



# Management Directive 715 Report

Fiscal Year 2018

## Table of Contents

<b>Part A – Department or Agency Identifying Information</b> .....	1
<b>Part B – Total Employment</b> .....	1
<b>Part C – Head of Agency and Agency Officials</b> .....	1
<b>Part D – Components and Mandatory Documents</b> .....	4
<b>Part E – Executive Summary</b> .....	9
<b>Part F – Certification of Establishment of Continuing Equal Employment Opportunity Programs</b> .....	18
<b>Part G – FY2018 Self-Assessment Towards a Model EEO Program Checklist</b> .....	19
<b>Part H – Plan to Correct Deficiencies</b> .....	52
<b>Part I – Agency EEO Plan to Eliminate Identified Barrier</b> .....	61
<b>Part J – Special Program Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities</b> .....	68
<b>Appendix A – FY2018 Workforce Data Tables</b> .....	92

<b>EEOC FORM 715-01 PARTS A-J</b>	<b>U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM EPA STATUS REPORT FY2018</b>
---	--

### Part A – Department or Agency Identifying Information

Agency	Second Level Component	Address	City	State	Zip Code	Agency Code	FIPS Code
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency		1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW	Washington	DC.	20460	EP00	6800

### Part B – Total Employment

Total Employment	Permanent Workforce	Temporary Workforce	Total Workforce
Number of Employees reported between October 1, 2017 and September 30, 2018	13,747	814	14,561

### Part C – Head of Agency and Agency Officials

#### Part C.1 - Head of Agency and Head of Agency Designee

Agency Leadership	Name	Title
<i>Head of Agency</i>	Andrew Wheeler	Administrator
<i>Head of Agency Designee</i>	Helena Wooden-Aguilar	Acting Deputy Chief of Staff

Part C.2 - Agency Official(s) Responsible for Oversight of EEO Program(s)

EEO Program Staff	Name	Title	Occupational Series	Pay Plan and Grade	Phone Number	Email Address
<b>Principal EEO Director/Official</b>	Vicki Simons Kevin J Bailey	Acting Director, Office of Civil Rights  Acting Deputy Director, Office of Civil Rights	0905	SES	202-564- 7272202-564- 2998	<a href="mailto:Simons.vicki@epa.gov">Simons.vicki@epa.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Kevinj.bailey@epa.gov">Kevinj.bailey@epa.gov</a>
<b>Affirmative Employment Program Manager</b>	Michael Nieves	Acting Assistant Director, Affirmative Employment, Analysis, and Accountability Staff	0260	GS-15	202-566-1478	<a href="mailto:nieves.michael@epa.gov">nieves.michael@epa.gov</a>
<b>Complaint Processing Program Manager</b>	Cynthia Darden	Assistant Director Employee Complaint Resolution Staff, Title VII	0260	GS-15	202-564-1587	<a href="mailto:Darden.Cynthia@epa.gov">Darden.Cynthia@epa.gov</a>
<b>Diversity &amp; Inclusion Officer</b>	Bisa Cunningham	Director, Diversity, Recruitment, and Employee Services Division	0201	GS-15	202-5646635	<a href="mailto:Cunningham.Bisa@epa.gov">Cunningham.Bisa@epa.gov</a>
<b>Hispanic Program Manager (SEPM)</b>	Michael Nieves	EEO Manager/ National Hispanic Employment Program	0260	GS-15	202-566-1478	<a href="mailto:nieves.michael@epa.gov">nieves.michael@epa.gov</a>
<b>Women's Program Manager (SEPM)</b>	Margaret Gérardin	EEO Manager / National Federal Women's Employment Program, WISE	0260	GS-13	202-564-5491	<a href="mailto:gerardin.margaret@epa.gov">gerardin.margaret@epa.gov</a>
<b>Disability Program Manager (SEPM)</b>	Christopher Emanuel	EEO Manager/ National Disability Employment Program	0260	GS-14	202-5647286	<a href="mailto:Emanuel.Christopher@epa.gov">Emanuel.Christopher@epa.gov</a>

<b>EEO Program Staff</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Occupational Series</b>	<b>Pay Plan and Grade</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
<b>Special Placement Program Coordinator (Individuals with Disabilities)</b>	Christopher Emanuel	EEO Manager/ National Disability Employment Program, AI/AN	0260	GS-14	202-5647287	<a href="mailto:Emanuel.Christopher@epa.gov">Emanuel.Christopher@epa.gov</a>
<b>Reasonable Accommodation Program Manager</b>	Amanda Sweda	National Reasonable Accommodations Coordinator	0260	GS-14	202-566-0678	<a href="mailto:Sweda.Amanda@epa.gov">Sweda.Amanda@epa.gov</a>
<b>Anti-Harassment Program Manager</b>	Randolph Ferrell	Program Manager, "Order 4711" Anti-Harassment	0201	GS-14	202-5641927	<a href="mailto:Ferrell.Randolph@epa.gov">Ferrell.Randolph@epa.gov</a>
<b>ADR Program Manager</b>	Norwood Dennis	OCR ADR Coordinator	0260	GS-14	919-541-4249	<a href="mailto:Dennis.Norwood@epa.gov">Dennis.Norwood@epa.gov</a>
<b>Principal MD-715 Preparer</b>	Jerome King	EEO Manager, National LGBT, Black, NACE, and EFEDs Program	0260	GS-14	202-564-7429	<a href="mailto:King.Jerome@epa.gov">King.Jerome@epa.gov</a>
<b>Other EEO Staff</b>	Kristin Tropp	Assistant National Reasonable Accommodations Coordinator	0343	GS-12	202-559-0006	<a href="mailto:Tropp.Kristin@epa.gov">Tropp.Kristin@epa.gov</a>
	Renee Clark	EEO Specialist/Team Lead, Title VII	0260	GS-14	202-564-7269	<a href="mailto:Clark.Renee@epa.gov">Clark.Renee@epa.gov</a>

## Part D – Components and Mandatory Documents

### Part D.1 – List of Subordinate Components Covered in this Report

Please identify the subordinate components within the Agency (e.g., bureaus, regions, etc.).

If the Agency does not have any subordinate components, please check the box.

Subordinate Component	City	State	Country (Optional)	Agency Code	FIPS Codes
<b>Headquarters Program Offices in Washington, DC</b>					
Office of the Administrator	Washington	DC		EP00AM	<b>6800</b>
Office of Administration and Resources Management	Washington	DC		EP00HG	<b>6800</b>
Office of Air and Radiation	Washington	DC		EP00LA	<b>6800</b>
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	Washington	DC		EP00FJ	<b>6800</b>
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance	Washington	DC		EP00BE	<b>6800</b>
Office of General Counsel	Washington	DC		EP00CN	<b>6800</b>
Office of the Inspector General	Washington	DC		EP00DP	<b>6800</b>
Office of International and Tribal Affairs	Washington	DC		EP00EL	<b>6800</b>
Office of Environmental Information	Washington	DC		EP00GH	<b>6800</b>
Office of Chemical, Safety and Pollution Prevention	Washington	DC		EP00MC	<b>6800</b>

<b>Subordinate Component</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Country (Optional)</b>	<b>Agency Code</b>	<b>FIPS Codes</b>
Office of Research and Development	Washington	DC		EP00NF	<b>6800</b>
Office of Land and Emergency Management	Washington	DC		EP00KD	<b>6800</b>
Office of Water	Washington	DC		EP00JB	<b>6800</b>
<b>Human Resources Support</b>					
Shared Service Centers	Research Triangle Park	NC		EP00HG	<b>6800</b>
Shared Service Centers	Cincinnati	OH		EP00HG	<b>6800</b>
Shared Service Centers	Las Vegas	NV		EP00HG	<b>6800</b>
<b>Regional Offices</b>					
Region 1	Boston	MA		EP00Q1	<b>6800</b>
Region 2	New York	NY		EP00R2	<b>6800</b>
Region 3	Philadelphia	PA		EP00S3	<b>6800</b>
Region 4	Atlanta	GA		EP00T4	<b>6800</b>
Region 5	Chicago	IL		EP00U5	<b>6800</b>
Region 6	Dallas	TX		EP00V6	<b>6800</b>

Subordinate Component	City	State	Country (Optional)	Agency Code	FIPS Codes
Region 7	Lenexa	KS		EP00W7	<b>6800</b>
Region 8	Denver	CO		EP00X8	<b>6800</b>
Region 9	San Francisco	CA		EP00Y9	<b>6800</b>
Region 10	Seattle	WA		EP00ZX	<b>6800</b>
<b>Program Labs</b>					
OAR/ORIA/NAREL	Montgomery	AL		EP00LA	<b>6800</b>
OAR/ORIA/NVFEL:	Ann Arbor	MI		EP00LA	<b>6800</b>
OAR/ORIA/NCRFO	Las Vegas	NV		EP00LA	<b>6800</b>
ORD, NRM Research Lab	Ada	OK		EP00NF	<b>6800</b>
ORD/NERL	Athens	GA		EP00NF	<b>6800</b>
ORD/NHEER Labs	Narragansett	RI		EP00NF	<b>6800</b>
	Gulf Breeze	FL		EP00NF	<b>6800</b>
	Duluth	MN		EP00NF	<b>6800</b>
	Corvallis	OR		EP00NF	<b>6800</b>



Part D.2 – Mandatory and Optional Documents for this Report

*In the table below, the Agency must submit these documents with its MD-715 report.*

Did the Agency submit the following mandatory documents?	Please respond Yes or No	Comments
Organizational Chart	YES	
EEO Policy Statement	YES	The Policy issued in FY16 remains in effect.
Agency’s Strategic Plan	YES	FY 2018 – FY 2022 EPA Strategic Plan was finalized February 12, 2018. The Strategy was drafted in FY17.
Anti-Harassment Policy and Procedures	YES	The procedures that were issued in FY16. are still in effect
Reasonable Accommodation Procedures	YES	The Agency has two RA procedures: the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) National Reasonable Accommodation Procedures (NRAP) and the EPA Reasonable Accommodation Procedures.
Personal Assistance Services Procedures	YES	An addendum to meet new 501 Rule and EEOC guidance was drafted in FY18. A memo outlining the plan to finalize the addendum is included as an Appendix.
Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures	YES	ADR and Workplace Resolution is marketed to all employees on the OHR intranet webpage and link at <a href="https://workplace.epa.gov/facilitation-mediation/">https://workplace.epa.gov/facilitation-mediation/</a> ). An ADR program was piloted for the EEO informal complaint process in FY16, which has been extended through FY17.

*In the table below, the Agency may decide whether to submit these documents with its MD-715 report.*

Did the Agency submit the following optional documents?	Please respond Yes or No	Comments
Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) Report	YES	
Disabled Veterans Affirmative Action Program (DVAAP) Report	YES	The FY 2016 DVAAP Report and FY 2017 DVAAP Plan are included as Appendices.
Operational Plan for Increasing Employment of Individuals with Disabilities under Executive Order 13548	NO	The Agency utilizes alternatives such as the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan (DISP), Plan for Addressing Unconscious Bias, and Agency Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (e.g., Rochester Institute of Technology/National Technical Institute for the Deaf (RIT/NTID) MOU), for increasing awareness of employment opportunities for Individuals with Disabilities.
Diversity and Inclusion Plan under Executive Order 13583	YES	The FY 2017-2021 DISP was issued January 13, 2017.
Diversity Policy Statement	NO	The Agency drafted a new statement anticipated for issuance in FY18.
Human Capital Strategic Plan (HCSP)	NO	OPM informed all federal Agency Chief Human Capital Officers that the requirement to modernize/reduce HC has been waived as of January 16, 2016.
EEO Strategic Plan	NO	The Agency will consider a new plan after all reshaping efforts have been considered and implemented.
Results from most recent Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey or Annual Employee Survey	YES	

## Part E – Executive Summary

All agencies must complete Part E.1; however, only agencies with 199 or fewer employees in permanent FT/PT appointments are required to complete Part E.2 to E.5. Agencies with 200 or more employees in permanent FT/PT appointments have the option to complete Part E.2 to E.5.

### Introduction

---

This Equal Employment Opportunity Program (EEO) Status Report outlines the status of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA or Agency) FY2018 (FY18) Equal Employment Opportunity Program activities, as required by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) Management Directive 715 (MD-715). This report highlights EPA's accomplishments in establishing and maintaining a model EEO program based on the six essential elements outlined by the EEOC:

- Demonstrated Commitment from Agency Leadership
- Integration of EEO into the Agency's Strategic Plan
- Management and Program Accountability
- Proactive Prevention of Unlawful Discrimination
- Efficiency
- Responsiveness and Legal Compliance

EPA reviewed its programs activities from FY18 against these six essential elements. Where program deficiencies were identified, planned activities to address them were developed.

### The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

---

The mission of the EPA is, *"To protect human health and the environment."* Fostering and maintaining a diverse, highly-skilled, and engaged workforce consistent with EEO and merit system principles is essential to fulfilling EPA's mission. EPA works to ensure that Americans have clean air, land and water and safe chemicals by administering and enforcing federal laws passed by Congress. The Agency works to achieve its environmental and human health objectives through collaboration with its external partners, such as states, tribal governments and the regulated community.

### The Office of Civil Rights

---

The EPA's Office of Civil Rights (OCR) provides leadership, direction, and guidance in carrying out the Agency's EEO program. OCR ensures compliance with federal nondiscrimination employment laws, regulations, and executive orders (EO). EPA's senior leadership has established EEO as one of its top priorities by recognizing that building and supporting a diverse and talented workforce is critical to the Agency's mission. OCR's mission statement is, *"To*

*create a model civil rights program that improves the employment experience at EPA.”* To fulfill this mission, OCR utilizes five guiding principles:

- Timeliness of Regulatory Deliverables and Services
- Customer Service
- Collaboration/Cooperation
- Innovation
- Expertise

These principles were developed as a guidepost for OCR and reflect the commitment of the program to achieve its various objectives.

## **Model EEO Program - Essential Elements**

As noted above, the Agency reviewed its program activities from FY18 against the six essential elements of a model civil rights program as prescribed by the EEOC. The sections below provide a few examples of EPA’s accomplishments under each of those elements. Additional information can be found in Part G.

### ***Essential Element A – Demonstrated Commitment from Agency Leadership***

EPA’s senior leadership has demonstrated commitment to EEO as evidenced through the release of the EEO Policy Statement on July 31, 2018 and the Anti-Harassment Policy Statement on August 10, 2018. Both policies were released by then Acting Administrator Andrew Wheeler (since confirmed as Administrator). Both policies were released within 60 days of Administrator Wheeler becoming the head of the Agency. Additionally, Agency leadership has shown demonstrated commitment to EEO in the following ways:

- Hired a permanent Director for OCR in May 2018, bringing stability to the Office of Civil Rights after several years of acting leadership.
- The EEO policy statement released in July 2018, reaffirmed the Administrator’s expectation that management participation in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), when requested, is mandatory, absent extraordinary circumstances.
- The Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Council (DIAC), consisting of EPA leadership in the Senior Executive Service (SES) played an active role in EEO and diversity related initiatives including the DIAC’s review and approval of the FY18 workplan of the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan (DISP), 2017-2021. OCR and the Office of Human Resources (OHR) collaborate on many of the DISP’s activities.
- The amplification - via direct messages and discussions with staff - of Agency policies on EEO and anti-harassment by senior leadership in their respective sub-components (i.e., program and regional offices).
- Continued engagement by EPA senior leadership in Special Emphasis Program (SEP) activities.

- OHR's Agency-wide reissuance of EPA's policies and procedures related to EEO, anti-harassment and reasonable accommodations. For example, hard copy materials are posted and visible throughout EPA headquarters, regions and labs. Information is also made available on EPA's intranet. OCR also regularly provides information about our programs, policies and practices to all new employees at New Employee Orientations.
- EPA annually awards *Suzanne E. Olive Award for Exemplary Leadership in National EEO* to recognize individuals and/or groups for their significant contributions to EEO and civil rights, and diversity and inclusion.

### *Essential Element B – Integration of EEO into the Agency's Strategic Mission*

In FY18, OCR continued to work with Agency senior leadership to integrate EEO into the Agency's strategic mission. More specifically, several functions within OCR align with Goal 3 of the Agency's Strategic Plan, 2018-2022: *Rule of Law and Process*. The most notable processes aligning with this goal include the Title VII investigations process and the reasonable accommodation program. Timeliness metrics for both the Title VII investigations and reasonable accommodations were also measured as part of the Agency's EPA Lean Management System (ELMS). As referenced in the EPA's Strategic Plan, ELMS is being implemented to improve business processes and eliminate waste throughout the Agency. Additionally, in FY18, OCR began developing its own Strategic Plan to direct the program's work through FY23.

Other ways EEO was integrated into the Agency's mission are as follows:

- The EEO Director reports directly to the Office of the Administrator. The EEO Director routinely met with EPA's senior management and was provided opportunities to discuss EEO issues.
- Continued implementation of the DISP. The DISP has specific goals and objectives aimed at meeting the Agency's EEO and diversity objectives and thus working towards fostering and maintaining a diverse, highly-skilled, and engaged workforce.
- OCR and OHR senior managers met monthly to identify areas of collaboration on EEO and diversity and inclusion efforts, including targeted outreach and recruitment.
- EPA continued to focus on building partnerships with professional organizations and minority-serving institutions as part of its recruitment and outreach efforts and to identify areas of mutual interest to support EPA's mission.

### *Essential Element C - Management and Program Accountability*

In FY18 OCR continued to ensure management and program accountability. For example, OCR ensured compliance with settlement agreements resulting from Title VII investigations of complaints of discrimination. OCR leadership also addressed other areas to ensure greater accountability within the Title VII program; this included using the Lean methodology to create a more efficient approach to processing investigations. The use of ADR also increased in FY18 to

a participation rate of 45%. The Agency worked to significantly improve the processing time for issuing final Agency decisions (FADs) by fine-tuning internal processes. For example, OCR reduced inefficiency by developing standardized FAD templates to speed up the issuance process and to allow OCR staff and a cadre of volunteer FAD writers to effectively and quickly assist in the FAD reduction project that concluded in January 2018. Other efforts included:

- The OCR Director, with the support of the Deputy Civil Rights Officials (i.e., senior managers in each of our programs and regions), ensured effective and timely management of EPA's EEO complaints program (including responsiveness of management to complaints, specifically affidavits).
- Continued direct, monthly communication between the OCR director and EEO Officers who support implementation of the programs in EPA's regional offices.
- Reengaged Agency partners and our cadre of Deputy Civil Rights Officials on areas previously identified as deficiencies by EEOC, including applicant-flow for both the 0905 attorney advisor series and career development opportunities (see part H for more details).
- OCR and OHR revised and released our Handbook to ensure greater accountability with the Special Emphasis Program (SEP).
- Implemented Special Emphasis Program Manager (SEPM) training based on principles and practices described in the SEPM Handbook.
- With OHR, ensured implementation of FY18 activities outlined in the DISP.
- Processed a record 459 reasonable accommodation requests while maintaining a timeliness rate of 97%.
- Provided regular training to management and staff on Reasonable Accommodations.

