

Additional FY 2017 Contributions to EPA’s Portfolio of Evidence

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p>EPA's WaterSense Program at 10 Years</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Inspector General 17-P-0352 /OPE-FY17-0001</p> <p>https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-08/documents/epaig_20170801-17-p-0352.pdf</p>	<p>Examined if accomplishments reported by the EPA’s WaterSense Program reflected actual results.</p>	<p>OIG found that EPA’s WaterSense program adhered to good practices in program management, achieved significant returns on investment, documented its controls on water savings and product performance, and obtained broad partner and consumer support.</p>	
<p>EPA is Taking Steps to Improve State Drinking Water Program Reviews and Public Water Systems Compliance Data</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Inspector General 17-P-0326 / OPE-FY16-0032</p> <p>https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-07/documents/epaig_20170718-17-p-0326.pdf</p>	<p>Evaluated how the EPA ensures that SDWA primacy states monitor and report drinking water sampling results from public water systems. Also determine how the EPA can improve its oversight of state drinking water sampling programs.</p>	<p>OIG found there are limitations to both of the tools that EPA uses as oversight for state work. There is not a level of comprehensiveness and region-to-region consistency shown in previous data verifications. Also, there is the risk that states did not provide reliable information to the EPA data system on monitoring and reporting violations.</p>	
<p>EPA Needs to Provide Leadership and Better Guidance to Improve Fish Advisory Risk Communications</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Inspector General 17-P-0174 / OPE-FY15-0061</p> <p>https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-04/documents/epaig_20170412-17-p-0174.pdf</p>	<p>Evaluated the extent the EPA ensures that federal, state, and tribal risk communication efforts protect the public from mercury contamination through the consumption of fish.</p>	<p>OIG found that some subsistence fishers consume large amounts of contaminated fish without health warnings. Also, found that the EPA has not assessed methylmercury as proposed in the agency’s published Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) agendas.</p>	<p>Office of Water prioritized updating Fish Advisory Risk Communication Guidance to States and Tribes and development and increased distribution of Fish/Shellfish Newsletter to tribes in FY18 Division -level operating plan.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p>Using Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) data to identify potential non-compliance with TRI and other programs</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Inspector General Report No. 18-P-0001</p> <p>https://www.epa.gov/office-inspector-general/report-analysis-toxics-release-inventory-data-identifies-few-noncompliant</p>	<p>Evaluated EPA's use of TRI data in identifying potentially non-compliant facilities</p>	<p>OIG draft report recommended that OCSPP develop a mechanism to identify potential Risk Management Plan (RMP) non-filers by using an automated comparison of RMP and TRI data</p>	<p>EPA responded, in part, that the agency has taken a preventive approach by incorporating checks in TRI reporting software to alert TRI facilities that they may be required to file RMP (and NPDES) reports. The TRI Program also conducts annual data quality outreach, which has included a comparison of facilities that filed RMP reports with facilities that filed TRI reports for reporting years 2011-2015, to identify facilities that may be non-compliant with TRI reporting requirements.</p>
<p>Space reduction</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Office of Administration and Resource Management</p>	<p>Reduce EPA's owned and leased space footprint</p>	<p>Since FY 2012 the EPA released over 517 thousand square feet of office space nationwide, resulting in a cumulative annual rent avoidance of nearly \$20 million across all appropriations.</p>	<p>OARM's senior managers remain committed to their priorities outlined in the agency's space reduction plan.</p>
<p>Strategic sourcing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Office of Administration and Resource Management</p>	<p>Improve EPA's buying power.</p>	<p>In FY 2017 OARM's use of data and program evaluation tools enabled the agency to monitor specific, measurable data related to print services, cellular services, shipping, Microsoft software, voice services, office supplies, and lab supplies for a total of \$3.7 million avoided costs. At the end of FY 2017, a total of \$11.8 million had been achieved since FY 2013.</p>	<p>OARM continues to apply this same data driven approach to avoid costs in these seven categories: print services, cellular service, shipping, Microsoft software, voice service, office supplies, and lab supplies.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p>Our Nation’s Air: Status and Trends through 2016</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Air and Radiation</p> <p>https://gispub.epa.gov/air/trendsreport/2017/</p>	<p>Presents the trends in the nation's air quality, and summarizes the detailed information found at EPA's AirTrends website annually. EPA is committed to protecting public health by improving air quality and reducing air pollution.</p> <p>Annual emissions estimates are used as one indicator of the effectiveness of the air program.</p>	<p>Nationally, concentrations of the criteria air pollutants have dropped significantly since 1990. Between 1970 and 2016, the combined emissions of the six common pollutants (PM2.5 and PM10, SO2, NOx, VOCs, CO and Pb) dropped by 73 percent.</p>	<p>This progress occurred while the U.S. economy continued to grow, Americans drove more miles and population and energy use increased.</p>
