



At a Glance

Catalyst for Improving the Environment

Why We Did This Review

Workforce planning identifies human capital required to meet organizational goals. We sought to determine whether the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established and effectively implemented internal controls for determining workforce levels and effectively used workforce planning in its strategic planning process.

Background

The Government Performance and Results Act requires agencies to describe the human resources needed to meet strategic and performance goals. For fiscal year 2009, EPA's full-time equivalents (FTEs) on board were approximately 17,200 with payroll costs representing \$2.2 billion of EPA's \$7.6 billion budget. The Government Accountability Office and EPA Office of Inspector General have reported on the importance of basing workforce levels on workload.

For further information, contact our Office of Congressional, Public Affairs and Management at (202) 566-2391.

To view the full report, click on the following link:
www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2011/20101220-11-P-0031.pdf

EPA Needs to Strengthen Internal Controls for Determining Workforce Levels

What We Found

EPA's policies and procedures do not include a process for determining employment levels based on workload as prescribed by the Office of Management and Budget. Further, EPA does not determine the number of positions needed per mission-critical occupation (MCO) using workforce analysis as required by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). These conditions occurred because EPA has not developed a workload assessment methodology and has not developed policies and procedures that require identifying and reporting on the number of positions needed per MCO. As a result, EPA cannot demonstrate that it has the right number of resources to accomplish its mission. The Government Accountability Office and EPA Office of Inspector General have reported instances in which personnel resources were not adequately considered and, consequently, offices encountered delays or did not meet mission requirements.

OPM noted that EPA's Human Capital Management Report shows evidence that EPA's work is guided by human capital goals and objectives. However, EPA's Office of Human Resources does not require that workforce planning results link to EPA's strategic and performance goals. This condition occurred because the Office of Human Resources has not clearly defined the reporting requirements needed. As a result, there is no assurance that EPA's workforce levels are sufficient to meet the workload of the Agency.

What We Recommend

We recommend that EPA's Chief Financial Officer amend guidance to require that the Agency complete a workload analysis for all critical functions to support the Agency's budget request for FTEs. We recommend that Office of Administration and Resources Management amend its workforce planning guidance to require that headquarters program offices and regions provide the number of positions needed for each MCO, along with the applicable FTEs associated with each of EPA's strategic goals and program areas. In addition, we recommend that Office of Administration and Resources Management provide the Chief Financial Officer's Office of Budget with the workforce planning results for each program and strategic goal for inclusion in the budget. EPA disagreed with the recommendations in the draft report. The recommendations in chapter 2 are unresolved and pending the Agency's 90-day response. For recommendations in chapters 3 and 4, EPA provided alternative recommendations and we accepted the recommendations with one slight revision. We consider these recommendations open, and EPA should provide estimated or actual completion dates for chapter 3 and 4 recommendations.