### *Essential Element D – Proactive Prevention*

The EEO Policy Statement released in July 2018 made clear the Agency's commitment to a workplace free of discrimination and to the principles of EEO. Efforts by OCR to proactively prevent discrimination include identifying triggers within FY18 workforce data and prioritizing triggers through barrier analysis. The barrier analysis priorities resulting from an identification of triggers from FY18 data are:

- Upward Mobility of Hispanics to Senior Level Positions (GS-13 through SES)
- Persons with Disabilities (PWD) in the Major Occupations
- Participation Rates in the SES

Additional proactive prevention efforts included:

- A coordinated effort between OCR and OHR to develop a new process for hiring PWD under the Schedule A hiring authority. An initial pilot program created an online post on USAJOBS.gov to guide PWD to EPA vacancy announcements. Additionally, EPA will

create a resume repository for Schedule A job candidates. This effort aims to increase the hiring of PWD and provide consistency and clarity in their recruitment experience.

- Reasonable accommodation training provided to supervisors to better inform them of the procedure associated with providing accommodations for qualified PWD.
- OHR produced individual Employment Viewpoint Survey (EVS) reports for individual race and sexual orientation groups; the reports focused on determining the feeling of “inclusivity” for each group by using the five identified habits of inclusion: fairness; openness; cooperativeness; empowerment; and support.
- Bi-annually, EPA conducts the *Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002* (No FEAR Act) training. 98% of EPA employees participated in biennial training in FY18. Additionally, EPA required all newly hired employees to complete the online No FEAR Act training within their first 90 days of employment at the Agency.

### *Essential Element E – Efficiency*

During FY18, the Title VII program used the Lean methodology to develop streamlined and efficient procedures for processing Title VII investigations. As a result, the program achieved a 90% timeliness completion rate for investigations. The Title VII program had an ADR participation rate of 45%. Of the matters that went to ADR, 47% successfully resolved the informal complaint (i.e., 21.62% of all informal complaints were resolved through ADR).

Additional efforts included:

- Completing a multi-year final agency decision (FAD) reduction project, using a cadre of volunteer FAD writers from across the Agency. This approach proved to be the most efficient and effective way to reduce the docket.
- 97% timeliness rate for processing reasonable accommodation requests.
- Greater coordination between OCR and OHR on areas of mutual interest to reduce duplicative efforts.

### *Essential Element F – Responsiveness and Legal Compliance*

EPA continues to focus on compliance with EEO laws and EEOC regulations, policies, and directives. As part of this effort, OCR staff received training to ensure they were up-to-date on regulatory and other changes impacting their programs. Additionally, OCR:

- Ensured compliance with Title VII settlement agreements because of complaints of discrimination.
- Achieved a timeliness rate of 90% for the 71 complaint investigations conducted in FY18.
- Updated reasonable accommodations training and procedures to reflect the EEOC regulations on personal assistance services (PAS).
- Timely submitted of the No FEAR Act Report.

## Workforce Analysis

---

Workforce analysis of FY18 data resulted in the prioritization of three areas for barrier analysis: Upward mobility of Hispanics, GS-12 through SES; PWD in the Major Occupations; and Participation Rates within the SES. A brief snapshot of our trigger analysis is below. This analysis is supplemented by the formation of project teams comprised of OCR staff, SES Executive Champions, and other civil rights and human resources champions. Applying EPA Lean principles and practices, the teams will launch efforts to develop barrier analysis associated with identified triggers.

### Overall Agency Demographics for FY18

<b>Permanent Workforce</b>	13,747
<b>Temporary Workforce</b>	814
<b>Total Workforce</b>	14,561

Table 1: Overall Agency Demographics for FY18

Race/National Origin National	TOTAL	By Gender: Male	By Gender: Female
<b>White</b>	<b>66.97%</b>	<b>36.53%</b>	<b>30.44%</b>
<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>17.05%</b>	<b>4.89%</b>	<b>12.16%</b>
<b>Asian</b>	<b>7.19%</b>	<b>3.48%</b>	<b>3.71%</b>
<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>7.03%</b>	<b>3.23%</b>	<b>3.80%</b>
<b>American Indian / Alaska Native</b>	<b>1.01%</b>	<b>.47%</b>	<b>.54%</b>
<b>Two or More Races</b>	<b>.58%</b>	<b>.2%</b>	<b>.38%</b>
<b>Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander</b>	<b>.10%</b>	<b>0.05%</b>	<b>0.05%</b>

### *Upward Mobility of Hispanics, GS-13 through SES*

Due to persistent low representation of Hispanics in the federal workforce, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and the EEOC directed federal agencies, at the suggestion of the Hispanic Council on Federal Employment (HCFE), to conduct a more thorough barrier analysis on Hispanic employment. EPA looked at trends from FY16 – FY18 and noted that there has been very little change in Hispanic participation in the workforce; only a net gain of 3 Hispanic employees during that timeframe.

**FY 2016** – Total Hispanics: 1,020

**FY 2017** – Total Hispanics: 1,051

**FY 2018** – Total Hispanics: 1,023



In FY18, Hispanics at EPA had less than expected participation rates when compared to the Civilian Labor Force (CLF).

**Hispanic Males:** 5.17% (CLF) vs 3.23% (EPA)  
**Hispanic Females:** 4.79% (CLF) vs 3.80% (EPA)

Regarding the upward mobility of Hispanics, an analysis of workforce data revealed that selection rates for internal promotions to the GS13, GS14, and GS15 levels are less than expected for Hispanic males and females. The participation rates in the SES show that Hispanic males are participating at higher rates than their representation in the feeder pool (GS-15). However, this is not the case for Hispanic females as they are participating in the SES at rates lower than their representation in the feeder pool (GS-15).

**Hispanic Males:** 2.66% (GS-15) vs 3.50% (SES)  
**Hispanic Females:** 2.38% (GS-15) vs 2.33% (SES)

Again, this is an initial analysis based on triggers identified within the workforce. A thorough barrier analysis will be conducted to determine whether any policy, practice or procedure is causing the statistical result, thereby limiting opportunities for advancement for Hispanics at the Agency.

### *PWD and PWTD in the Major Occupations*

EPA continues to fall short in some areas with hiring PWD and PWTD, despite the availability of special hiring authorities. The EEOC and OPM have set a target for inclusion in the federal workforce of 12% for persons with disabilities and 2% for persons with targeted (severe) disabilities (PWTD). Based on triggers identified from workforce data, EPA will focus its barrier analysis on PWD and PWTD in the major occupations.

For FY18, Major occupations where the selection rates for applications and hires were less than expected compared to qualification rates for both PWD and PWTD were:

**Environmental Protection Specialist (0028)**  
**Misc. Administration and Program Specialist (0301)**  
**Management/Program Analyst (0343)**  
**General Biological Science (0401)**

Considering these are some of the occupations where the Agency does the most of its hiring, it is important to determine if there are in fact barriers adversely impacting the hiring of PWD and PWTD. This effort will also support the new hiring process for PWD and PWTD being developed with OHR to increase the participation of PWD and PWTD in EPA's workforce.

Details regarding the EPA’s affirmative action plan for PWD and PWTD can be found below in Part J – Special Program Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement and Retention of Persons with Disabilities.

### *Participation Rates in the SES*

Participation rates within the Senior Executive Service (SES) show minimal change in the last three fiscal years. However, with an increasing number of SES eligible for retirement, there is a potential for change in the SES. EPA will conduct further analysis of SES participation rates and applicant flow data.

Table 2: Participation Rates in the SES

	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18
SES Total	271	266	257
Male	58.67%	56.77%	55.64%
Female	41.33%	43.23%	44.36%
Hispanic	5.17%	5.64%	5.84%
White	80.44%	80.83%	79.77%
Black	11.44%	10.15%	11.28%
Asian	2.22%	2.63%	2.33%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%
American Indian/Alaska Native	.74%	.75%	.75%
Two or More Races	0%	0%	0%

An initial analysis of participation rates by race, national origin, and sex indicated lower than expected participation rates when compared to the GS-15 feeder pools for the following:

**Females**

**Hispanic/Latina Females**

**Black/African American Females**

**Asian Males and Females**

**Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Males and Females**

**Two or More Races Males and Females**

There are several caveats to consider when conducting an analysis on the SES, including: length of tenure; availability of opportunities; and how applicants enter SES. EPA is further refining its methodology for conducting this barrier analysis considering these and other factors. This analysis is critical as the possibility of high turnover amongst EPA senior leadership due to retirement over the next several years will mean opportunities for advancement.

OCR established an Executive Champions model that will be used to directly engage and involve DCROs in the above priorities. OCR will leverage Champions’ experience, resources, expertise, and networks to identify and eliminate barriers. The champions will be supported by OCR

project leads and other identified workgroup members whose job functions or interests align with a priority. Using this approach, the Agency expects to complete barrier analyses in the target areas, and report findings in the FY19 MD-715 Report to EEOC.

**Part F – Certification of Establishment of Continuing Equal Employment Opportunity Programs**

**Certification of Establishment of  
Continuing Equal Employment Opportunity Programs**

I, Vicki A. Simons, Director of the Office of Civil Rights, am the Principal EEO Director/Official for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

The annual self-assessment of EPA programs relative to Section 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 against the essential elements, as prescribed by the Management Directive 715 (MD-715), has been completed. If an essential element was not fully compliant with MD-715 standards, a subsequent evaluation was conducted. As appropriate, EPA’s plans for attaining the essential elements of a model EEO program are included with this Federal Agency Annual EEO Program Status Report.

EPA has also analyzed its workforce profiles and will conduct barrier analyses aimed at detecting whether any management or personnel policy, procedure, or practice is operating to disadvantage any group based on race, national origin, gender, or disability. EEO Plans to Eliminate Identified Barriers, as appropriate, are included with this Federal Agency Annual EEO Program Status Report.

I certify that proper documentation of this assessment is in place and is being maintained for U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) review upon request.



Signature of Principal EEO Director/Official  
Certifies that this Federal Agency Annual EEO Program  
Status Report is in compliance with EEOC MD-715

5/23/19

Date



Signature of Agency Head or Agency Head Designee



MAY 30 2019

Date



## Part G – FY2018 Self-Assessment Towards a Model EEO Program Checklist

### Essential Element A: Demonstrated Commitment from Agency Leadership

This element requires the Agency head to communicate a commitment to equal employment opportunity and a discrimination-free workplace.



	Compliance Indicator	A.1 – The agency issues an effective, up-to-date EEO policy statement.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
1	A.1.a	Does the Agency annually reissue the signed and dated EEO policy statement that clearly communicates the agency's commitment to EEO for all employees and applicants? If "yes", please provide the annual issuance date in the comments column. [see MD-715, II(A)]	YES	The EEO policy statement was issued on July 31, 2018.
2	A.1.b	Does the EEO policy statement address all protected bases (age, color, disability, sex (including pregnancy, sexual orientation and gender identity), genetic information, national origin, race, religion, and reprisal) contained in the laws EEOC enforces? [see 29 CFR § 1614.101(a)]	YES	

	Compliance Indicator	A.2 – The agency has communicated EEO policies and procedures to all employees.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			



3	<b>A.2.a</b>	Does the AAship/Region disseminate the following policies and procedures to all employees:		
4	<b>A.2.a.1</b>	Anti-harassment policy? [see MD 715, II(A)]	YES	
5	<b>A.2.a.2</b>	Reasonable accommodation procedures? [see 29 C.F.R § 1614.203(d)(3)]	YES	
6	<b>A.2.b</b>	Does the AAship/Region prominently post the following information throughout the workplace and on its public website:		
7	<b>A.2.b.1</b>	The business contact information for its EEO Counselors, EEO Officers, Special Emphasis Program Managers, and EEO Director? [see 29 C.F.R § 1614.102(b)(7)]	YES	
8	<b>A.2.b.2</b>	Written materials concerning the EEO program, laws, policy statements, and the operation of the EEO complaint process? [see 29 C.F.R § 1614.102(b)(5)]	YES	
9	<b>A.2.b.3</b>	Reasonable accommodation procedures? [see 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(3)(i)] If so, please provide the internet address in the comments column.	YES	<a href="https://www.epa.gov/ocr/reasonable-accommodation##unionprocedures">https://www.epa.gov/ocr/reasonable-accommodation##unionprocedures</a> <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/afge_nrap_revised_2018.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/afge_nrap_revised_2018.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/non-afge_nrap_revised_2018.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/non-afge_nrap_revised_2018.pdf</a>
10	<b>A.2.c</b>	Does the agency inform its employees about the following topics?		

11	A.2.c.1	EEO complaint process? [see 29 CFR §§ 1614.102(a)(12) and 1614.102(b)(5)] If “yes”, please provide how often.	YES	On an annual basis the Agency distributes the EEO and Anti-Harassment policies to all employees. These policies are always available on the Agency’s website and in Agency EEO trainings. Information about the complaint process can be found at: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/ocr/employment-complaint-resolutions#what">https://www.epa.gov/ocr/employment-complaint-resolutions#what</a>
12	A.2.c.2	ADR process? [see MD-110, Ch. 3(II)(C)] If “yes”, please provide how often.	YES	On an annual basis the Agency distributes the EEO and Anti-Harassment policies to all employees. These policies are always available on the Agency’s website and in Agency EEO trainings. Information about the complaint process can be found at: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/ocr/employment-complaint-resolutions#what">https://www.epa.gov/ocr/employment-complaint-resolutions#what</a>
13	A.2.c.3	Reasonable accommodation program? [see 29 CFR § 1614.203(d)(7)(ii)(C)] If “yes”, please provide how often.	YES	Training on the reasonable accommodations program is offered several times throughout the year and is made available to all Agency employees. Information about the program can always be found here: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/ocr/reasonable-accommodation##unionprocedures">https://www.epa.gov/ocr/reasonable-accommodation##unionprocedures</a>
14	A.2.c.4	Anti-harassment program? [see EEOC Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (1999), § V.C.1] If “yes”, please provide how often.	YES	On an annual basis the Agency distributes the Anti-Harassment policy to all employees. This policy is always available on the Agency’s website and can be found out: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-09/documents/fy-18-anti-harassment-policy-statments.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-09/documents/fy-18-anti-harassment-policy-statments.pdf</a> Procedures for addressing allegations of workplace harassment can be found here: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-01/documents/epa_order_4711_workplace_harassment_final.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-01/documents/epa_order_4711_workplace_harassment_final.pdf</a>
15	A.2.c.5	Behaviors that are inappropriate in the workplace and could result in disciplinary action? [5 CFR § 2635.101(b)] If “yes”, please provide how often.	YES	On an annual basis the Agency distributes the Anti-Harassment policy to all employees. This policy is always available on the Agency’s website and can be found out: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-09/documents/fy-18-anti-harassment-policy-statments.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-09/documents/fy-18-anti-harassment-policy-statments.pdf</a> Information regarding behaviors inappropriate in the workplace can be found here: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-01/documents/epa_order_4711_workplace_harassment_final.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-01/documents/epa_order_4711_workplace_harassment_final.pdf</a>

	Compliance Indicator	A.3 – The agency assesses and ensures EEO principles are part of its culture.	Measure Met?	Comments
	 Measures		(Yes/No/NA)	
16	A.3.a	Does the AAship/Region provide recognition to employees, supervisors, managers, and units demonstrating superior accomplishment in equal employment opportunity? [see 29 CFR § 1614.102(a) (9)] If “yes”, provide one or two examples in the comments section.	YES	The Agency recognizes employees, supervisors, managers, and units (e.g., the Susan E. Olive National Award for Exemplary Leadership in Equal Employment Opportunity).
17	A.3.b	Does the AAship/Region utilize the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey or other climate assessment tools to monitor the perception of EEO principles within the workforce? [see 5 CFR Part 250]	YES	



### Essential Element B: Integration of EEO into the Agency’s Strategic Mission

This element requires that the agency’s EEO programs are structured to maintain a workplace that is free from discrimination and support the Agency’s strategic mission.

	Compliance Indicator	B.1 - The reporting structure for the EEO program provides the principal EEO official with appropriate authority and resources to effectively carry out a successful EEO program.	Measure Met?	Comments
	 Measures		(Yes/No/NA)	
18	B.1.a	Is the Agency head the immediate supervisor of the person (“EEO Director”) who has day-to-day control over the EEO office? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(4)]	YES	



19	B.1.a.1	If the EEO Director does not report to the Agency head, does the EEO Director report to the same AAship/Region head designee as the mission-related programmatic offices? <b>If "yes," please provide the title of the agency head designee in the comments.</b>	N/A	See previous answer.
20	B.1.a.2	Does the Agency's organizational chart clearly define the reporting structure for the EEO office? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(4)]	YES	
21	B.1.b	Does the EEO Director have a regular and effective means of advising the Agency's head and other senior management officials of the effectiveness, efficiency and legal compliance of the agency's EEO program? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(1); MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	YES	
22	B.1.c	During this reporting period, did the EEO Director present to the head of the Agency and other senior management officials, the "State of the EEO" covering the six essential elements of the model EEO program and the status of the barrier analysis process? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I)] <b>If "yes", please provide the date of the briefing in the comments column.</b>	NO	The Agency's Head and senior management officials did not receive the "State of the Agency's EEO" briefing from the EEO Director in FY18. This deficiency will be corrected in FY19 with the "State of the Agency EEO" briefing taking place in April 2019. Please see Part H-1 for further explanation.
23	B.1.d	Does the EEO Director regularly participate in senior-level staff meetings concerning personnel, budget, technology, and other workforce issues? [see MD-715, II(B)]	YES	

	Compliance Indicator	B.2 – The EEO Director controls all aspects of the EEO program.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
24	B.2.a	Is the EEO Director responsible for the implementation of a continuing affirmative employment program to promote EEO and to identify and eliminate discriminatory policies, procedures, and practices? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(III)(A); 29 CFR §1614.102(c)]	YES	
25	B.2.b	Is the EEO Director responsible for overseeing the completion of EEO counseling [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(4)]	YES	
26	B.2.c	Is the EEO Director responsible for overseeing the fair and thorough investigation of EEO complaints? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(5)] [This question may not be applicable for certain subordinate level components.]	YES	
27	B.2.d	Is the EEO Director responsible for overseeing the timely issuance of final agency decisions? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(5)] [This question may not be applicable for certain subordinate level components.]	YES	
28	B.2.e	Is the EEO Director responsible for ensuring compliance with EEOC orders? [see 29 CFR §§ 1614.102(e); 1614.502]	YES	
29	B.2.f	Is the EEO Director responsible for periodically evaluating their EEO program and providing recommendations for improvement to the Agency head? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)]	YES	

30	B.2.g	Does the EEO Director provide effective guidance and coordination for the components? [see 29 CFR §§ 1614.102(c)(2) and (c)(3)]	YES	
----	-------	---	-----	--



↓	Compliance Indicator	B.3 - The EEO Director and other EEO professional staff are involved in, and consulted on, management/personnel actions.	Measure Met?	Comments
	→		(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
31	B.3.a	Do EEO program officials participate in agency meetings regarding workforce changes that might impact EEO issues, including strategic planning, recruitment strategies, vacancy projections, succession planning, and selections for training/career development opportunities? [see MD-715, II(B)]	YES	
32	B.3.b	Do strategic plans reference EEO / diversity and inclusion principles? [see MD-715, II(B)] <b>If “yes”, please identify the EEO principles in the strategic plan in the comments column.</b>	YES	Agency EEO principles are included in the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan for FYs 2018 - 2022 (See Appendices) developed by the Office of Human Resources; for example, management and program accountability. Additionally, the Office of Civil Rights is developing its strategic plan for FY2019 - 2022. The goals for this plan mirrors the six essential elements of a model civil rights program.