<p>Title V Permitting Program Reviews</p> <p>On-going</p> <p>Office of Air and Radiation</p> <p>https://www.epa.gov/title-v-operating-permits/epa-oversight-operating-permits-program</p>	<p>EPA periodically audits state and local permitting programs as part of its responsibility to oversee delegated and approved air permitting programs.</p>	<p>Results vary and are specific to the program being reviewed. For example, in FY 2017 EPA completed a program evaluation of Maryland’s approved title V Operating Permits program, including a review of Maryland Department of the Environment’s permitting process and fees, among other topics. (For additional information, please see https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-10/documents/mde_title_v_evaluation.pdf)</p>	<p>The reviews evaluate the overall effectiveness of the planning, permitting, monitoring and compliance, and enforcement programs to identify: (1) good practices implemented by the state/tribal agency, (2) areas needing improvement within the state/tribal program, and (3) ways in which the EPA can improve oversight.</p>
<p>Process for State Implementation Plans (SIPs)</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Office of Air and Radiation</p>	<p>OAR and the Regions continue to make the SIP process more efficient and effective while fulfilling Clean Air Act statutory responsibilities.</p>	<p>Process has resulted in improved communication and cooperation between EPA and states prior to SIP submittal and SIP development tools. This includes development of an online resource for release in the late Fall for recommended best practices, tools and templates for processing and preparing SIPs.</p>	<p>Data is used to better utilize resources, improve coordination, and support planning, and managing SIP processing backlog. The recommended best practices, tools and templates are being implemented by regions and states to assist with communication and</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
			planning for SIP development.
<p>Performance Evaluation Program (PEP) and National Performance Audit Program (NPAP) Process Re-Engineering Project</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Office of Air and Radiation</p>	<p>The National Ambient Monitoring Program uses two audit processes to ensure the stability and reliability of the national ambient air monitoring network. Both processes, the Performance Evaluation Program (PEP) and the National Performance Audit Program (NPAP), were manual in nature and required considerable quality assurance to ensure accuracy.</p>	<p>EPA began a multi-year Lean project in March 2015 to re-engineer both audit processes has devised improvements to make them more efficient and reduce/eliminate the manual steps in the process. The goal is to facilitate the timely (in weeks for NPAP, months for PEP) reporting of audit data by State, Local, and Tribal air pollution control agencies to the Air Quality System.</p>	<p>NPAP was addressed first, and the new process was successfully implemented in February 2016. EPA expects to implement the new PEP process by October 2017. Tools required to support the new process were developed in-house and will be maintained by EPA.</p>
<p>Data Analysis and Review System (DARS)</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Office of Air and Radiation</p>	<p>DARS is a suite of tools for analyzing and reviewing emissions data submitted under Part 75 - Continuous Emission Monitoring.</p>	<p>The tools allow users to access, review, and analyze facility information (e.g., equipment, controls, monitoring systems), measurement practices, QA testing data, and emissions data.</p>	<p>When finalized, the tools will be used to target facilities for audits, support facility audits, assess compliance with existing environmental programs, and support development of new programs.</p>
<p>Leaning Congressional Correspondence Process</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Office of Air and Radiation</p>	<p>OAR, in consultation with OCIR, worked to Lean the OAR portion of the process for drafting and reviewing responses to Congressional correspondence.</p>	<p>The key changes included adding a triage step at the beginning of the process to create higher quality initial drafts and creating templates for common topics that speed responses on those or closely-related topics.</p>	<p>Weekly, OAR tracks the amount of time Congressional correspondence “sits” in each sub-office, and uses the information to identify which letters may be moving too slowly. The data allows EPA to determine whether it is topic-related (i.e. the response is difficult to write, and therefore is expected to take extra time) or whether there</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
			is a process issue that needs to be resolved.
