
DATA SOURCE	Regional files of required state submissions to EPA.		
UPDATE FREQUENCY	Monthly		
OBTAINING DATA	Regional administrative files.		
DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY	EPA relies on state and territorial documentation of triennial review actions. California has 9 regional water boards that conduct triennial reviews independently, so each water board conducting a triennial review on time counts as 1/9 toward the metric. Therefore, the ratio of water boards to states and territories in the calculation does not produce a whole number.		
MORE INFORMATION	https://www.epa.gov/wqs-tech/final-rulemaking-update-national-water-quality-standards-regulation		

Number of states and territories with a methodology for notifying the public when a harmful algal bloom is present

This metric aims to quantify new or updated state tools that water managers use to notify the public on Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs) occurrences and possible public health risks from exposure to HABs and their toxins in drinking and recreational waters. State water managers are usually the first responders to control and manage harmful algal blooms and their toxins in surface water systems. Having a HABs notification system and tools for the protection of public health helps state water managers provide information on HABs occurrences and possible public health risks in a timely manner.

METRIC CATEGORY: National Water Program Guidance

REPORTING OFFICE	PROGRAM	TRIBAL STATUS	TECHNICAL CONTACT(S)
OST	Water Quality Standards	Not tribal	Istanbul Yusuf, yusuf.istanbul@epa.gov
RELATED METRICS	None		
UNITS	States and territories		
GOAL	The goal is for those states, tribes and territories with historical HABs occurrences to have a HABs Program with bloom notification and public health tools in place.		
BASELINE	FY 2018: 20		
UNIVERSE	56 states and territories.		
DIRECTION OF POSITIVE CHANGE	Increase		
TERMS AND PHRASES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HABs. Certain environmental conditions in water bodies can intensify algae growth, causing algal blooms. Blooms with the potential to harm human health or aquatic ecosystems are referred to as harmful algal blooms or HABs. HABs are seasonal events, occurring mostly during the summer. 		
CALCULATION OF METRIC	Annual		
METHODOLOGY	Number of States and Territories with a method for notifying the public when there is an algal bloom of any kind. States have different mechanisms for letting their citizens know. "Methods" include 1) monitoring for algal blooms (cyanobacteria cells and/or toxins, use of remote satellite data, reporting forms and links in State websites for public reporting); 2) responding (guideline values in place, Cyanobacterial Management/Response Plans in place, post advisories and closures); 3) risk communication (emails, press notifications, maps, websites, social media, and outreach materials like fact sheets, signs, pictures of blooms, etc.)		
DATA SOURCE	Monthly Reports from States and Tribes that are publicly available through the internet.		

UPDATE FREQUENCY Monthly

OBTAINING DATA These data are published by state departments of health and/or environmental quality on their HABS webpages.

DATA LIMITATIONS AND QUALITY Developing a HABS program that includes a HABS notification system such as a map for bloom reporting, or tools to communicate and manage cyanobacterial blooms and their toxins, such as cyanotoxins management plans, requires both financial and human resources. During HABS season, States are busy monitoring and providing guidance, therefore the development of new methodologies is limited, and most probably new entries will not be published until later in the Fall or Winter when States stop monitoring for HABS.

MORE INFORMATION <https://www.epa.gov/nutrient-policy-data/monitoring-and-responding-cyanobacteria-and-cyanotoxins-recreational-waters>