↓	Compliance Indicator	B.4 - The agency has sufficient budget and staffing to support the success of its EEO program.	Measure Met?	Comments
	→		(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
33	B.4.a	Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(1), has the agency allocated sufficient funding and qualified staffing to successfully implement the EEO program, for the following areas:		



34	B.4.a.1	to conduct a self-assessment for possible program deficiencies? [see MD-715, II(D)]	YES	
35	B.4.a.2	to enable thorough barrier analysis of its workforce? [see MD-715, II(B)]	YES	
36	B.4.a.3	to timely, thoroughly, and fairly process EEO complaints, including EEO counseling, investigations, final agency decisions, and legal sufficiency reviews? [see 29 CFR § 1614.102(c)(5) & 1614.105(b) – (f); MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(D) & 5(IV); MD-715, II(E)]	YES	
37	B.4.a.4	to provide all supervisors and employees with training on the EEO program, including but not limited to retaliation, harassment, religious accommodations, disability accommodations, the EEO complaint process, and ADR? [see MD-715, II(B) and III(C)] <b>If not, please identify the type(s) of training with insufficient funding in the comments column.</b>	YES	
38	B.4.a.5	to conduct thorough, accurate, and effective field audits of the EEO programs in components and the field offices, if applicable? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)]	YES	
39	B.4.a.6	to publish and distribute EEO materials (e.g. harassment policies, EEO posters, reasonable accommodations procedures)? [see MD-715, II(B)]	YES	

40	B.4.a.7	to maintain accurate data collection and tracking systems for the following types of data: complaint tracking, workforce demographics, and applicant flow data? [see MD-715, II(E)]. <b>If not, please identify the systems with insufficient funding in the comments section.</b>	YES	
41	B.4.a.8	to effectively administer its special emphasis programs (such as, Federal Women's Program, Hispanic Employment Program, and People with Disabilities Program Manager)? [5 USC § 7201; 38 USC § 4214; 5 CFR § 720.204; 5 CFR § 213.3102(t) and (u); 5 CFR § 315.709]	YES	
42	B.4.a.9	to effectively manage its anti-harassment program? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I); EEOC Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (1999), § V.C.1]	YES	
43	B.4.a.10	to effectively manage its reasonable accommodation program? [see 29 CFR § 1614.203(d)(4)(ii)]	YES	
44	B.4.a.11	to ensure timely and complete compliance with EEOC orders? [see MD-715, II(E)]	YES	
45	B.4.b	Does the EEO office have a budget that is separate from other offices within the agency? [see 29 CFR § 1614.102(a)(1)]	YES	
46	B.4.c	Are the duties and responsibilities of EEO officials clearly defined? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(III)(A), 2(III), & 6(III)]	YES	

47	B.4.d	Does the agency ensure that all new counselors and investigators, including contractors and collateral duty employees, receive the required 32 hours of training, pursuant to Ch. 2(II)(A) of MD-110?	YES	
48	B.4.e	Does the agency ensure that all experienced counselors and investigators, including contractors and collateral duty employees, receive the required 8 hours of annual refresher training, pursuant to Ch. 2(II)(C) of MD-110?	YES	



	Compliance Indicator	<b>B.5 – The agency recruits, hires, develops, and retains supervisors and managers who have effective managerial, communications, and interpersonal skills.</b>	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
49	B.5.a	Pursuant to 29 CFR § 1614.102(a)(5), have all managers and supervisors received training on their responsibilities under the following areas under the agency EEO program:		
50	B.5.a.1	EEO Complaint Process? [see MD-715(II)(B)]	YES	
51	B.5.a.2	Reasonable Accommodation Procedures? [see 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102(d)(3)]	YES	
52	B.5.a.3	Anti-Harassment Policy? [see MD-715(II)(B)]	YES	

53	B.5.a.4	Supervisory, managerial, communication, and interpersonal skills in order to supervise most effectively in a workplace with diverse employees and avoid disputes arising from ineffective communications? [see MD-715, II(B)]	YES	
54	B.5.a.5	ADR, with emphasis on the federal government's interest in encouraging mutual resolution of disputes and the benefits associated with utilizing ADR? [see MD-715(II)(E)]	YES	



	Compliance Indicator	B.6 – The agency involves managers in the implementation of its EEO program.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
55	B.6.a	Are senior managers involved in the implementation of Special Emphasis Programs? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	YES	
56	B.6.b	Do senior managers participate in the barrier analysis process? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	YES	
57	B.6.c	When barriers are identified, do senior managers assist in developing agency EEO action plans (Part I, Part J, or the Executive Summary)? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	YES	
58	B.6.d	Do senior managers successfully implement EEO Action Plans and incorporate the EEO Action Plan Objectives into agency strategic plans? [29 CFR § 1614.102(a)(5)]	YES	

### Essential Element C: Management and Program Accountability

This element requires the Agency head to hold all managers, supervisors, and EEO officials responsible for the effective implementation of the Agency's EEO Program and Plan.



	Compliance Indicator	C.1 – The agency conducts regular internal audits of its component and field offices.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
59	C.1.a	Does the agency regularly assess its component and field offices for possible EEO program deficiencies? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)]. <b>If "yes", please provide the schedule for conducting audits in the comments section.</b>	YES	The Agency requested all program and regional offices to participate in completing an annual Part G self-assessment to identify program level deficiencies. Each office also meets with OCR quarterly to assess progress.
60	C.1.b	Does the agency regularly assess its component and field offices on their efforts to remove barriers from the workplace? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)] <b>If "yes", please provide the schedule for conducting audits in the comments section.</b>	YES	The Agency engaged all program and regional offices during the annual self-assessment process to help identify efforts to remove potential barriers from the workplace. Each office also meets with OCR quarterly to assess progress.
61	C.1.c	Do the component and field offices make reasonable efforts to comply with the recommendations of the field audit? [see MD-715, II(C)]	YES	




	Compliance Indicator	C.2 – The agency has established procedures to prevent all forms of EEO discrimination.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
62	C.2.a	Has the agency established comprehensive anti-harassment policy and procedures that comply with EEOC's enforcement guidance? [see MD-715, II(C); Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (Enforcement Guidance), EEOC No. 915.002, § V.C.1 (June 18, 1999)]	YES	
63	C.2.a.1	Does the anti-harassment policy require corrective action to prevent or eliminate conduct before it rises to the level of unlawful harassment? [see EEOC Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (1999), § V.C.1]	YES	
64	C.2.a.2	Has the agency established a firewall between the Anti-Harassment Coordinator and the EEO Director? [see EEOC Report, Model EEO Program Must Have an Effective Anti-Harassment Program (2006)]	YES	
65	C.2.a.3	Does the agency have a separate procedure (outside the EEO complaint process) to address harassment allegations? [see Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (Enforcement Guidance), EEOC No. 915.002, § V.C.1 (June 18, 1999)]	YES	


66	C.2.a.4	Does the agency ensure that the EEO office informs the anti-harassment program of all EEO counseling activity alleging harassment? [see Enforcement Guidance, V.C.]	YES	
67	C.2.a.5	Does the agency conduct a prompt inquiry (beginning within 10 days of notification) of all harassment allegations, including those initially raised in the EEO complaint process? [see <u>Complainant v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs</u> , EEOC Appeal No. 0120123232 (May 21, 2015); <u>Complainant v. Dep't of Defense (Defense Commissary Agency)</u> , EEOC Appeal No. 0120130331 (May 29, 2015)] <b>If "no", please provide the percentage of timely-processed inquiries in the comments column.</b>	YES	
68	C.2.a.6	Do the agency's training materials on its anti-harassment policy include examples of disability-based harassment? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(2)]	YES	
69	C.2.b	Has the agency established disability reasonable accommodation procedures that comply with EEOC's regulations and guidance? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(3)]	YES	
70	C.2.b.1	Is there a designated agency official or other mechanism in place to coordinate or assist with processing requests for disability accommodations throughout the agency? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(3)(D)]	YES	
71	C.2.b.2	Has the agency established disability reasonable accommodation procedures that comply with EEOC's regulations and guidance? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(3)]	YES	

72	C.2.b.3	Does the agency ensure that job applicants can request and receive reasonable accommodations during the application and placement processes? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(1)(ii)(B)]	YES	
73	C.2.b.4	Do the reasonable accommodation procedures clearly state that the agency should process the request within a maximum amount of time (e.g., 20 business days), as established by the agency in its affirmative action plan? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(3)(i)(M)]	YES	
74	C.2.b.5	Does the agency process all accommodation requests within the time frame set forth in its reasonable accommodation procedures? [see MD-715, II(C).] If “no”, please provide the percentage of timely-processed requests in the comments column.	YES	
75	C.2.c	Has the agency established procedures for processing requests for personal assistance services that comply with EEOC’s regulations, enforcement guidance, and other applicable executive orders, guidance, and standards? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(6)]	YES	
76	C.2.c.1	Does the agency post its procedures for processing requests for Personal Assistance Services on its public website? [see 29 CFR § 1614.203(d)(5)(v)]. If “yes”, please provide the internet address in the comments column.	YES	EPA’s current procedures for requesting RA requests are posted at:  <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/afge_nrap_revised_2018.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/afge_nrap_revised_2018.pdf</a>  <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/non-afge_nrap_revised_2018.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/non-afge_nrap_revised_2018.pdf</a>



	Compliance Indicator	<b>C.3 - The agency evaluates managers and supervisors on their efforts to ensure equal employment opportunity.</b>	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
77	<b>C.3.a</b>	Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(5), do all managers and supervisors have an element in their performance appraisal that evaluates their commitment to agency EEO policies and principles and their participation in the EEO program?	YES	
78	<b>C.3.b</b>	Does the agency require rating officials to evaluate the performance of managers and supervisors based on the following activities:		
79	<b>C.3.b.1</b>	Resolve EEO problems/disagreements/conflicts, including the participation in ADR proceedings? [see MD-110, Ch. 3.]	YES	
80	<b>C.3.b.2</b>	Ensure full cooperation of employees under his/her supervision with EEO officials, such as counselors and investigators? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(6)]	YES	
81	<b>C.3.b.3</b>	Ensure a workplace that is free from all forms of discrimination, including harassment and retaliation? [see MD-715, II(C)]	YES	
82	<b>C.3.b.4</b>	Ensure that subordinate supervisors have effective managerial, communication, and interpersonal skills to supervise in a workplace with diverse employees? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	YES	

83	C.3.b.5	Provide religious accommodations when such accommodations do not cause an undue hardship? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(7)]	YES	
84	C.3.b.6	Provide disability accommodations when such accommodations do not cause an undue hardship? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(8)]	YES	
85	C.3.b.7	Support the EEO program in identifying and removing barriers to equal opportunity. [see MD-715, II(C)]	YES	
86	C.3.b.8	Support the anti-harassment program in investigating and correcting harassing conduct. [see Enforcement Guidance, V.C.2]	YES	
87	C.3.b.9	Comply with settlement agreements and orders issued by the agency, EEOC, and EEO-related cases from the Merit Systems Protection Board, labor arbitrators, and the Federal Labor Relations Authority? [see MD-715, II(C)]	YES	
88	C.3.c	Does the EEO Director recommend to the Agency head improvements or corrections, including remedial or disciplinary actions, for managers and supervisors who have failed in their EEO responsibilities? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)]	N/A	EEO Director did not identify any manager or supervisor who failed in their EEO responsibilities.
89	C.3.d	When the EEO Director recommends remedial or disciplinary actions, are the recommendations regularly implemented by the Regional and senior leadership? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)]	N/A	In FY18 the EEO Director did not recommend any remedial or disciplinary actions.



 Compliance Indicator	C.4 – The agency ensures effective coordination between its EEO	Measure Met?	Comments
--	---	--------------	----------

		<b>programs and Human Resources (HR) program.</b>	<b>(Yes/No/NA)</b>	
	<b>Measures</b>			
<b>90</b>	<b>C.4.a</b>	Do the HR Director and the EEO Director, including subcomponents meet regularly to assess whether personnel programs, policies, and procedures conform to EEOC laws, instructions, and management directives? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(2)]	<b>YES</b>	The EEO Director and the HR Director established a monthly schedule beginning June 2018. Please see Part H-3 for further explanation.
<b>91</b>	<b>C.4.b</b>	Have Regions established timetables/schedules to review at regular intervals its merit promotion program, employee recognition awards program, employee development/training programs, and management/personnel policies, procedures, and practices for systemic barriers that may be impeding full participation in the program by all EEO groups? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	<b>YES</b>	
<b>92</b>	<b>C.4.c</b>	Does the EEO office have timely access to accurate and complete data (e.g., demographic data for workforce, applicants, training programs, etc.) required to prepare the MD-715 workforce data tables? [see 29 CFR §1614.601(a)]	<b>YES</b>	
<b>93</b>	<b>C.4.d</b>	Does the HR office timely provide the EEO office with access to other data (e.g., exit interview data, climate assessment surveys, and grievance data), upon request? [see MD-715, II(C)]	<b>YES</b>	
<b>94</b>	<b>C.4.e</b>	Pursuant to Section II(C) of MD-715, does the EEO office collaborate with the HR office to:		

95	C.4.e.1	Implement the Affirmative Action Plan for Individuals with Disabilities? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d); MD-715, II(C)]	YES	
96	C.4.e.2	Develop and/or conduct outreach and recruiting initiatives? [see MD-715, II(C)]	YES	
97	C.4.e.3	Develop and/or provide training for managers and employees? [see MD-715, II(C)]	YES	
98	C.4.e.4	Identify and remove barriers to equal opportunity in the workplace? [see MD-715, II(C)]	YES	
99	C.4.e.5	Assist in preparing the MD-715 report? [see MD-715, II(C)]	YES	



	Compliance Indicator	C.5 – Following a finding of discrimination, the agency explores whether it should take a disciplinary action.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
100	C.5.a	Does the agency have a disciplinary policy and/or table of penalties that covers discriminatory conduct? [see 29 CFR § 1614.102(a)(6); see also <u>Douglas v. Veterans Administration</u> , 5 MSPR 280 (1981)]	YES	
101	C.5.b	When appropriate, does the agency discipline or sanction managers and employees for discriminatory conduct? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(6)] If “yes”, please state the number of disciplined/sanctioned individuals during this reporting period in the comments.	N/A	The Agency had no disciplined/sanctioned individuals in FY18.

102	C.5.c	If the agency has a finding of discrimination (or settles cases in which a finding was likely), does the agency inform managers and supervisors about the discriminatory conduct? [see MD-715, II(C)]	YES	
-----	-------	---	-----	--

	Compliance Indicator	C.6 – The EEO office advises managers/supervisors on EEO matters.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
103	C.6.a	Does the EEO office provide management/supervisory officials with regular EEO updates on at least an annual basis, including EEO complaints, workforce demographics and data summaries, legal updates, barrier analysis plans, and special emphasis updates? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I] If “yes”, please identify the frequency of the EEO updates in the comments column.	YES	At least annually, the EEO office provides management/supervisory officials with EEO updates.
104	C.6.b	Are EEO officials (EEOOs/PMOs) readily available to answer managers’ and supervisors’ questions or concerns? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	YES	



### Essential Element D: Proactive Prevention

This element requires that the agency head make early efforts to prevent discrimination and to identify and eliminate barriers to equal employment opportunity.



	Compliance Indicator	D.1 – The agency conducts a reasonable assessment to monitor progress towards achieving equal	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	



	Measures	employment opportunity throughout the year.		
105	D.1.a	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) have a process for identifying triggers in the workplace? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	YES	
106	D.1.b	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) regularly use the following sources of information for trigger identification: workforce data; complaint/grievance data; exit surveys; employee climate surveys; focus groups; affinity groups; union; program evaluations; special emphasis programs; reasonable accommodation program; anti-harassment program; and/or external special interest groups? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	YES	
107	D.1.c	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) conduct exit interviews or surveys that include questions on how the agency could improve the recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention and advancement of individuals with disabilities? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(1)(iii)(C)]	NO	The Agency redeveloped its existing exit survey for employees to include relevant questions for persons with disabilities in FY18. The revised exit survey was launched in FY19. Please see Part H-4 for further explanation.

	Compliance Indicator	D.2 – The agency identifies areas where barriers may exclude EEO groups (reasonable basis to act.)	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
108	D.2.a	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) have a process for analyzing the identified triggers to find possible barriers? [see MD-715, (II)(B)]	YES	

109	D.2.b	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) regularly examine the impact of management/personnel policies, procedures, and practices by race, national origin, sex, and disability? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(3)]	YES	
110	D.2.c	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) consider whether any group of employees or applicants might be negatively impacted prior to making human resource decisions, such as re-organizations and realignments? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(3)]	YES	
111	D.2.d	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) regularly review the following sources of information to find barriers: complaint/grievance data, exit surveys, employee climate surveys, focus groups, affinity groups, union, program evaluations, anti-harassment program, special emphasis programs, reasonable accommodation program; anti-harassment program; and/or external special interest groups? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I] <b>If “yes”, please identify the data sources in the comments column.</b>	YES	The Agency uses a number of sources to identify potential barriers such as FEVS, EPA Form 462, i-Complaints, reasonable accommodation program data, special emphasis programs and advisory councils, affinity groups, and program evaluations.