<p>Office of Pollution and Prevention Toxics Lean Exercise on Confidential Business Information (CBI) Review Process</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention</p>	<p>OPPT and OGC applied Lean practices in FY 2017 to develop a path forward for the efficient Agency implementation of TSCA section 14(g) CBI reviews, improving reliability, effectiveness, efficiency and transparency of the CBI review process.</p>	<p>The project created a: (1) front-end quality control and decision-making process, (2) queue for managing TSCA Section 5 New Chemicals submissions containing CBI claims, (3) delegation of review and signature authority at OGC, and (4) package development and delivery by OPPT's Confidential Business Information Center (CBIC), along with numerous other changes.</p>	<p>OPPT used the findings/results of the project to reduce learning time, create a more consistent flow of work, create agility in problem solving when issues arose and initiate work on an automated workflow.</p>
<p>Evaluation of RCRA 3007 Letter Process</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Region 7</p>	<p>The EPA Region 7 Process Excellence Team facilitated an evaluation of the RCRA compliance officer's decision process/criteria regarding whether to send a RCRA section 3007 information request letter following an inspection.</p>	<p>RCRA compliance officers were not utilizing a consistent approach in determining appropriate programmatic actions following a site inspection. Therefore, the program was issuing more 3007 letters asking for additional information than what is required. Each letter issued adds an additional 30+ days to any subsequent enforcement action.</p> <p>This activity developed a Decision Tree for the RCRA program to utilize to ensure that all compliance officers were utilizing a consistent approach in determining appropriate follow-up actions.</p>	<p>The RCRA program in Region 7 utilizes the Decision Tree as a tool to standardize their work and ensure consistency in their approach to program actions. It is anticipated that fewer 3007 letters will be needed saving the Agency time and money. The team also believes the decision tree will provide an excellent training tool for new staff.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p>Evaluation of Compliance Inspection Tracking System</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Region 7</p>	<p>Improve the process for approving annual and quarterly inspection targets to ensure internal/State partner timelines are met; include refinement of local data management software (INSPECTrax) and development of a SharePoint workflow to drive the process.</p>	<p>Most of the target list rework and lost time resulted from internally routing lists that had not been fully vetted and approved within the originating program office (PO), in addition to delays in uploading large amounts of unnecessary target data into INSPECTrax.</p> <p>The process was further degraded by the lack of a central tracking mechanism, linked to an agreed upon timeline, to ensure all 12 target lists (3 Programs x 4 States) were being negotiated, approved, and assembled into the final list prior to the September 30 State delivery deadline.</p>	<p>Several changes were made to the existing process to add efficiency and eliminate rework including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishing a timeline for each stage to introduce pull into the process; - Obtain PO Director approval of the target lists prior to distributing them for coordination; - Separating INSPECTrax data upload into two-stages where only data needed for coordination is initially uploaded and supplemental data needed to complete the inspection is added later in the process; and - Developing a SharePoint workflow aligned with the timeline and with automatic trigger mechanisms to manage and track the process.