	Compliance Indicator	D.3 – The agency establishes appropriate action plans to remove identified barriers.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
112	D.3.a.	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) effectively tailor action plans to address the identified barriers, in particular policies, procedures, or practices? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(3)]	N/A	The Agency did not identify barriers in FY18.



113	D.3.b	If the agency (HQ/Regions) identified one or more barriers during the reporting period, did the agency (HQ/Regions) implement a plan in Part I, including meeting the target dates for the planned activities? [see MD-715, II(D)]	N/A	No barriers were identified in FY18.
114	D.3.c	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) periodically review the effectiveness of the plans? [see MD-715, II(D)]	N/A	No barriers were identified in FY18.

↓	Compliance Indicator	D.4 – The agency has an affirmative action plan for people with disabilities, including those with targeted disabilities.	Measure Met?	Comments
	→		(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
115	D.4.a	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) post its affirmative action plan on its public website? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(4)] <b>Please provide the internet address in the comments.</b>	NO	Please see Part H-8 for further explanation.
116	D.4.b	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) take specific steps to ensure qualified people with disabilities are aware of and encouraged to apply for job vacancies? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(1)(i)]	YES	
117	D.4.c	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) ensure that disability-related questions from members of the public are answered promptly and correctly? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(1)(ii)(A)]	YES	



118	D.4.d	Has the agency (HQ/Regions) taken specific steps that are reasonably designed to increase the number of persons with disabilities or targeted disabilities employed at the agency until it meets the goals? [see 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(7)(ii)]	YES	
-----	-------	---	-----	--


### Essential Element E: Efficiency


This element requires the agency head to ensure that there are effective systems for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the agency's EEO programs and an efficient and fair dispute resolution process.



 	Compliance Indicator	E.1 - The agency maintains an efficient, fair, and impartial complaint resolution process.	Measure Met?	Comments
	Measures		(Yes/No/NA)	
119	E.1.a	Does the agency timely provide EEO counseling, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.105?	YES	
120	E.1.b	Does the agency provide written notification of rights and responsibilities in the EEO process during the initial counseling session, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.105(b)(1)?	YES	
121	E.1.c	Does the agency issue acknowledgment letters immediately upon receipt of a formal complaint, pursuant to MD-110, Ch. 5(l)?	YES	
122	E.1.d	Does the agency issue acceptance letters/dismissal decisions within a reasonable time (e.g., 60 days) after receipt of the written EEO Counselor report, pursuant to MD-110, Ch. 5(l)? If so, please provide the average processing time in the comments.	YES	Acceptance/dismissal letters are issued in an average of 30 days.
123	E.1.e	Does the agency ensure all employees fully cooperate with EEO counselors and EEO personnel in the EEO process, including granting routine access to personnel records related to an investigation, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(6)?	YES	

124	E.1.f	Does the agency timely complete investigations, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.108?	YES	
125	E.1.g	If the agency does not timely complete investigations, does the agency notify complainants of the date by which the investigation will be completed and of their right to request a hearing or file a lawsuit, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.108(g)?	YES	
126	E.1.h	When the complainant does not request a hearing, does the agency timely issue the final agency decision, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.110(b)?	NO	In FY18 FADs were issued at an average rate of 70 days, which is above the EEOC target of 60 days. Please see Part H-5 for further explanation.
127	E.1.i	Does the agency timely issue final actions following receipt of the hearing file and the administrative judge's decision, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.110(a)?	YES	
128	E.1.j	If the agency uses contractors to implement any stage of the EEO complaint process, does the agency hold them accountable for poor work product and/or delays? [See MD-110, Ch. 5(V)(A)] If "yes", please describe how in the comments column.	YES	If the Agency receives a work product deemed of poor quality, it is not accepted and returned for rework. The Agency has on occasion ceased working with the contractor due to performance issues.
129	E.1.k	If the agency uses employees to implement any stage of the EEO complaint process, does the agency hold them accountable for poor work product and/or delays during performance review? [See MD-110, Ch. 5(V)(A)]	YES	
130	E.1.l	Does the agency submit complaint files and other documents in the proper format to EEOC through the Federal Sector EEO Portal (FedSEP)? [See 29 CFR § 1614.403(g)]	YES	

	Compliance Indicator	E.2 – The agency has a neutral EEO process.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
131	E.2.a	Has the agency established a clear separation between its EEO complaint program and its defensive function? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(D)]	YES	
132	E.2.b	When seeking legal sufficiency reviews, does the EEO office have access to sufficient legal resources separate from the agency representative? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(D)] If “yes”, please identify the source/location of the attorney who conducts the legal sufficiency review in the comments column.	YES	The Civil Rights Law Practice Group conducts legal sufficiency reviews and is separate from the Agency representatives in the Employment Law Practice Group.
133	E.2.c	If the EEO office relies on the agency’s defensive function to conduct the legal sufficiency review, is there a firewall between the reviewing attorney and the agency representative? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(D)]	N/A	
134	E.2.d	Does the agency ensure that its agency representative does not intrude upon EEO counseling, investigations, and final agency decisions? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(D)]	YES	
135	E.2.e	If applicable, are processing time frames incorporated for the legal counsel’s sufficiency review for timely processing of complaints? [see EEOC Report, <i>Attaining a Model Agency Program: Efficiency</i> (Dec. 1, 2004)]	YES	



	Compliance Indicator	E.3 - The agency has established and encouraged the widespread use	Measure Met?	Comments
---	----------------------	--	--------------	----------

		of a fair alternative dispute resolution (ADR) program.	(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
136	E.3.a	Has the agency established an ADR program for use during both the pre-complaint and formal complaint stages of the EEO process? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(2)]	YES	
137	E.3.b	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) require managers and supervisors to participate in ADR once it has been offered? [see MD-715, II(A)(1)]	YES	
138	E.3.c	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) encourage all employees to use ADR, where ADR is appropriate? [see MD-110, Ch. 3(IV)(C)]	YES	
139	E.3.d	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) ensure a management official with settlement authority is accessible during the dispute resolution process? [see MD-110, Ch. 3(III)(A)(9)]	YES	
140	E.3.e	Does the agency prohibit the responsible management official named in the dispute from having settlement authority? [see MD-110, Ch. 3(I)]	YES	
141	E.3.f	Does the agency annually evaluate the effectiveness of its ADR program? [see MD-110, Ch. 3(II)(D)]	YES	

	Compliance Indicator	E.4 – The agency has effective and accurate data collection systems in place to evaluate its EEO program.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			





142	E.4.a	Does the agency have systems in place to accurately collect, monitor, and analyze the following data:		
143	E.4.a.1	Complaint activity, including the issues and bases of the complaints, the aggrieved individuals/complainants, and the involved management official? [see MD-715, II(E)]	YES	
144	E.4.a.2	The race, national origin, sex, and disability status of agency employees? [see 29 CFR §1614.601(a)]	YES	
145	E.4.a.3	Recruitment activities? [see MD-715, II(E)]	YES	
146	E.4.a.4	External and internal applicant flow data concerning the applicants' race, national origin, sex, and disability status? [see MD-715, II(E)]	NO	This deficiency is specifically related to applicant flow data for the attorney-advisor series (0905). Applicant flow data for the 0905 series is currently unavailable for analysis. Please see Part H-6 for further explanation.
147	E.4.a.5	The processing of requests for reasonable accommodation? [29 CFR § 1614.203(d)(4)]	YES	
148	E.4.a.6	The processing of complaints for the anti-harassment program? [see EEOC Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (1999), § V.C.2]	YES	
149	E.4.b	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) have a system in place to re-survey the workforce on a regular basis? [MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	YES	

	Compliance Indicator	E.5 – The agency identifies and disseminates significant trends and best practices in its EEO program.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			



150	E.5.a	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) monitor trends in its EEO program to determine whether the agency is meeting its obligations under the statutes EEOC enforces? [see MD-715, II(E)] <b>If “yes”, provide an example in the comments.</b>	YES	The largest trends represented allegations of harassment and retaliation: 47% of the complaints included allegations of harassment. 43% of the complaints were allegations of retaliation.
151	E.5.b	Does the agency (HQ/Regions) review other agencies’ best practices and adopt them, where appropriate, to improve the effectiveness of its EEO program? [see MD-715, II(E)] <b>If “yes”, provide an example in the comments.</b>	YES	The Office of Civil Rights periodically benchmarks other agencies’ best practices to determine where they may be applied. Benchmarking of other agencies’ investigations procedures was done while using the Lean process to evaluate EPA’s investigation procedures for efficiencies. Specifically, OCR reviewed GSA’s minimal review process for accept/dismiss letters and the use of document sharing (i.e., OneDrive or Google Docs). These and other GSA practices helped to better inform OCR’s efforts to improve the investigation procedures.
152	E.5.c	Does the agency compare its performance in the EEO process to other federal agencies of similar size? [see MD-715, II(E)]	YES	



### Essential Element F: Responsiveness and Legal Compliance

This element requires federal agencies to comply with EEO statutes and EEOC regulations, policy guidance, and other written instructions.

	Compliance Indicator	F.1 – The agency has processes in place to ensure timely and full compliance with EEOC Orders and settlement agreements.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
153	F.1.a	Does the agency have a system of management controls to ensure that its officials timely comply with EEOC orders/directives and final agency actions? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(e); MD-715, II(F)]	YES	

154	F.1.b	Does the agency have a system of management controls to ensure the timely, accurate, and complete compliance with resolutions/settlement agreements? [see MD-715, II(F)]	YES	
155	F.1.c	Are there procedures in place to ensure the timely and predictable processing of ordered monetary relief? [see MD-715, II(F)]	YES	
156	F.1.d	Are procedures in place to process other forms of ordered relief promptly? [see MD-715, II(F)]	YES	
157	F.1.e	When EEOC issues an order requiring compliance by the agency, does the agency hold its compliance officer(s) accountable for poor work product and/or delays during performance review? [see MD-110, Ch. 9(IX)(H)]	YES	

	Compliance Indicator	F.2 – The agency complies with the law, including EEOC regulations, management directives, orders, and other written instructions.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			
158	F.2.a	Does the agency timely respond and fully comply with EEOC orders? [see 29 CFR §1614.502; MD-715, II(E)]	YES	
159	F.2.a.1	When a complainant requests a hearing, does the agency timely forward the investigative file to the appropriate EEOC hearing office? [see 29 CFR §1614.108(g)]	YES	
160	F.2.a.2	When there is a finding of discrimination that is not the subject of an appeal by the agency, does the agency ensure timely compliance with the orders of relief? [see 29 CFR §1614.501]	YES	
161	F.2.a.3	When a complainant files an appeal, does the agency timely forward the investigative file to EEOC's Office of Federal Operations? [see 29 CFR §1614.403(e)]	YES	
162	F.2.a.4	Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.502, does the agency promptly provide EEOC with the required documentation for completing compliance?	YES	

	Compliance Indicator	F.3 - The agency reports to EEOC its program efforts and accomplishments.	Measure Met?	Comments
			(Yes/No/NA)	
	Measures			

163	F.3.a	Does the agency timely submit to EEOC an accurate and complete No FEAR Act report? [Public Law 107-174 (May 15, 2002), §203(a)]	YES	
164	F.3.b	Does the agency timely post on its public webpage its quarterly No FEAR Act data? [see 29 CFR §1614.703(d)]	YES	

## Part H – Plan to Correct Deficiencies

<b>Part H-1:</b>	<b>Essential Element B: Integration of EEO into the Agency’s Strategic Mission – Compliance Indicator B.1 - The reporting structure for the EEO program provides the principal EEO official with appropriate authority and resources to effectively carry out a successful EEO program.</b>
Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency:	<i>Part G Compliance Indicator/Measure B.1.c. During this reporting period, did the EEO Director present to the head of the Agency (or delegate) and other senior management officials, the EEO’s “State of the Agency” briefing? This briefing covers the six essential elements of the model EEO program and the status of the barrier analysis process.</i>
	The EEO’s “State of the Agency” briefing was not conducted in FY18.
Objective:	To conduct an annual EEO “State of the Agency” briefing with the Agency head (or delegate) and senior management officials. Annual briefings will begin in FY19.
Responsible Official:	Vicki Simons, Director, Office of Civil Rights (OCR)
Date Objective Initiated:	January 30, 2018
Target Date for Completion of Objective:	April 22, 2019
<b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective:</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
OCR will deliver “State of the Agency EEO” briefings in FY19 for the Administrator and other Agency leadership to include the Office of General Counsel (OGC), the Office of Mission Support (OMS) (formerly known as OARM), and the Deputy Civil Rights Officials (DCROs).	Annual briefings will begin to be conducted in 2019
<b>Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective:</b>	

<b>Part H-2:</b>	<b>Essential Element C: Management and Program Accountability – Compliance Indicator C.2 - The Agency has established procedures to prevent all forms of EEO discrimination.</b>
Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency:	<i>Part G Compliance Indicator C.2.c.1 – Does the Agency post its procedures for processing Personal Assistance Services (PAS) / Reasonable Accommodation (RA) requests on its public website? [See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(5)(v)]</i>
	In FY18, the Agency did not post procedures for processing PAS requests on its website.
Objective:	To develop, implement and publicly web-post procedures for PAS / RA requests.
Responsible Official:	Vicki Simons, Director, Office of Civil Rights (OCR)
Date Objective Initiated:	January 30, 2018
Target Date for Completion of Objective:	<b>COMPLETED:</b> August 2, 2018
<b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective:</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
1. OCR and Labor and Employee Relations (LER), in consultation and coordination with OGC, will develop a proposal for the EPA PAS/RA request procedures.	March 30, 2018
2. OCR and LER, in consultation and coordination with OGC, will ensure all EPA stakeholder (i.e., EPA Unions) concerns are considered prior to finalizing the EPA PAS / RA request procedures.	September 28, 2018
3. OCR will issue the EPA PAS / RA request procedures to all employees and applicants and post to EPA's internal and external webpages.	August 2, 2018
<b>Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective:</b>	
EPA's current procedures for requesting PAS/RA are web-posted: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/node/38461/view##unionprocedures">https://www.epa.gov/node/38461/view##unionprocedures</a> PAS/RA request procedures were updated June 2018: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/afge_nrap_revised_2018.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-08/documents/afge_nrap_revised_2018.pdf</a>	

<b>Part H-3:</b>	<b>Essential Element C: Management and Program Accountability – Compliance Indicator C.4 - The Agency ensures effective coordination between its EEO programs and Human Resources (HR) program.</b>
Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency:	<i>Part G Compliance Indicator C.4.a – Do the HR Director and the EEO Director meet regularly to assess whether personnel program, policies, and procedures conform to EEOC laws, instructions, and management directives? [See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102(a)(2)]</i>
	The HR and EEO Directors did not conduct regular meetings in FY17.
Objective:	To ensure standing EEO/HR meetings occur a minimum of three times a year.
Responsible Official:	Vicki Simons, Director, Office of Civil Rights (OCR)
	Wes Carpenter, Acting Director, Office of Human Resources (OHR)
Date Objective Initiated:	January 30, 2018
Target Date for Completion of Objective:	<b>COMPLETED: May 31, 2018</b>
<b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective:</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
OCR and OHR will establish a regular meeting schedule within 30 days of this annual report.	May 31, 2018
<b>Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective:</b>	
The EEO Director and the HR Director established a monthly schedule beginning May 2018.	



<b>Part H-4:</b>	<b>Essential Element D: Proactive Prevention – Compliance Indicator D.1 - The Agency conducts a reasonable assessment to monitor progress towards achieving equal employment opportunity throughout the year.</b>
Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency:	<i>Part G Compliance Indicator D.1.c – Does the Agency conduct exit interviews or surveys that include questions on how the Agency could improve the recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention and advancement of individuals with disabilities? [See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(1)(iii)]</i>
	Existing Agency exit surveys do not include recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention and advancement improvement questions directly related to individuals with disabilities.
Objective:	To create a mechanism for exit surveys that will incorporate employment and career development improvement questions for individuals with disabilities.
Responsible Official:	Vicki Simons, Director, Office of Civil Rights (OCR)
	Wes Carpenter, Acting Director, Office of Human Resources (OHR)
Date Objective Initiated:	January 30, 2018
Target Date for Completion of Objective:	<b>COMPLETED:</b> January 28, 2019
<b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
1. OHR/PPTD will update its existing exit survey to gather data that could improve the recruitment, hiring, inclusion, and advancement of individuals with disabilities.	December 26, 2018
2. OHR/PPTD will launch the updated <i>EPA Employee Exit Survey</i> on EPA's Intranet site.	January 28, 2019
<b>Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective:</b>	

In FY18, the Policy, Planning and Training Division (PPTD) developed a phased process for reinvigorating the Agency's exit survey. PPTD developed a workgroup that assessed the Agency's existing, electronically-accessible exit survey. The workgroup redeveloped the exit survey and proposed new questions to assist the Agency in evaluating areas of improvements in recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention and advancement related to individuals with disabilities. The final version of the *EPA Employee Exit Survey* can be found in the List of Additional Appendices and is available on the EPA's Intranet: <https://intranet.epa.gov/oarm/offboarding/index.html>

<b>Part H-5 (a):</b>	<b>Essential Element E: Efficiency - Compliance Indicator E.1 – The Agency maintains an efficient, fair, and impartial complaint resolution process.</b>
Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency:	<i>Part G Compliance Indicator E.1.f - Does the Agency timely complete investigations, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.108?</i>
Objective:	To ensure EPA completes timely investigations.
Responsible Official:	Vicki Simons, Director, Office of Civil Rights (OCR)
Date Objective Initiated:	March 1, 2011
Target Date for Completion of Objective:	<b>COMPLETED:</b> September 28, 2018
<b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
1. OCR's Employment Complaints Resolution Staff (ECRS) will conduct a LEAN Kaizen event for investigations. This event will identify opportunities to frame accepted claims. This action will enable the investigation process to be completed within an acceptable timeframe.	December 15, 2017
<b>Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective:</b>	
The LEAN Kaizen event for investigations was completed. The event produced an action plan that allowed ECRS to implement changes to the investigation process. As a result of the updated process, ECRS ended FY18 with a 90% timeliness completion rate. The 90% timeliness rate for investigations exceeded the benchmark for performance for similar sized federal agencies and has allowed the Agency to note this portion of the Planned Activity as completed.	

<b>Part H-5 (b):</b>	<b>Essential Element E: Efficiency - Compliance Indicator E.1 – The Agency maintains an efficient, fair, and impartial complaint resolution process.</b>
Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency:	<i>Part G Compliance Indicator E.1.h (formerly Part G: Q. 119) - When the complainant does not request a hearing, does the Agency timely issue the Final Agency Decision (FAD), pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.110(b)?</i>
	Agency FADs were not timely issued in FY18.
Objective:	To ensure EPA completes timely and legally sufficient FADs.
Responsible Official:	Vicki Simons, Director, Office of Civil Rights (OCR)
Date Objective Initiated:	March 1, 2011
Target Date for Completion of Objective:	September 28, 2018
<b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
1. ECRS will continuously look for opportunities to improve the timeliness of issuing FADs with the expectation that by the end of FY19, the Agency will complete FADs within the 60-day regulatory timeframe.	September 30, 2019
<b>Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective:</b>	
By the end of FY18, ECRS reached an average of 70 days for issuing Final Agency Decisions, slightly above EEOC's target 60-day threshold.	

<b>Part H-6:</b>	<b>Essential Element E: Efficiency – Compliance Indicator E.4- The Agency has effective and accurate data collection systems in place to evaluate its EEO program.</b>
Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency:	<i>Part G Compliance Indicator E.4.a.4 - Does the Agency have effective and accurate data collection systems in place to collect, monitor, and analyze data including: recruitment activities; external and internal applicant flow data concerning the applicants' race, national origin, sex, and disability status?</i>
	EPA does not have a method to capture applicant flow data for Attorney-Advisers (Series 0905).
Objective:	To put in place effective and accurate data collection systems to evaluate the Agency's EEO program with respect to attorney-advisors (Series 0905).
Responsible Official:	Elise Packard, Acting Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Council (OGC)
	Rafael DeLeon, Deputy Director, Office of Site Remediation Enforcement (OSRE), Office of Compliance Assurance (OECA)
Date Objective Initiated:	November 1, 2013
Target Date for Completion of Objective:	September 27, 2019
<b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
1. Identify Deputy Civil Rights Official (DCRO) Executive Champions.	November 1, 2018
2. Establish a benchmark by assessing EPA regions' hiring practices for Attorney-Advisors (Series 0905).	July 29, 2019
3. OCR, OECA, OGC, and OHR will collaborate to develop an Agency-wide process for hiring Attorney-Advisors (Series 0905). The current use of USA Jobs for all other positions at EPA may be used as a recruitment/hiring process template.	August 30, 2019

<p>4. Using applicant flow data captured from the Agency-wide process for hiring Attorney-Advisors (Series 0905), OCR will begin to conduct trigger analysis, looking for potential barriers to equal opportunity employment.</p>	<p>September 27, 2019</p>
<p><b>Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective:</b></p>	
<p>Two DCROs have been identified who will serve as Executive Champions for this Planned Activity.</p>	
<p>A pilot began in FY16 to collect applicant flow data and assist OCR in analyzing associated recruitment efforts. This resulted in a lack of expected progress towards addressing this deficiency. The pilot yielded incomplete data that could not be analyzed to determine triggers. Additionally, the pilot was specific to OGC and not applicable to all Attorney-Advisors (Series 0905) hiring in the Agency.</p>	
<p>For FY16-18, OGC collected application qualification rates, but not selection rates; this was due to a technical processing issue that has since been resolved through an interim workaround. Through the interim workaround OGC has retroactively applied the selection rates allowing for a complete data set. This process is serving as a foundation for our efforts to develop a process for capturing applicant flow data for Attorney-Advisors (Series 0905).</p>	

<b>Part H-7:</b>	<b>Essential Element D: Proactive Prevention - Compliance Indicator D.4 – The Agency has an Affirmative Action Plan for people with disabilities, including those with targeted disabilities.</b>
Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency:	<i>Part G Compliance Indicator D.4.a - Does the Agency (HQ/Regions) post its Affirmative Action Plan for People with Disabilities on its public website? [See 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(4)]</i>
	The <i>Affirmative Action Plan for People with Disabilities</i> , developed from Part J, will be posted to the public website in FY19.
Objective:	To post the Agency's <i>Affirmative Action Plan for People with Disabilities</i> to the public website.
Responsible Official:	Vicki Simons, Director, Office of Civil Rights (OCR)
	Arron Helm, Acting Director, Office of Human Resources (OHR) (as of 2/2019)
Date Objective Initiated:	December 28, 2018
Target Date for Completion of Objective:	June 3, 2019
<b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
OCR will coordinate with OHR's Web Editor-in-Chief to post the <i>Affirmative Action Plan for People with Disabilities</i> on the Agency's public website.	June 3, 2019
<b>Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective:</b>	

## Part I – Agency EEO Plan to Eliminate Identified Barrier

Please describe the status of each plan that the agency implemented to identify possible barriers in policies, procedures, or practices for employees and applicants by race, ethnicity, and gender.

If the agency did not conduct barrier analysis during the reporting period, please check the box.

### ANALYSIS I: Statement of Condition That Was a Trigger for a Potential Barrier:

Source of the Trigger	Specific Workforce Data Table	Narrative Description of Trigger
Workforce Data Tables	A4-1	A review of the FY18 workforce data (table A4-1) indicates lower than expected participation rates in certain categories (gender/RNO) in the Senior Executive Service.

### EEO Group(s) Affected by Trigger

EEO Group
Females
Hispanic/Latina Females
Black/African American Females
Asian Males and Females
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Males and Females
Two or More Races Males and Females

Barrier Analysis Process

Sources of Data	Source Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	<p>A review of FY18 data (Table A4-1) provided information on the SES levels at EPA. Data analysis demonstrated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Females have a less than expected participation rate at the SES level (44.36%) when compared to the G15 feeder pool (46.22%)</li> <li>• Hispanic/Latino Females have a less than expected participation rate at the SES level (2.33%) when compared to the GS15 feeder pool (2.38%)</li> <li>• Black/African American Females have a less than expected participation rate at the SES level (6.61%) when compared to the GS15 feeder pool (7.22%)</li> <li>• Asian Males have a less than expected participation rate at the SES level (1.57%) when compared when compared to the GS15 feeder pool (2.89%)</li> <li>• Asian Females have a less than expected participation rate at the SES level (0.78%) when compared when compared to the GS15 feeder pool (2.75%)</li> <li>• Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Males have a less than expected participation rate at the SES level (0.0%) when compared when compared to the GS15 feeder pool (0.093%)</li> <li>• Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Females have a less than expected participation rate at the SES level (0.0%) when compared when compared to the GS15 feeder pool (0.047%)</li> <li>• Two or More Races Males have a less than expected participation rate at the SES level (0.0%) when compared when compared to the GS15 feeder pool (0.19%)</li> <li>• Two or More Races Females have a less than expected participation rate at the SES level</li> </ul>



Sources of Data	Source Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected
		(0.0%) when compared when compared to the GS15 feeder pool (0.28%)
Career Development Program, OHR/OMS-RTP	Yes	Discussion with Lead HR Specialist from EPA's Executive Resources Team provided information on the Agency's SES process (application, qualification, and selection of candidates) for FY18.

Status of Barrier Analysis Process

Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)	Barrier(s) Identified? (Yes or No)
No	N/A

Statement of Identified Barrier(s)

Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice
N/A

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan

Objective	Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding & Staffing?	Modified Date	Date Completed
Assess opportunities to enter the SES through EPA's career development program and through external hiring.	03/01/19	09/30/20	Yes		

Responsible Official(s)

Title	Name	Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)
Director, Office of Civil Rights (OCR)	Vicki Simons	Yes
Director, Office of Human Resources (OHR)	Mara Kamen	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective

Target Date	Planned Activities	Modified Date	Completion Date
09/30/20	Review available applicant flow data from the FY16, 17, 18 SES cohorts to assess whether a policy, practice, or procedure is a barrier to advancement to the SES.		
09/30/20	Analyze how existing developmental programs for upward mobility to SES are available to a wide and diverse applicant pool.		

Report of Accomplishments

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
FY20	

-----

**ANALYSIS II: Statement of Condition That Was a Trigger for a Potential Barrier:**

Source of the Trigger	Specific Workforce Data Table	Narrative Description of Trigger
Workforce Data Tables	A4-1	A review of the FY18 workforce data (Table A4-1) indicates lower than expected participation rates for Hispanic/Latino employees (Males and Females) in certain categories in the senior grades (GS13 through SES levels).

EEO Group(s) Affected by Trigger

<b>EEO Group</b>
Hispanic/Latino Males and Females

Barrier Analysis Process

Sources of Data	Source Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	<p>A review of FY18 data (Table A4-1) provided information on the upward mobility of Hispanics/Latinos at EPA. Data analysis demonstrated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hispanic/Latina Females at GS13 have a less than expected participation rate (3.98%) when compared to the feeder pool of GS12 Hispanic/Latina Females (6.03%)</li> <li>• Hispanic/Latina Females at GS14 have a less than expected participation rate (2.56%) when compared to the feeder pool of GS13 Hispanic/Latina Females (3.98%)</li> <li>• Hispanic/Latina Females at GS15 have a less than expected participation rate (2.38%) when compared to the feeder pool of GS14 Hispanic/Latina Females (2.56%)</li> <li>• Hispanic/Latina Females at SES level have a less than expected participation rate (2.33%) when compared to the feeder pool of GS15 Hispanic/Latino Females (2.38%)</li> <li>• Hispanic/Latino Males at GS14 have a less than expected participation rate (3.45%) when compared to the feeder pool of GS13 Hispanic/Latino Males (3.80%)</li> <li>• Hispanic/Latino Males at GS15 have a less than expected participation rate (2.66%) when compared to the feeder pool of GS14 Hispanic/Latino Males (3.45%)</li> </ul>

Status of Barrier Analysis Process

<b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)</b>	<b>Barrier(s) Identified? (Yes or No)</b>
No	N/A

Statement of Identified Barrier(s)

<b>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</b>
N/A

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Date Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Sufficient Funding &amp; Staffing?</b>	<b>Modified Date</b>	<b>Date Completed</b>
Conduct analysis of Agency policies, practices, or procedures that may create potential barriers to the upward mobility of Hispanic/Latino employees to the senior grades of GS-13 through SES.	03/01/19	09/20/20	Yes		

Responsible Official(s)

<b>Title</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)</b>
Director, Office of Civil Rights (OCR)	Vicki Simons	Yes
Director, Office of Human Resources (OHR)	Mara Kamen	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective

Target Date	Planned Activities	Modified Date	Completion Date
09/20/20	Conduct internal employee focus groups with Hispanic/Latino employees at EPA to solicit input on their experiences with hiring and career development opportunities.		
09/20/20	Elevate the discussion of upward mobility for Hispanics/Latinos to the Agency's Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Committee.		
09/20/20	Identify an Executive Champion who will participate in an intra-agency committee focusing on the issue of Hispanic/Latino upward mobility.		

Report of Accomplishments

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
FY20	

## Part J – Special Program Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To capture agencies’ affirmative action plans for persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD), EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(e)) and MD-715 require agencies to describe how their plan will improve the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of applicants and employees with disabilities. All agencies, regardless of size, must complete this Part of the MD-715 report.

### Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with reportable and targeted disabilities in the federal government.

Using the goal of 12% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- |                                |       |      |
|--------------------------------|-------|------|
| a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD) | Yes 0 | No X |
| b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD)  | Yes X | No 0 |

PWD in the GS-11 to SES cluster of the permanent workforce participate at 7.45%. This rate is lower than the expected 12% benchmark. This indicates a trigger.

Using the goal of 2% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- |                                 |       |      |
|---------------------------------|-------|------|
| a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD) | Yes 0 | No X |
| b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)  | Yes X | No 0 |

PWTD in the GS-11 to SES cluster of the permanent workforce participate at 1.55%. This rate is lower than the expected 2% benchmark. This indicates a trigger.

2. Describe how the agency has communicated the numerical goals to the hiring managers and/or recruiters.

EPA utilizes EEOC’s 12% and 2% benchmarks for PWD and PTWD, respectively, as goals. The goals were communicated to management, along with additional information on PWD/PWTD, as part of the strategy to increase the use of Schedule A hiring authority in their program level MD-715 planned activities.

In addition, EPA conducts ongoing briefings/trainings of federal agency disability hiring tools for managers and supervisors and Equal Employment Opportunity Officers/Recruiters.

## Section II: Model Disability Program

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1), agencies must ensure sufficient staff, training and resources to recruit and hire persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities, administer the reasonable accommodation program and special emphasis program, and oversee any other disability hiring and advancement program the agency has in place.

### **A. PLAN TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT & COMPETENT STAFFING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM**

Has the agency designated sufficient qualified personnel to implement its disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to improve the staffing for the upcoming year.

Yes X      No 0

--

Identify all staff responsible for implementing the agency’s disability employment program by the office, staff employment status, and responsible official.

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff by Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office, Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	36	0	0	Kristen Arel, Grants Management Specialist, Diversity, Recruitment and Employee Services Division (DRES), Office of Human Resources (OHR) <a href="mailto:arel.kristen@epa.gov">arel.kristen@epa.gov</a>  Anthony Napoli, Diversity and Inclusion Manager, DRES, OHR <a href="mailto:napoli.anthony@epa.gov">napoli.anthony@epa.gov</a>  Sharon Hilliard, HR Specialist, DRES, OHR <a href="mailto:hilliard.sharon@epa.gov">hilliard.sharon@epa.gov</a>  Tania Allen, Chief, Diversity and Recruitment Branch, OHR <a href="mailto:allen.tania@epa.gov">allen.tania@epa.gov</a>  Jerome Bonner, Director, Cincinnati Shared Service Center, Office of

				<p>Mission Support (OMS)  <a href="mailto:bonner.jerome@epa.gov">bonner.jerome@epa.gov</a></p> <p>Jeremy Taylor, Director,  Research Triangle Park Shared  Service Center, OMS  <a href="mailto:taylor.jeremy@epa.gov">taylor.jeremy@epa.gov</a></p>
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	36	0	0	<p>Christopher Emanuel, Disability Program Manager, OCR  <a href="mailto:emanuel.christopher@epa.gov">emanuel.christopher@epa.gov</a></p> <p>Kristen Arel, Grants Management Specialist, DRESO, OHR  <a href="mailto:arel.kristen@epa.gov">arel.kristen@epa.gov</a></p> <p>Anthony Napoli, Diversity and Inclusion Manager, DRESO, OHR  <a href="mailto:napoli.anthony@epa.gov">napoli.anthony@epa.gov</a></p>
Processing reasonable Accommodation requests from applicants and employees	2	0	2	<p>Amanda Sweda, Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator, OCR  <a href="mailto:sweda.amanda@epa.gov">sweda.amanda@epa.gov</a></p> <p>Kristin Tropp, Assistant Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator, OCR  <a href="mailto:tropp.kristin@epa.gov">tropp.kristin@epa.gov</a></p>
Section 508 Compliance	5	0	0	<p>Solymer Grecco, Section 508 Coordinator, OMS  <a href="mailto:solymer.grecco@epa.gov">solymer.grecco@epa.gov</a></p> <p>Sarah Sorathia, Assistant Section 508 Coordinator, OMS  <a href="mailto:sorathia.sarah@epa.gov">sorathia.sarah@epa.gov</a></p> <p>Giselle Jasmin, Section 508, OMS  <a href="mailto:jasmin.giselle@epa.gov">jasmin.giselle@epa.gov</a></p> <p>Christina Bell  Section 508, OMS  <a href="mailto:bell.christina@epa.gov">bell.christina@epa.gov</a></p> <p>Jessica Neumann, OMS  <a href="mailto:neumann.jessica@epa.gov">neumann.jessica@epa.gov</a></p>



Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	Amanda Sweda, Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator, OCR <a href="mailto:sweda.amanda@epa.gov">sweda.amanda@epa.gov</a>
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	3	0	0	Christopher Emanuel, Disability Program Manager, OCR <a href="mailto:emanuel.christopher@epa.gov">emanuel.christopher@epa.gov</a>  Kristen Arel, Grants Management Specialist, DRESD, OHR <a href="mailto:arel.kristen@epa.gov">arel.kristen@epa.gov</a>  Anthony Napoli, Diversity and Inclusion Manager, DRESD, OHR <a href="mailto:napoli.anthony@epa.gov">napoli.anthony@epa.gov</a>

Has the agency provided disability program staff with sufficient training to carry out their responsibilities during the reporting period? If “yes”, describe the training that disability program staff have received. If “no”, describe the training planned for the upcoming year.

Yes X      No 0

In FY18, EPA provided ongoing disability training to its disability program staff using various educational methods. These methods included coaching/mentoring, small group discussions, instructional on-the-job and online training, conferences and Office of Personnel (OPM) training. (e.g., Skillport "Accessibility and Section 508 Awareness," "Reasonable Accommodation for the Federal Workplace," and "EEO and Preventing Discrimination in the Workplace"). Facilitated trainings captured the basic principles of disability awareness, laws and regulations, Schedule A, resources for job applicants, Computer/Electronic Accommodation Program (CAP), Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP), internal reasonable Accommodation program and procedures, and sensitivity/cultural awareness (i.e., Disability Etiquette).

**B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM**

Has the agency provided sufficient funding and other resources to successfully implement the disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to ensure all aspects of the disability program have sufficient funding and other resources.

Yes X      No 0

**Section III: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities**

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(1)(i) and (ii), agencies must establish a plan to increase the recruitment and hiring of individuals with disabilities. The questions below

are designed to identify outcomes of the agency's recruitment program plan for PWD and PWTD.

## **A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICANTS WITH DISABILITIES**

Describe the programs and resources the agency uses to identify job applicants with disabilities, including individuals with targeted disabilities.