<p>Annual Data Collection on the Impact of Region 2's Clean and Green Superfund Remediation Policy</p> <p>Completed: Annually</p> <p>Office of Land and Emergency Management</p>	<p>Tracking CO2 reductions and tons of waste materials recycled at Superfund sites as a result of the Region 2 <i>Clean and Green Remediation Policy</i>. https://www.epa.gov/greenercleanups/epa-region-2-clean-and-green-policy</p>	<p>In FY 2017, Region 2 achieved 9,665 Metric Tons of CO2 reductions, and recycled 32,969 tons of waste materials at Superfund sites by implementing this policy. Since the policy was issued in 2010, Region 2 has achieved reductions of over 565,000 tons of CO2.</p>	<p>To help Region 2 understand and track over time the results achieved with its <i>Clean and Green Policy</i>, which is included in its:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreements with EPA contractors who perform fund-lead cleanups. • Interagency Agreements with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to ensure that the

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
			<p>Corps includes the requirement in its agreements with its contractors who carry out much of the Region 2 fund-lead work, particularly at larger and more expensive sites.</p> <p>Enforcement instruments such as administrative orders and consent decrees.</p>
<p>Removal Characterization Project</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Land and Emergency Management</p>	<p>To identify data obtained in the Removal program, analyze multi-year trends and determine if more data should be collected to adequately show the state of the Removal program.</p>	<p>One major finding was that data collection efforts have significantly improved since a Dec. 27, 2011 memo that requested more data from OSCs on Removal completions (such as amounts of specific contaminants). However, more information is needed from the program.</p>	<p>Better data reporting and other improvements in accountability.</p>
<p>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Hazardous Waste Import/Export Program</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Land and Emergency Management</p>	<p>Reviewed and analyzed the two major components of the hazardous waste import/export process: 1) notice and consent, and 2) government-to-government communications.</p> <p>The Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery (ORCR) and the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) staff completed the Lean analysis in June 2017.</p>	<p>EPA is working on implementing recommendations from the Lean analysis. The Program identified inefficiencies and instances that did not achieve the desired result in terms of workload efficiencies and/or work product quality or timeliness. Specifically, the Lean analysis identified poor input quality across all export-import processes; multiple constraining steps leading to long lead times; and concerns with IT systems of foreign countries. As the recommendations are</p>	<p>Actions have already been taken to improve efficiency and resource use. For example, all EPA Regions have identified 'back up' import-export coordinators to avoid unnecessary delays in processing hazardous waste import notices; OECA established notice processing 'hours of operation' to increase efficiencies; ORCR created a group mailbox so any group member can answer incoming questions from industry;</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
		implemented, potential steps are being taken to solve the identified inefficiencies or process failures.	and, ORCR created a SharePoint site for better coordinated import-export related policy development and related communications.
<p>Review of US EPA Office of Research and Development's (ORD) Research Programs</p> <p>Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC)</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Research and Development</p>	<p>Addressed charge questions posed by ORD's national research program areas and the four cross-cutting Roadmap programs</p>	<p>The BOSC report found these programs to be on track to meet the objectives in their current Strategic Research Action Plans (StRAPs) and Roadmaps.</p>	<p>ORD is working to implement a series of recommendations (located at https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-05/documents/2017_bosc_ec_report.pdf) to continue to strengthen the research being done.</p>
<p>Pilot testing of Sustainable and Healthy Communities (SHC) science-based tools by members of Environmental Council of the States (ECOS)/the Environmental Research Institute of the States (ERIS)</p> <p>Pilot tests and webinars throughout FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Research and Development</p>	<p>By holding regular demonstration and outreach webinars for members of ECOS, SHC is able to receive ongoing feedback, specific to its various research efforts. Registered users range from 8 attendees (for a specific agency) to 186 (for presentations to multiple states).</p>	<p>Findings and feedback differ based on the webinar, but the overall effect has been to cause SHC's scientists to make adjustments to aspects of its research or the usability of research products. Doing so should lead to greater uptake of research products by stakeholders within state programs.</p>	<p>Regular webinars on SHC's research and tools allows the program to: (1) perform outreach to state environmental protection offices, (2) get feedback on that research, and (3) demonstrate research products for stakeholders.</p>
<p>Internal EPA Partner Engagement</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Office of Research and Development Homeland Security Research Program</p>	<p>Identifying high priority threats and the corresponding high priority capability gaps in the Agency's ability to respond to these threats. These processes are done with our EPA partners (OHS, OLEM, OW, OAR, OCSPP, and the Regions) to inform ORD's research program and Program Office/Regional preparedness activities.</p>	<p>Developing lists of high priority threats and lists of prioritized capability gaps broken out by threat type (chemical, biological, radiological).</p>	<p>These efforts inform the Agency's preparedness and research activities in its Homeland Security enterprise. OHS, OLEM, OW, OAR, OCSPP, and the Regions may have additional input in this area. For ORD, the findings from these prioritization exercises provide critical input into the Homeland</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
	<p>To prioritize gaps the following questions were asked:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will filling this gap allow EPA to decrease the response and recovery timeline from a chemical, biological or radiological (CBR) incident? 2. What are the consequences if the gap is not filled? 3. Would filling this gap impact EPA's ability to respond to both CBR terrorism and other catastrophes (e.g., conventional war, accidents, natural disasters)? 		<p>Security Research Program's research agenda.</p>
<p>Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI): FY 2016 Report to Congress and the President</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Water</p> <p>https://www.glri.us/pdfs/fy2016-glri-progress-report-to-congress-and-president-20170803-35pp.pdf</p>	<p>The 2010 Appropriations Conference Report, 111-316, requires EPA to report to Congress on behalf of the Great Lakes Interagency Task Force, on program accomplishments and compare agency annual funding levels. The report also satisfies the Action Plan II Measure of Progress for issuance of annual GLRI reports to Congress and the President.</p>	<p>The GLRI has been a catalyst for unparalleled federal agency coordination – through both the Interagency Task Force (IATF) and the Regional Working Group (RWG), which are led by the EPA. This coordination has produced unprecedented results. GLRI resources have supplemented agency base budgets that have funded over 3,500 projects that improve water quality, protect and restore native habitats and species, prevent and control invasive species, and address other additional Great Lakes environmental problems. The report provides an overview of progress during FY 2016 for each Focus Area under GLRI Action Plan II. It also includes select success stories, detailed information on funding, and performance</p>	<p>EPA is using results to influence out-year planning and funding decisions, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA used lists of identified management actions necessary for Area of Concern delisting to direct funding to those AOCs that can be completed near term. • Upon reviewing progress in addressing harmful algal blooms, EPA coordinated with States to prioritize additional GLRI funding of agricultural phosphorus reduction through accelerating the pace of Best Management Practice implementation in targeted areas of Wisconsin and Ohio.

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
		information for Action Plan II Measures of Progress.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GLRI agencies utilized assessments of coastal wetland quality and current management to target additional resources and outreach to agencies best suited to accelerate protection, restoration, and enhancement. EPA is also using results to make adjustments to applicable targets under GPRA.
<p>Great Lakes Ecosystem Indicators</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Water</p> <p>https://binational.net/2017/06/19/sogl-edgl-2017/</p> <p>https://binational.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/SOGL_2017_Technical_Report-EN.pdf</p>	<p>Pursuant to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, Canada and the United States, together with their many partners, established a suite of 9 indicators of ecosystem health, supported by 44 sub-indicators, to assess the state of the Great Lakes. State of the Great Lakes assessments support the identification of current and emerging challenges to Great Lakes water quality and ecosystem health. The report also helps Governments evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs and policies to address challenges, and inform and engage others. Over 180 government and non-government Great Lakes scientists and other experts worked to assemble available data to populate the suite of indicators and sub-indicators and prepare assessment reports.</p>	<p>The Great Lakes are assessed as “Fair” and “Unchanging”. While progress to restore and protect the Great Lakes has been made, including the reduction of toxic chemicals, challenges remain with issues such as invasive species and nutrients. The State of the Great Lakes Technical Report is expected in summer 2017.</p>	<p>EPA is using results to influence out-year planning and funding decisions and to make adjustments to applicable targets under GPRA.</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
<p>2016 Progress Run Using Phase 5.3.2 of the Watershed Model</p> <p>Completed: FY 2017</p> <p>Office of Water</p> <p>http://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/clean-water/water-quality/watershed-implementation-plans</p>	<p>The annual progress run incorporated reported wastewater data and best management practice implementation data into a calibrated model, to estimate the percentage of the reduction goal (Bay TMDL) met for each jurisdiction for nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment.</p>	<p>Pollution-reducing practices are in place to achieve 31% of nitrogen reductions, 81% of phosphorus reductions and 57% of sediment reductions necessary to attain applicable water quality standards as compared to 2009, the year before the EPA established the Bay TMDL.</p> <p>The annual budget measure target for FY16 for nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment are all 45%. Therefore, the nitrogen reductions missed the target for FY17, but the phosphorus and sediment reductions have exceeded their respective targets for this year.</p> <p>Provision of this data in the future is contingent on adequate funding and expertise of funded staff.</p>	<p>Under the accountability framework, EPA committed to conduct <u>oversight</u> of Bay jurisdictions' programs to ensure they are on track to meet the goals of their WIPs and two-year milestones. See https://www.epa.gov/chesapeake-bay-tmdl/epa-interim-evaluation-2016-2017-milestone-progress-chesapeake-bay-watershed-for-epa-interim-evaluation-of-2016-2017-milestone-progress.</p>
<p>Water Quality Standards Attainment indicator: annual update</p> <p>Completed: FY 2016</p> <p>Office of Water</p> <p>http://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/clean-water/water-quality/water-quality</p>	<p>Used available monitoring information from the 92 segments of the Chesapeake Bay to estimate whether each segment is attaining certain criteria for one or more of its designated uses on an annual basis.</p>	<p>Results of the 2013 to 2015 assessment period indicate that 37% of the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries met water quality standards during this time. These results mark a 9% increase from those of the previous assessment period, during which 34% of the Bay and its tidal tributaries met water quality standards.</p> <p>EPA expected new data as early as September 2017, but the information was unavailable at the time this report.</p>	<p>EPA, along with other federal, state and academic partners, are using this information to explain progress toward meeting water quality standards and the Bay TMDL. This includes assessing changes in nutrients and sediment in the Bay watershed and analyzing water quality trends in the estuary and tidal tributaries. Further incorporation and use of monitoring information to assess progress is critical to better understand how on the ground actions have an</p>

Project in Brief	Purpose and Brief Description	List of Results and Conclusions	Significance
			<p>impact toward meeting the 2017 and 2025 WIP outcomes, particularly since monitoring assessments will ultimately determine when the jurisdictions' water quality standards are achieved.</p>
<p>Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC)</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Office of Water</p>	<p>STAC provides independent scientific and technical advice in various ways, including (1) technical reports and position papers, (2) discussion groups, (3) assistance in organizing merit reviews of CBP programs and projects, (4) technical workshops, and (5) interaction between STAC members and the CBP. STAC serves as a liaison between the region's scientific community and the CBP. Through professional and academic contacts and organizational networks of its members, STAC ensures close cooperation among and between the various research institutions and management agencies represented in the Bay watershed.</p>	<p>STAC reviews past and present are available online.</p>	<p>STAC <u>workshops</u> provide a format for formulating recommendations to the Chesapeake Bay Program from the scientific and technical community on information needs, opportunities for collaborations, and further management actions. Speakers from the Chesapeake Bay Program and experts from around the watershed are often invited to STAC <u>meetings</u> to discuss how science is being used to inform management decisions throughout the watershed. STAC <u>reviews</u> provide thorough, competent, and objective technical guidance in a timely fashion to advise the Chesapeake Bay Program decision-making process.</p>