In FY18, the EPA utilized a variety of programs and resources to identify qualified job applicants with disabilities, including those with targeted disabilities. These included, but were not limited to:

- An inbox was created for collecting Resumes and other documents for those applying for consideration under Schedule A
- OPM has a Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) with Bender Consulting firm, which maintains a list of Schedule A applicants
- Veteran Employment Programs (e.g., Operations War Fighter, Wounded Warrior, Safe Harbor)
- Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) for College Students with Disabilities
- Special Emphasis Program Managers and Advisory Councils
- Volunteer Student Programs
- Selective Placement Program Coordinators (SPPC)/Disability Recruitment and Program Managers
- Careers and Disability Job Expositions
- Pathways - Presidential Management Fellows (PMF) Program
- Pathways - Interns/Recent Graduates

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(a)(3), describe the agency's use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A) to recruit PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce.

EPA uses all available and appropriate hiring authorities to recruit and hire. Examples of authorities where PWD and PWTD are considered:

- Excepted Service, Schedule A: 5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)
- Disabled Veterans Affirmative Action Program (DVAAP)
- Veterans Recruitment Appointments (VRA)

When individuals apply for a position under a hiring authority that takes disability into account (e.g., Schedule A), explain how the agency (1) determines if the individual is eligible for appointment under such authority and (2) forwards the individual's application to the relevant hiring officials with an explanation of how and when the individual may be appointed.

EPA determines eligibility for individuals who apply using special hiring authorities, such as Schedule A, using the following process:

- Shared Service Centers (SSCs) review all incoming applicants who submit documentation designating their disability status pursuant to special hiring authority Schedule A (5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)).
- SSCs screen all applicants for minimum qualifications/selective factors to determine eligibility for noncompetitive, Schedule A appointments. A qualified person must have an intellectual disability, a severe physical disability, or a psychiatric disability. The Agency accepts, as proof of disability, appropriate documentation (e.g., records, statements, or other appropriate information) issued by a licensed medical professional (e.g., a physician or other medical professional duly certified by a state, the District of Columbia, or a U.S. territory, to practice medicine); a licensed vocational rehabilitation specialist (state or private); or any federal agency, state agency, or an agency of the District of Columbia or a U.S. territory that issues or provides disability benefits. For permanent or time-limited appointments, EPA also determines whether the individual is likely to succeed in the performance of the duties of the position for which he or she is applying.
- Disabled veterans with disability ratings of 30% or more may be considered under multiple special hiring programs.
- Once eligibility is determined, the HR specialist notifies the hiring manager in accordance with applicable regulations for further consideration. SSC and HR specialists, along with SPPC, work closely with each hiring official using various communication methods to ensure that all pre- and post-appointment procedures are carried out and that applicants meet all legal and regulatory requirements for EPA position(s).
- Candidates may be selected and appointed with or without the typical formal interview process.
- A hiring manager may fill the position based on the applicant's ability to perform the duties of the position as described in the position description. Applicants can be hired on 1) a temporary position with a Not to Exceed (NTE) date; 2) a non-temporary position with an NTE date; or 3) a non-temporary excepted service position. After two years of successful performance on the job, they may be non-competitively converted to a permanent appointment.
- The hiring manager notifies SSC of their selection. SSC extends an official offer based on the vacancy's selection factors and determines a start date based on dialogue with the manager and selectee. Prior to the entry-on-duty, a manager discusses and verifies the need for any accommodation with the selected individual.

Has the agency provided training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A)? If "yes", describe the type(s) of training and frequency. If "no", describe the agency's plan to provide this training.

Yes X                      No 0                      N/A 0

In FY18, EPA used various educational methods to provide ongoing training on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account. These methods included small group discussions, instructional on-the-job and online training (e.g., Skillport "Accessibility and Section 508 Awareness," "Reasonable Accommodation for the Federal Workplace," and "EEO and Preventing Discrimination in the Workplace"). Facilitated training captured the basic principles of disability awareness, laws and regulations, special hiring authorities (Schedule A), resources for job applicants, WRP, CAP, internal reasonable Accommodation program and procedures, and sensitivity/cultural awareness (i.e., Disability Etiquette).

**B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT**

**ORGANIZATIONS**

Describe the agency’s efforts to establish and maintain contacts with organizations that assist PWD, including PWTD, in securing and maintaining employment.

In FY18, EPA and the Rochester Institute of Technology/National Technical Institute for the Deaf (RIT/NTID) operated a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) established in FY17. Through this MOU, EPA and RIT/NTID collaborated on the advancement of environmental education and the awareness of employment and other opportunities for individuals with disabilities. Additionally, in FY18, EPA’s Office of Environmental Information (OEI) established an EPA-wide MOU with Gallaudet University. This MOU will increase cooperation between Gallaudet and EPA in areas of mutual interest, such as promoting equal opportunity in higher education, contributing to the university’s capacity to provide high-quality education, and encouraging university participation in EPA programs. Gallaudet students will also be given notice of publicly available career opportunities at EPA, through paid and unpaid internships. EPA maintains the use of other programs, such as WRP (sponsored by Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of Labor (DOL)). EPA works collaboratively with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the Virginia Department of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Federal Exchange on Employment & Disability (FEED). FEED is an interagency group managed through the DOL’s Office of Disability Employment Policy (ODEP), as well as its contactor, the Employer Assistance and Resource Network on Disability Inclusion (EARN).

**C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)**

1. Using the goals of 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD as the benchmarks, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.

a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD)	Yes 0	No X
b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD)	Yes X	No 0

EPA utilized Table B8: New Hires by Type of Appointment – Distribution by Disability.

- There were 3 PWTD new hires out of 200 new permanent hires for a rate of 1.5%. This rate is lower than the expected 2% benchmark. This indicates a trigger.

2. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.

a. New Hires for MCO (PWD)	Yes X	No 0
b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD)	Yes X	No 0

For FY18, EPA utilized Table B7: Application and Hires for Major Occupations by Disability. In FY19, EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect data on the Agency’s Mission Critical Occupations.

For PWD, triggers were identified in the following Major Occupation series:

- **Environmental Protection Specialist (0028)**: Selection at 2.17% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 5.49%.
- **Misc. Administration and Program Specialist (0301)**: Selection at 8.00% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 8.25%.
- **Management/Program Analyst (0343)**: Selection at 2.04% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 6.97%.
- **General Biological Science (0401)**: Selection at 3.90% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 4.67%.
- **Environmental Engineer (0819)**: Selection at 2.33% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 3.03%.
- **Physical/Environmental Scientist (1301)**: Selection at 3.70% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 4.34%.

For PWTD, triggers were identified in the following Major Occupation series:

- **Environmental Protection Specialist (0028)**: Selection at 2.17% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 2.71%.
- **Misc. Administration and Program Specialist (0301)**: Selection at 4.00% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 4.37%.
- **Management/Program Analyst (0343)**: Selection at 0.00% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 2.81%.
- **General Biological Science (0401)**: Selection at 1.30% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 2.27%.

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified *internal* applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.

- |  |       |      |
|--|-------|------|
| a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD)  | Yes X | No 0 |
| b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) | Yes X | No 0 |

For FY18, EPA utilized Table B9: Selection for Internal Complete Promotions for Major Occupations by Disability. In FY19, EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect data on the Agency's Mission Critical Occupations.

- **Environmental Protection Specialist (0028):** PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 2.30% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 4.48%. This indicates a trigger.  
PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 0.66% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applications Received at 2.01%. This indicates a trigger.
- **Misc. Administration and Program Specialist (0301):** PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 4.35% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 12.84%. This indicates a trigger.  
PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 2.61% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applications Received at 8.49%. This indicates a trigger.
- **Management/Program Analyst (0343):** PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 3.56% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 8.17%. This indicates a trigger.  
PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 1.78% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applications Received at 4.15%. This indicates a trigger.
- **General Biological Science (0401):** PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 3.07% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 5.12%. This indicates a trigger.  
PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 1.44% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 2.61%. This indicates a trigger.
- **Environmental Engineer (0819):** PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 0.97% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 1.21%. This indicates a trigger.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among employees promoted to any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If "yes", please describe the triggers below.

- |                              |       |      |
|------------------------------|-------|------|
| a. Promotions for MCO (PWD)  | Yes X | No 0 |
| b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) | Yes X | No 0 |

For FY18, EPA utilized Table B9: Selection for Internal Complete Promotions for Major Occupations by Disability. In FY19, EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect data on the Agency's Mission Critical Occupations.

- **Management/Program Analyst (0343):** PWD promoted at 1.98% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool of 3.56%. This indicates a trigger.  
PWTD promoted at 0.00% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool of 1.78%. This indicates a trigger.
- **Environmental Protection Specialist (0028):** PWD promoted at 2.13% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool of 2.30%. This indicates a trigger.
- **General Biological Science (0401):** PWD promoted at 3.03% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool of 3.07%. This indicates a trigger.
- **Environmental Engineer (0819):** PWD promoted at 0.00% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool of 0.97%. This indicates a trigger.  
PWTD promoted at 0.00% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool of 0.97%. This indicates a trigger.

## Section IV: Plan to Ensure Advancement Opportunities for Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R §1614.203(d)(1)(iii), agencies are required to provide sufficient advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities. Such activities might include specialized training and mentoring programs, career development opportunities, awards programs, promotions, and similar programs that address advancement. In this section, agencies should identify, and provide data on programs designed to ensure advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities.

### **A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN**

1. Describe the agency's plan to ensure PWD, including PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

EPA informs all employees of advancement opportunities through 1) the Talent Hub website (a centralized experiential learning resource that promotes a range of career development opportunities available across the Agency); 2) job sharing; and 3) fee/non-fee based in-person/online training. Opportunities are marketed through email to all users, office announcements, intranet postings, and newsletters. Additional opportunities may include fee/non-fee based in-person/online training. Employees are encouraged to participate in skill-building trainings and courses related to federal employment such as, how to search through USAJOBS, resume writing, and improving interviewing skills are available.

**Technical Assistance Visits:** OCR plans to schedule visits in FY19. These visits will serve to educate managers on how they may support opportunities for advancement and retain employees with disabilities, provide information on the Schedule A hiring authority, and stress the importance of timely conversion for those participating in the program.

**Opportunities to Implement Strategies to Mitigate Unconscious Bias:** In FY18, EPA finalized its *2018-2022 Strategy for Mitigating Unconscious Bias* (MUB) in the human resources selection process. MUB includes any human resources process or decision made regarding recruitment, hiring, promotion, awards, development, advancement, and retention, including PWD and PWTD. The MUB Strategy aligns with EPA's *2017-2021 Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan*; Executive Order 13583 – *Establishing a Coordinated Government-wide Initiative to Promote Diversity and Inclusion in the Federal Workforce*, and the *2016 Report on Reducing the Impact of Bias in the STEM Workforces* (released jointly by the OPM and the White House Office of Science & Technology Policy).

The MUB Strategy will help EPA employees: 1) recognize and mitigate potential unconscious bias that may exist in the workplace; 2) raise awareness among EPA leaders, managers, supervisors, and EPA personnel about the presence and impact of unconscious bias; and 3) offer a toolkit of proven strategies to mitigate unconscious bias.

The-overarching goals of the EPA's MUB include: 1) reducing unconscious bias in the HR selections process; 2) building unconscious bias awareness and mitigation skills among employees; 3) identifying and measuring the effectiveness of strategies to mitigate unconscious bias to determine the success of the strategy. The scope of this strategy is specifically focused on HR selections. As part of this strategy in FY19, the development and implementation of a pilot will ensure transparency in existing processes regarding career advancement and development.

Further, EPA created a Blanket Purchase Agreement for diversity and inclusion activities associated with training, data analytics, and consultative services that support Agency offices and regions.

**Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan:** EPA's *2017-2021 Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan* (DISP) guides the Agency's efforts in sustaining EPA as a leader in creating and maintaining a high-performing workforce that embraces diversity and inclusion and empowers all employees to achieve their full potential. The multi-year plan outlines goals, priorities, specific action items and measures that were developed by senior leadership and the EPA Human Resources community. The DISP received concurrence from EPA's Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Committee (DIAC), a subcommittee of the Human Resources Council. DISP goals are outlined below.

**Goal 1:** Diversify the federal workforce through active engagement of leadership: a) senior leaders will conduct regular informational sessions open to all employees to share information on training and career development opportunities and resources; b) OARM will ensure that all hiring managers receive training on the use of appropriate hiring authorities and flexibilities; c) review of participation in leadership development programs and develop strategies to eliminate any barriers to participation will be conducted.

**Goal 2:** Include and engage everyone in the workplace: senior leadership and managers will use Talent Hub to promote and encourage all employees to apply for temporary, full-time detail assignments, part-time projects/special assignments, temporary promotions, SES rotations, and other developmental assignments.

**Goal 3:** Optimize inclusive diversity efforts using data-driven approaches: a) utilize the MD-715 reports, applicant flow data, and focus groups to identify actions that can be taken to address any potential barriers to career development and advancement identified by the Agency; b) senior leaders will use the results of the annual Employee Viewpoint Surveys and other workforce feedback to be responsive to employees' concerns regarding opportunities for employee training, development and advancement.

**Stepping Up to Supervision:** Continue to offer this training to all employees interested in learning about the roles and responsibilities of formal leadership. Each participant receives formal feedback through a multi-rater 360 assessment and is encouraged to build a development plan to help map their learning plans towards their career goals and objectives.

**EPA's Successful Leader's Program:** Mandatory program for newly-promoted or hired supervisors and managers. The program contains information regarding the various hiring authorities (such as Schedule A) to reach a wide range of candidates training on the Disability Hiring Tool such as the WRP, CAP, as well as training on what the Reasonable Accommodation means to supervisors and manager.

**Miscellaneous:** In October 2018, Fed Talent, was launched. Fed Talent is a new learning management system that interfaces with the Agency's HR system of record (FPPS). The interface allows EPA to track selectees in its training and coaching programs and allow offices to report the type of employee learning opportunities afforded to staff career development.



## B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Please describe the career development opportunities that the agency provides to its employees.

Employee career development is available through a variety of programs. Training is designed to promote professional and personal development. EPA provides the following programs and resources designated for career development:

- Fellowship Programs
- Mentoring Programs
- Coaching Programs
- Training Programs
- Detail Program

In the table below, please provide the data for career development opportunities that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/approval to participate. [Collection begins with the FY 2018 MD-715 report, due on May 31, 2019.]

EPA has made the capture of applicant flow data for career development opportunities a priority for FY 2019.

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Fellowship Programs						
Mentoring Programs						
Coaching Programs						
Training Programs						
Detail Programs						
Other Career Development Programs						

Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- a. Applicants (PWD)                      Yes 0              No X  
 b. Selections (PWD)                      Yes 0              No X

Data is not available for FY18. EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect this data in FY19.

Do triggers exist for PWTD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs identified? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWTD)	Yes 0	No X
b. Selections (PWTD)	Yes 0	No X

Data is not available for FY18. EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect this data in FY19.
--

**1. AWARDS**

1. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for any level of the time-off awards, bonuses, or other incentives? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD)	Yes X	No 0
b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD)	Yes X	No 0

<p>Comparing Employee Recognition and Awards for PWD/PWTD (Table B13) to Total Workforce for PWD/PWTD (Table B1), there are triggers in the following Awards, Bonuses and Incentives category.</p> <p><b>FY 18 Cash Awards \$500+:</b> PWD received awards at 84.62% compared to people without disabilities at 93.07%. This indicates a trigger.  PWTD received awards at 86.81% compared to people without a targeted disability at 92.49%. This indicates a trigger.</p>
---

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for quality step increases or performance-based pay increases? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Pay Increases (PWD)	Yes X	No 0
b. Pay Increases (PWTD)	Yes X	No 0

<p>Comparing Employee Recognition and Awards for PWD/PWTD (Table B13) to Total Workforce for PWD/PWTD (Table B1), there is a trigger in one Awards, Bonuses and Incentives category.</p> <p><b>QSI:</b> PWD received awards at 2.08% compared to people without disabilities at 2.81%. This indicates a trigger.  PWTD received awards at 1.28% compared to people without a targeted disability at 2.77%. This indicates a trigger.</p>
--

3. If the agency has other types of employee recognition programs, are PWD and/or PWTD recognized disproportionately less than employees without disabilities? (The appropriate benchmark is the inclusion rate.) If “yes”, describe the employee recognition program and relevant data in the text box.

a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0	N/A X
-------------------------------------	-------	------	-------

--

## C. PROMOTIONS

Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified *internal* applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

### a. SES

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes	0	No	0	N/A	X
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Yes	0	No	0	N/A	X

### b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes	X	No	0		
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Yes	0	No	X		

### c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes	X	No	0		
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Yes	X	No	0		

### d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes	X	No	0		
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Yes	X	No	0		

For FY18, EPA utilized Table B11: Internal Selections for Senior Level (GS-13, 14, 15) Positions by Disability. In FY19, EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect data on the Agency's Mission Critical Occupations.

Using PWD Applications Received when analyzing the applicant flow of internal applicants and/or selections for promotions by grade (Table B11), the following triggers are identified for GS-13 thru GS-15:

- **GS-13:** PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 4.04% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 9.28%. This indicates a trigger.

PWD Selected Internal Applicants at 1.91% is less than expected compared to the Qualified Applicants at 4.04%. This indicates a trigger.

- **GS-14:** PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 1.69% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 4.19%. This indicates a trigger.

PWD Selected Internal Applicants at 0.00% is less than expected compared to the Qualified Applicants at 1.69%. This indicates a trigger.

- **GS-15:** PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 1.41% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 4.84%. This indicates a trigger.

2. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified *internal* applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. SES

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes	0	No	0	N/A	X
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Yes	0	No	0	N/A	X

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes	X	No	0		
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Yes	0	No	X		

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes	X	No	0		
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Yes	X	No	0		

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes	X	No	0		
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Yes	X	No	0		

EPA used Table B11: Internal Selections for Senior Level Positions, to analyze the applicant flow of internal applicants and/or selections for promotions by grade for PWTD. The senior level analysis includes grades 13-15. The SES is excluded from this analysis because relevant data was not collected for this series in FY18. EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect this data in FY19.

- **GS-13:** PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 2.57% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applications Received at 4.76%. This indicates a trigger.

PWTD Selected Internal Applicants at 1.91% is less than expected compared to the Qualified Applicants at 2.57%. This indicates a trigger.

- **GS-14:** PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 1.22% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applications Received at 2.05%. This indicates a trigger.

PWTD Selected Internal Applicants at 0.00% is less than expected compared to the Qualified Applicants at 1.22%. This indicates a trigger.

- **GS-15:** PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 0.80% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applications Received at 3.10%. This indicates a trigger.

Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. New Hires to SES	(PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
b. New Hires to GS-15	(PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
c. New Hires to GS-14	(PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
d. New Hires to GS-13	(PWD)	Yes 0	No 0

EPA's official EEO FY18 workforce data tables do not provide information on New Hires of PWD in the senior grades. Thus, analysis for FY18 could not be conducted. EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect this data in FY19.

5. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. New Hires to SES (PWTD)		Yes 0	No 0
b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD)		Yes 0	No 0
c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD)		Yes 0	No 0
d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD)		Yes 0	No 0

EPA's official EEO FY18 workforce data tables do not provide information on New Hires of PWTD in the senior grades. Thus, analysis for FY18 could not be conducted. EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect this data in FY19.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified *internal* applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Executives		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
b. Managers		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
c. Supervisors		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0

EPA's official EEO FY18 workforce data tables do not provide information on PWD internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions. EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect this data in FY19.
--

Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified *internal* applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Executives		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0
b. Managers		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0
c. Supervisors		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0

EPA's official EEO FY18 workforce data tables do not provide information on PWTB internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions. EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect this data in FY19.

Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- |                                    |       |      |
|------------------------------------|-------|------|
| a. New Hires for Executives (PWD)  | Yes 0 | No 0 |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWD)    | Yes 0 | No 0 |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) | Yes 0 | No 0 |

EPA's official EEO FY18 workforce data tables do not provide information on PWD selections of new hires to supervisory positions. EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect this data in FY19.

Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- |                                     |       |      |
|-------------------------------------|-------|------|
| a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD)  | Yes 0 | No 0 |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD)    | Yes 0 | No 0 |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) | Yes 0 | No 0 |

EPA's official EEO FY18 workforce data tables do not provide information on PWTD selections to supervisory positions. EPA will make reasonable efforts to collect this data in FY19.

## Section V: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To be a model employer for persons with disabilities, agencies must have policies and programs in place to retain employees with disabilities. In this section, agencies should: (1) analyze workforce separation data to identify barriers retaining employees with disabilities; (2) describe efforts to ensure accessibility of technology and facilities; and (3) provide information on the reasonable Accommodation program and workplace personal assistance services.

### **A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS**

1. In this reporting period, did the agency convert all eligible Schedule A employees with a disability into the competitive service after two years of satisfactory service (5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)(6)(i))? If "no", please explain why the agency did not convert all eligible Schedule A employees.

Yes X      No 0      N/A 0

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

d. Voluntary Separations (PWD)	Yes X	No 0
e. Involuntary Separations (PWD)	Yes X	No 0

PWD Voluntary Separations (Tables B1 and B14): The PWD inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations is 8.24%. The People Without Disabilities inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations is 5.53%. The PWD inclusion rate is greater than the People Without Disability inclusion rate. This indicates a trigger.

PWD Involuntary Separations (Tables B1 and B14): The PWD inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations is 0.72%. The People Without Disabilities inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations is 0.12%. The PWD inclusion rate is greater than the People Without Disability inclusion rate. This indicates a trigger.

3. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWTD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without targeted disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

Voluntary Separations (PWTD)	Yes X	No 0
Involuntary Separations (PWTD)	Yes X	No 0

PWTD Voluntary Separations (Tables B1 and B14): The PWTD inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations is 11.06%. The People Without Targeted Disabilities inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations is 5.66%. The PWTD inclusion rate is greater than the People Without Targeted Disabilities inclusion rate. This indicates a trigger.

PWTD Involuntary Separations (Tables B1 and B14): The PWTD inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations is 0.85%. The People Without Targeted Disabilities inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations is 0.16%. The PWTD inclusion rate is greater than the People Without Targeted Disabilities inclusion rate. This indicates a trigger.

4. If a trigger exists involving the separation rate of PWD and/or PWTD, please explain why they left the agency using exit interview results and other data sources.

At the end of FY 2018, EPA updated its exit survey to include questions related to disability to better identify possible reasons why PWD/PWTD left the Agency. The revised (voluntary) exit survey is now available to departing employees. Data from the surveys will be analyzed as departures occur.

**B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES**

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(4), federal agencies are required to inform applicants and employees of their rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794(b), concerning the accessibility of agency technology, and the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 4151-4157), concerning the accessibility



of agency facilities. In addition, agencies are required to inform individuals where to file complaints if other agencies are responsible for a violation.

1. Please provide the internet address on the agency's public website for its notice explaining employees' and applicants' rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

The Accessibility Statement explains employees' and applicants' rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. <https://www.epa.gov/accessibility/epa-accessibility-statement>

EPA follows the same process for Section 508 complaints as for other employment discrimination complaints. <https://www.epa.gov/ocr/employment-complaint-resolutions>

2. Please provide the internet address on the agency's public website for its notice explaining employees' and applicants' rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

EPA currently does not have such a notice available on its public website. In FY19, EPA will web-post information on the Architectural Barriers Act that will include a copy of the Act and provide detailed information on employees' and applicants' rights, including information on how to file a complaint.

3. Describe any programs, policies, or practices that the agency has undertaken, or plans on undertaking over the next fiscal year, designed to improve accessibility of agency facilities and/or technology.

EPA is revising its Section 508 Policy and Section 508 Procedures for Compliance to address the Section 508 Refresh. The revised procedures will focus on the acquisitions, testing and exceptions processes. EPA anticipates submitting all for Agency-wide review within FY2019.

EPA Compliance Assessment and Remediation Plan (CARP):

CARP aims to help EPA assess and enhance the accessibility of its existing Information and Communication Technology (ICT), develop a baseline from which to measure improvements, and report bi-annually to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). CARP takes a phased approach with each phase focusing on certain types of ICT. Activities include:

1. Conduct an inventory of EPA's ICT and prioritize ICT for assessments.
2. Assess the inventoried ICTs' compliance.
3. Develop and implement remediation plans to address concerns identified during the assessments.
4. Report compliance within EPA and to OMB.

In FY19, EPA will assess internal ICT used by every employee within EPA. The inventory of all internal ICT used by specific EPA offices and groups of employees, intranet sites used by all employees, internal communication products and any other ICT essential to performing job duties will be assessed.

EPA Accessibility Forum:

In late FY18, EPA expanded the Section 508 Community Forum to include all accessibility-related issues. Now known as the Accessibility Forum, this is a voluntary forum for employees to provide input, feedback and recommendations to EPA's Section 508 Program, the Office of Mission Support/Administration and Resources Management, and the National Reasonable Accommodation Coordinators on how EPA can better identify, address and prevent

accessibility issues related to EPA resources. Meeting quarterly, participation is open to all employees who are interested in generally improving accessibility at EPA, eliminating barriers for persons with disabilities, Section 508, assistive technology (AT) tools or the accessibility of ICT.

### **C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM**

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(3), agencies must adopt, post on their public website, and make available to all job applicants and employees, reasonable accommodation procedures.

1. Please provide the average time frame for processing initial requests for reasonable Accommodation during the reporting period. (Please do not include previously approved requests with repetitive Accommodation, such as interpreting services.)

For the 459 reasonable Accommodation (RA) requests made in FY18, the average processing time (i.e., the time a request is made to the time a decision is made) was 35 days. The average included requests that required medical documentation, which can add an additional 60 days to the RA process.

2. Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the agency's reasonable Accommodation program. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests, timely providing approved Accommodation, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring Accommodation requests for trends.

In FY18, EPA demonstrated efficiency within its reasonable Accommodation program by processing 445 of the 459 requests (or 96.9%) within the time-frames identified in both AFG's National Reasonable Accommodation Procedures (NRAP) and EPA's Reasonable Accommodation Procedures. EPA has attained 90% or greater processing rate for the eighth consecutive year in compliance with the MD-715 requirements.

The RA Program delivered training to 298 participants, including managers / supervisors and employees across the Agency.

### **D. PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES ALLOWING EMPLOYEES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKPLACE**

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide personal assistance services (PAS) to employees who need them because of a targeted disability, unless doing so would impose an undue hardship on the agency.

Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the PAS requirement. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing

requests for PAS, timely providing approved services, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring PAS requests for trends.

In FY18, EPA posted addendums to the reasonable Accommodation procedures to explain how to request PAS. Additionally, all RA trainings for both managers and employees were updated to include information on PAS. At the time of this reporting, there is not enough data to identify trends. More information on PAS is expected to be available for FY19 reporting.

## Section VI: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

### **A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT**

During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging harassment, as compared to the government-wide average?

Yes 0      No X      N/A 0

During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging harassment based on disability status result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Yes 0      No X      N/A 0

If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

### **B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION**

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging failure to provide a reasonable Accommodation, as compared to the government-wide average?

Yes X      No 0      N/A 0

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging failure to provide reasonable Accommodation result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Yes 0      No X      N/A 0

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable Accommodation during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

## Section VII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

Element D of MD-715 requires agencies to conduct a barrier analysis when a trigger suggests that a policy, procedure, or practice may be impeding the employment opportunities of a protected EEO group.

1. Has the agency identified any barriers (policies, procedures, and/or practices) that affect employment opportunities for PWD and/or PWTD?

Yes 0 No X

2. Has the agency established a plan to correct the barrier(s) involving PWD and/or PWTD?

Yes 0 No 0 N/A X

3. Identify each trigger and plan to remove the barrier(s), including the identified barrier(s), objective(s), responsible official(s), planned activities, and, where applicable, accomplishments.

<b>Trigger 1</b>	Several triggers related to MCOs for PWD/PWTD have been identified in FY18 data (see Section III, C; Section IV, B and C; Section V, A). Further analysis is being done on these triggers to narrow the focus of the barrier analysis efforts. This is a priority for FY19.	
<b>Barrier(s)</b>	Barrier analysis to be conducted and completed in FY19.	
<b>Objective(s)</b>	To be determined after further analysis of triggers.	
<b>Responsible Official(s)</b>		
Vicki Simons, Director, OCR		
<b>Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)</b>		YES
<b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)</b>		NO
<b>Barrier(s) Identified? (Yes or No)</b>		NO
<b>Sources of Data</b>	<b>Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)</b>	<b>Identify Information Collected</b>
Workforce Data Tables	YES	EPA's existing EEO workforce tables were reviewed resulting in the identification of triggers that require further analysis.
Complaint Data (Trends)	NO	
Grievance Data (Trends)	NO	
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)	NO	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)	NO	
Exit Interview Data	NO	

Focus Groups	NO			
Interviews	NO			
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)	NO			
Other (Please Describe)	NO			
Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
<b>Fiscal Year</b>		Yes		
09/30/2019	Barrier Analysis			

4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities.

EPA will make reasonable efforts to complete the Planned Activities in FY19.

5. For the planned activities that were completed, please describe the actual impact of those activities toward eliminating the barrier(s).

N/A for FY18.

6. If the planned activities did not correct the trigger(s) and/or barrier(s), please describe how the agency intends to improve the plan for the next fiscal year.

N/A for FY18.

## Appendix A – FY2018 Workforce Data Tables

EPA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Pay Period from 201721 to 201821																		
Table A1: TOTAL WORKFORCE - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex																		
Table A1 Total Workforce 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018	RACE/ETHNICITY																	
	TOTAL WORKFORCE			Hispanic or Latino		Non- Hispanic or Latino		Black or African American		Asian		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific		American Indian Alaska Native		Two or more races		
						White	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	
All	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female
<b>TOTAL WORKFOCE - Permanent and Temporary</b>																		
Prior FY 17	#	15179	7442	7737	477	574	5583	4619	743	1835	531	556	9	9	70	82	24	51
	%	100%	49.03%	50.97%	3.14	3.78	36.78	30.43	4.89	12.09	3.5	3.66	0.06	0.06	0.46	0.54	0.16	0.34
Current FY 18	#	14567	7120	7447	470	553	5322	4434	712	1772	507	540	8	8	68	79	29	55
	%	100%	48.88%	51.12%	3.23	3.8	36.53	30.44	4.89	12.16	3.48	3.71	0.05	0.05	0.47	0.54	0.2	0.38
CLF 2010	%	100%	51.84%	48.16%	5.17%	4.79%	38.33%	34.03%	5.49%	6.53%	1.97%	1.93%	0.07%	0.07%	0.55%	0.53%	0.26%	0.28%
Org CLF	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Alternate Benchmark	%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference	#	-612	-322	-290	-7	-21	-261	-185	-31	-63	-24	-16	-1	-1	-2	-3	5	4
Ratio Change	%	0.00%	-0.15%	0.15%	0.08%	0.01%	-0.25%	0.01%	-0.01%	0.08%	-0.02%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	0.04%	0.04%
Net Change	%	-4.03%	-4.33%	-3.75%	-1.47%	-3.66%	-4.67%	-4.01%	-4.17%	-3.43%	-4.52%	-2.88%	-11.11%	-11.11%	-2.86%	-3.66%	20.83%	7.84%
<b>PERMANENT WORKFORCE</b>																		
Prior FY	#	14333	6896	7437	463	563	5124	4378	721	1817	486	529	8	9	67	82	23	50
	%	100%	48.11%	51.89%	3.23%	3.93%	35.75%	30.54%	5.03%	12.68%	3.39%	3.69%	0.06%	0.06%	0.47%	0.57%	0.16%	0.35%
Current FY	#	13753	6580	7173	458	546	4855	4210	693	1758	471	516	7	8	67	77	27	54
	%	100%	47.84%	52.16%	3.33%	3.97%	35.30%	30.61%	5.04%	12.78%	3.42%	3.75%	0.05%	0.06%	0.49%	0.56%	0.20%	0.39%
Difference	#	-580	-316	-264	-5	-17	-269	-168	-28	-59	-15	-13	-1	-1	0	-5	4	4
Ratio Change	%	0%	-0.27%	0.27%	0.10%	0.04%	-0.45%	0.07%	0.01%	0.11%	0.03%	0.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	-0.01%	0.04%	0.04%
Net Change	%	-4.05%	-4.58%	-3.55%	-1.08%	-3.02%	-5.25%	-3.84%	-3.88%	-3.25%	-3.09%	-2.46%	-12.50%	-11.11%	0.00%	-6.10%	17.39%	8.00%
<b>TEMPORARY WORKFORCE</b>																		
Prior FY	#	846	546	300	14	11	459	241	22	18	45	27	1	0	3	0	1	1
	%	100%	64.54%	35.46%	1.65	1.3	54.26	28.49	2.6	2.13	5.32	3.19	0.12	0	0.35	0	0.12	0.12
Current FY	#	814	540	274	12	7	467	224	19	14	36	24	1	0	1	2	2	1
	%	100%	66.34%	33.66%	1.47	0.86	57.37	27.52	2.33	1.72	4.42	2.95	0.12	0	0.12	0.25	0.25	0.12
Difference	#	-32	-6	-26	-2	-4	8	-17	-3	-4	-9	-3	0	0	-2	2	1	0
Ratio Change	%	0%	1.80%	-1.80%	-0.18%	-0.44%	3.12%	-0.97%	-0.27%	-0.41%	-0.90%	-0.24%	0.00%	0.00%	-0.23%	0.25%	0.13%	0.00%
Net Change	%	-3.78%	-1.10%	-8.67%	-14.29%	-36.36%	1.74%	-7.05%	-13.64%	-22.22%	-20.00%	-11.11%	0.00%	0%	-66.67%	0%	100.00%	0.00%

Source: Datamart

Date: 10/16/2018

**EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Pay Period from 201721 to 201821**

**Table B1 - Total Workforce - Distribution by Disability**

Table B1 Total Workforce 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		Total by Disability Status					Detail for Targeted Disabilities									
		(04,05)		-1	(06-98)	Targeted	(16,19)	(21,23,25)	(28,30,32-38)	(64-69)	(71-79)	-82	-90	-91	-92	
		No	Not	Disability	Disability	Deafness	Blindness	Missing	Partial	Total	Convulsive	Mental	Mental	Distortion		
<b>TOTAL WORKFORCE - Permanent and Temporary</b>																
Prior FY 17	#	15179	13521	477	1181	269	20	29	6	103	6	25	4	74	2	
	%	100%	89.08%	3.14%	7.78%	1.77%	0.13%	0.19%	0.04%	0.68%	0.04%	0.16%	0.03%	0.49%	0.01%	
Current FY 18	#	14567	12942	483	1142	239	21	29	4	82	6	24	4	68	1	
	%	100%	88.84%	3.32%	7.84%	1.64%	0.14%	0.20%	0.03%	0.56%	0.04%	0.16%	0.03%	0.47%	0.01%	
Federal Goal (FY09)	#				12%	2.00%										
Difference	#	-612	-579	6	-39	-30	1	0	-2	-21	0	-1	0	-6	-1	
Ratio Change	%	0.00%	-0.23%	0.17%	0.06%	-0.13%	0.01%	0.01%	-0.01%	-0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	-0.02%	-0.01%	
Net Change	%	-4.03%	-4.28%	1.26%	-3.30%	-11.15%	5.00%	0.00%	-33.33%	-20.39%	0.00%	-4.00%	0.00%	-8.11%	-50.00%	
<b>PERMANENT WORKFORCE</b>																
Prior FY	#	14333	12817	382	1134	263	20	29	6	102	6	23	4	71	2	
	%	100%	89.42%	2.67%	7.91%	1.83%	0.14%	0.20%	0.04%	0.71%	0.04%	0.16%	0.03%	0.50%	0.01%	
Current FY	#	13753	12265	383	1105	235	21	29	4	81	6	22	4	67	1	
	%	100%	89.18%	2.78%	8.03%	1.71%	0.15%	0.21%	0.03%	0.59%	0.04%	0.16%	0.03%	0.49%	0.01%	
Difference	#	-580	-552	1	-29	-28	1	0	-2	-21	0	-1	0	-4	-1	
Ratio Change	%	0.00%	-0.24%	0.12%	0.12%	-0.13%	0.01%	0.01%	-0.01%	-0.12%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	-0.01%	-0.01%	
Net Change	%	-4.05%	-4.31%	0.26%	-2.56%	-10.65%	5.00%	0.00%	-33.33%	-20.59%	0.00%	-4.35%	0.00%	-5.63%	-50.00%	
<b>TEMPORARY WORKFORCE</b>																
Prior FY	#	846	704	95	47	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	
	%	100%	83.22%	11.23%	5.56%	0.71%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.24%	0.00%	0.35%	0.00%	
Current FY	#	814	677	100	37	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	
	%	100%	83.17%	12.29%	4.55%	0.49%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	0.25%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	
Difference	#	-32	-27	5	-10	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2	0	
Ratio Change	%	0.00%	-0.05%	1.06%	-1.01%	-0.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	-0.23%	0.00%	
Net Change	%	-3.78%	-3.84%	5.26%	-21.28%	-33.33%	0%	0%	0%	0.00%	0%	0.00%	0%	-66.67%	0%	
Source: Datamart																
Date: 10/16/2018																

EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Pay Period (September 30, 2018)

Table A2 - Permanent Workforce By Component - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex

Table A2 Permanent Workforce 10/01/17 - 09/30/2018	TOTAL EMPLOYEES		RACE/ETHNICITY															
			Hispanic or Latino				Non- Hispanic or Latino											
							White		Black or African American		Asian		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific		American Indian Alaska Native		Two or more races	
			All	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male
Nat 2010 CLF	%	100%	51.86%	48.14%	5.17%	4.79%	38.33%	34.03%	5.49%	6.53%	1.97%	1.93%	0.07%	0.07%	0.55%	0.53%	0.26%	0.28%
	#	739	367	372	61	73	250	194	22	56	32	43	0	2	2	2	0	2
Region 02 New York, NY (SB)	%	100%	49.66%	50.34%	8.25%	9.88%	33.83%	26.25%	2.98%	7.58%	4.33%	5.82%	0.00%	0.27%	0.27%	0.27%	0.00%	0.27%
	#	515	242	273	13	18	200	220	13	20	14	12	0	0	1	2	1	1
Region 01 Boston, MA (SB)	%	100%	46.99%	53.01%	2.52%	3.50%	38.83%	42.72%	2.52%	3.88%	2.72%	2.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.39%	0.19%	0.19%
	#	739	326	413	18	28	247	285	37	79	22	17	1	0	0	4	1	0
Region 03 Philadelphia, PA (SB)	%	100%	44.11%	55.89%	2.44%	3.79%	33.42%	38.57%	5.01%	10.69%	2.98%	2.30%	0.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.54%	0.14%	0.00%
	#	855	416	439	27	18	280	197	82	207	23	11	0	0	2	2	2	4
Region 04 Atlanta, GA (SB)	%	100%	48.65%	51.35%	3.16%	2.11%	32.75%	23.04%	9.59%	24.21%	2.69%	1.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	0.23%	0.23%	0.47%
	#	977	461	516	26	36	355	289	45	149	31	32	0	0	3	5	1	5
Region 05 Chicago, IL (SB)	%	100%	47.19%	52.81%	2.66%	3.68%	36.34%	29.58%	4.61%	15.25%	3.17%	3.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.31%	0.51%	0.10%	0.51%
	#	684	353	331	57	52	209	136	50	115	30	22	0	0	6	4	1	2
Region 06 Dallas, TX (SB)	%	100%	51.61%	48.39%	8.33%	7.60%	30.56%	19.88%	7.31%	16.81%	4.39%	3.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.88%	0.58%	0.15%	0.29%
	#	455	228	227	12	18	185	161	13	38	11	5	0	0	7	4	0	1
Region 07 Lenexa, KS (SB)	%	100%	50.11%	49.89%	2.64%	3.96%	40.66%	35.38%	2.86%	8.35%	2.42%	1.10%	0.00%	0.00%	1.54%	0.88%	0.00%	0.22%
	#	480	227	253	26	28	173	188	10	18	16	15	1	0	0	2	1	2
Region 08 Denver, CO (SB)	%	100%	47.29%	52.71%	5.42%	5.83%	36.04%	39.17%	2.08%	3.75%	3.33%	3.13%	0.21%	0.00%	0.00%	0.42%	0.21%	0.42%
	#	669	294	375	34	44	204	195	15	40	30	85	2	1	6	8	3	2
Region 09 San Francisco, CA (SB)	%	100%	43.95%	56.05%	5.08%	6.58%	30.49%	29.15%	2.24%	5.98%	4.48%	12.71%	0.30%	0.15%	0.90%	1.20%	0.45%	0.30%
	#	497	219	278	13	17	165	205	10	14	23	31	1	2	5	6	2	3
Region 10 Seattle WA (SB)	%	100%	44.06%	55.94%	2.62%	3.42%	33.20%	41.25%	2.01%	2.82%	4.63%	6.24%	0.20%	0.40%	1.01%	1.21%	0.40%	0.60%
	#	265	130	135	9	7	82	64	30	48	5	15	1	0	2	1	1	0
OFC INSPECTOR GENERAL (SB)	%	100%	49.06%	50.94%	3.40%	2.64%	30.94%	24.15%	11.32%	18.11%	1.89%	5.66%	0.38%	0.00%	0.75%	0.38%	0.38%	0.00%
	#	528	231	297	12	17	178	194	21	59	17	26	0	0	2	0	1	1
OFFICE OF WATER (SB)	%	100%	43.75%	56.25%	2.27%	3.22%	33.71%	36.74%	3.98%	11.17%	3.22%	4.92%	0.00%	0.00%	0.38%	0.00%	0.19%	0.19%
	#	292	131	161	3	9	78	70	28	69	21	9	0	0	0	2	1	2
OFC CHIEF FINCL OFCR (SB)	%	100%	44.86%	55.14%	1.03%	3.08%	26.71%	23.97%	9.59%	23.63%	7.19%	3.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.68%	0.34%	0.68%
	#	1407	758	649	21	21	634	474	34	94	56	46	0	0	12	11	1	3
OFC RESEARCH & DEVELOP (SB)	%	100%	53.87%	46.13%	1.49%	1.49%	45.06%	33.69%	2.42%	6.68%	3.98%	3.27%	0.00%	0.00%	0.85%	0.78%	0.07%	0.21%
	#	67	29	38	4	5	18	17	3	13	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	0
OFC INTERNTL & TRIB AF (SB)	%	100%	43.28%	56.72%	5.97%	7.46%	26.87%	25.37%	4.48%	19.40%	4.48%	4.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.49%	0.00%
	#	220	91	129	2	8	74	81	7	28	8	11	0	0	0	1	0	0
OFC OF GENERAL COUNSEL (SB)	%	100%	41.36%	58.64%	0.91%	3.64%	33.64%	36.82%	3.18%	12.73%	3.64%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%	0.00%	0.00%
	#	469	211	258	10	15	157	161	26	70	13	9	0	0	4	1	1	2
OFC OF LAND & EMER MGMT (SB)	%	100%	44.99%	55.01%	2.13%	3.20%	33.48%	34.33%	5.54%	14.93%	2.77%	1.92%	0.00%	0.00%	0.85%	0.21%	0.21%	0.43%
	#	309	151	158	11	9	103	61	28	74	6	10	1	1	0	1	2	2
OFC OF ENVIRNMTL INFO (SB)	%	100%	48.87%	51.13%	3.56%	2.91%	33.33%	19.74%	9.06%	23.95%	1.94%	3.24%	0.32%	0.32%	0.00%	0.32%	0.65%	0.65%
	#	618	342	276	31	28	273	164	25	58	9	18	0	1	4	1	0	6
OFC ENF & COMPL ASSURAN (SB)	%	100%	55.34%	44.66%	5.02%	4.53%	44.17%	26.54%	4.05%	9.39%	1.46%	2.91%	0.00%	0.16%	0.65%	0.16%	0.00%	0.97%
	#	330	124	206	9	11	78	84	31	96	6	11	0	0	0	3	0	1
OFC OF ADMINISTRATOR (SB)	%	100%	37.58%	62.42%	2.73%	3.33%	23.64%	25.45%	9.39%	29.09%	1.82%	3.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.91%	0.00%	0.30%
	#	959	427	532	23	40	288	286	60	151	48	46	0	0	4	4	4	5
OFFICE OF CS AND PP (SB)	%	100%	44.53%	55.47%	2.40%	4.17%	30.03%	29.82%	6.26%	15.75%	5.01%	4.80%	0.00%	0.00%	0.42%	0.42%	0.42%	0.52%
	#	608	246	362	17	19	145	152	71	169	9	10	0	1	2	6	2	5
OFC ADMIN & RES MGMT (SB)	%	100%	40.46%	59.54%	2.80%	3.13%	23.85%	25.00%	11.68%	27.80%	1.48%	1.64%	0.00%	0.16%	0.33%	0.99%	0.33%	0.82%
	#	1065	574	491	19	25	479	332	32	93	38	29	0	0	5	7	1	5
OFC AIR AND RADIATION (SB)	%	100%	53.90%	46.10%	1.78%	2.35%	44.98%	31.17%	3.00%	8.73%	3.57%	2.72%	0.00%	0.00%	0.47%	0.66%	0.09%	0.47%
	#	13747	6578	7169	458	546	4855	4210	693	1758	471	516	7	8	67	77	27	54
<b>Total</b>	%	100%	47.85%	52.15%	3.33%	3.97%	35.32%	30.62%	5.04%	12.79%	3.43%	3.75%	0.05%	0.06%	0.49%	0.56%	0.20%	0.39%

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018



Table B2 - Permanent Workforce By Component - Distribution by Disability

Table B2 Permanent Workforce 10/01/17 - 09/30/2018	Total	Total by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities									
		(04,05)	-1	(06-98)	Targeted	(16,19)	(21,23,25)	(28,30,32-38)	(64-69)	(71-79)	-82	-90	-91	-92	
		No Disability	Not Identified	Disability	Disability	Deafness	Blindness	Missing Limbs/ Extremities	Partial Paralysis	Total Paralysis	Convulsive Disorder/ Epilepsy	Mental Retardation / Severe	Mental Illness/ Psychiatric	Distortion Limb- Spine/	
Federal Goal (FY09)	%			12%	2.00%										
Region 02 New York, NY (SB)	#	739	673	15	51	16	4	3	0	6	0	1	0	2	0
	%	100%	91.07%	2.03%	6.90%	2.17%	0.54%	0.41%	0.00%	0.81%	0.00%	0.14%	0.00%	0.27%	0.00%
	#	515	473	11	31	6	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0
Region 01 Boston, MA (SB)	%	100%	91.84%	2.14%	6.02%	1.17%	0.19%	0.19%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.58%	0.00%
Region 03 Philadelphia, PA (SB)	#	739	662	23	54	14	1	1	1	6	0	1	0	4	0
	%	100%	89.58%	3.11%	7.31%	1.89%	0.14%	0.14%	0.14%	0.81%	0.00%	0.14%	0.00%	0.54%	0.00%
	#	855	759	13	83	10	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	4	0
Region 04 Atlanta, GA (SB)	%	100%	88.77%	1.52%	9.71%	1.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.47%	0.00%	0.23%	0.00%	0.47%	0.00%
	#	977	871	21	85	26	0	3	1	7	1	3	1	9	1
Region 05 Chicago, IL (SB)	%	100%	89.15%	2.15%	8.70%	2.66%	0.00%	0.31%	0.10%	0.72%	0.10%	0.31%	0.10%	0.92%	0.10%
	#	684	600	15	69	10	2	2	0	2	0	1	0	3	0
Region 06 Dallas, TX (SB)	%	100%	87.72%	2.19%	10.09%	1.46%	0.29%	0.29%	0.00%	0.29%	0.00%	0.15%	0.00%	0.44%	0.00%
	#	455	382	13	60	16	5	0	0	3	2	1	1	4	0
Region 07 Lenexa, KS (SB)	%	100%	83.96%	2.86%	13.19%	3.52%	1.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.66%	0.44%	0.22%	0.22%	0.88%	0.00%
	#	481	427	16	38	14	0	2	0	5	0	1	0	6	0
Region 08 Denver, CO (SB)	%	100%	88.77%	3.33%	7.90%	2.91%	0.00%	0.42%	0.00%	1.04%	0.00%	0.21%	0.00%	1.25%	0.00%
	#	669	610	11	48	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0
Region 09 San Francisco, CA (SB)	%	100%	91.18%	1.64%	7.17%	0.75%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.60%	0.00%
	#	499	451	13	35	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Region 10 Seattle WA (SB)	%	100%	90.38%	2.61%	7.01%	0.60%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%
OFC INSPECTOR GENERAL (SB)	#	265	239	6	20	4	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
	%	100%	90.19%	2.26%	7.55%	1.51%	0.00%	0.38%	0.00%	0.75%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.38%	0.00%
	#	528	484	14	30	8	1	1	0	2	0	3	0	1	0
OFFICE OF WATER (SB)	%	100%	91.67%	2.65%	5.68%	1.52%	0.19%	0.19%	0.00%	0.38%	0.00%	0.57%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%
	#	292	260	8	24	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
OFC CHIEF FINCL OFCR (SB)	%	100%	89.04%	2.74%	8.22%	1.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.34%	0.00%	0.34%	0.00%	0.34%	0.00%
OFC RESEARCH & DEVELOP (SB)	#	1407	1272	42	93	27	0	8	1	11	0	2	1	4	0
	%	100%	90.41%	2.99%	6.61%	1.92%	0.00%	0.57%	0.07%	0.78%	0.00%	0.14%	0.07%	0.28%	0.00%
OFC INTERNTNL & TRIB AF (SB)	#	67	59	2	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	%	100%	88.06%	2.99%	8.96%	4.48%	1.49%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.49%	0.00%	1.49%	0.00%
OFC OF GENERAL COUNSEL (SB)	#	220	199	8	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
	%	100%	90.45%	3.64%	5.91%	0.91%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.45%	0.00%
OFC OF LAND & EMER MGMT (SB)	#	469	425	10	34	7	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	1	0
	%	100%	90.62%	2.13%	7.25%	1.49%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.07%	0.00%	0.21%	0.00%	0.21%	0.00%
OFC OF ENVIRNMTL INFO (SB)	#	309	259	11	39	12	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	6	0
	%	100%	83.82%	3.56%	12.62%	3.88%	0.32%	0.65%	0.00%	0.32%	0.00%	0.65%	0.00%	1.94%	0.00%
OFC ENF & COMPL ASSURAN (SB)	#	618	584	13	21	6	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100%	94.50%	2.10%	3.40%	0.97%	0.16%	0.00%	0.00%	0.81%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
OFC OF ADMINISTRATOR (SB)	#	330	284	12	34	9	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	0
	%	100%	86.06%	3.64%	10.30%	2.73%	0.30%	0.61%	0.30%	0.30%	0.30%	0.30%	0.00%	0.61%	0.00%
	#	959	833	39	87	16	3	0	0	8	1	0	0	4	0
OFFICE OF CS AND PP (SB)	%	100%	86.86%	4.07%	9.07%	1.67%	0.31%	0.00%	0.00%	0.83%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.42%	0.00%
OFC ADMIN & RES MGMT (SB)	#	610	497	41	72	7	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	3	0
	%	100%	81.48%	6.72%	11.80%	1.15%	0.00%	0.16%	0.00%	0.33%	0.00%	0.16%	0.00%	0.49%	0.00%
OFC AIR AND RADIATION (SB)	#	1066	962	26	78	11	0	2	0	6	0	0	1	2	0
	%	100%	90.24%	2.44%	7.32%	1.03%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.09%	0.19%	0.00%
	#	13753	12265	383	1105	235	21	29	4	81	6	22	4	67	1
<b>Total</b>	%	100%	89.18%	2.78%	8.03%	1.71%	0.15%	0.21%	0.03%	0.59%	0.04%	0.16%	0.03%	0.49%	0.01%

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018

**EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Pay Period 201821**

**Table B3-1 - Occupational Categories - Distribution by Disability - Permanent Workforce**

Table B3-1 Permanent Workforce 10/01/17 - 09/30/2018	Total	Total by Disability Status					Detail for Targeted Disabilities								
		(04,05) No Disability	-1 Not Identified	(06-98) Disability	Targeted Disability	(16,19) Deafness	(21,23,25) Blindness	(28,30,32- 38) Missing Limbs/ Extremities	(64-69) Partial Paralysis	(71-79) Total Paralysis	-82 Convulsive Disorder/ Epilepsy	-90 Mental Retardation / Severe	-91 Mental Illness/ Psychiatri	-92 Distortion Limb- Spine/	
<b>1. Officials and Managers</b>															
Executive/Senior Level (Grades 15 and Above)	#	1354	1248	30	76	12	0	5	0	3	0	3	0	1	0
	%	100%	92.17%	2.22%	5.61%	0.89%	0.00%	0.37%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.07%	0.00%
	#	480	458	4	18	5	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
Mid-Level (Grades 13-14)	%	100%	95.42%	0.83%	3.75%	1.04%	0.00%	0.21%	0.21%	0.21%	0.00%	0.21%	0.00%	0.21%	0.00%
	#	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
First-Level (Grades 12 and Below)	%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	#	2571	2184	106	281	64	5	7	0	24	3	6	0	18	1
Other	%	100%	84.95%	4.12%	10.93%	2.49%	0.19%	0.27%	0.00%	0.93%	0.12%	0.23%	0.00%	0.70%	0.04%
	#	4406	3891	140	375	81	5	13	1	28	3	10	0	20	1
<b>Officials And Managers - TOTAL</b>	%	100%	88.31%	3.18%	8.51%	1.84%	0.11%	0.30%	0.02%	0.64%	0.07%	0.23%	0.00%	0.45%	0.02%
	#	8714	7847	229	638	126	9	13	3	50	3	7	1	40	0
<b>2. Professionals</b>	%	100%	90.05%	2.63%	7.32%	1.45%	0.10%	0.15%	0.03%	0.57%	0.03%	0.08%	0.01%	0.46%	0.00%
	#	95	83	1	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>3. Technicians</b>	%	100%	87.37%	1.05%	11.58%	2.11%	1.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.05%	0.00%
	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>4. Sales Workers</b>	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	#	315	242	9	64	23	6	3	0	2	0	4	3	5	0
<b>5. Administrative Support Workers</b>	%	100%	76.83%	2.86%	20.32%	7.30%	1.90%	0.95%	0.00%	0.63%	0.00%	1.27%	0.95%	1.59%	0.00%
	#	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>6. Craft Workers</b>	%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	#	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>7. Operatives</b>	%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	#	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>8. Laborers and Helpers</b>	%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	#	186	176	4	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>9. Service Workers</b>	%	100%	94.62%	2.15%	3.23%	0.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.54%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018

EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY - Pay Period 201821

Table A4-1: Participation Rates for General Schedule Grades - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex - Permanent Workforce

Table A4-1: General Schedule Feeder Pool 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		RACE/ETHNICITY																		
		TOTAL EMPLOYEES			Hispanic or Latino		Non- Hispanic or Latino		White		Black or African American		Asian		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		American Indian or Alaska Native		Two or more races	
		All	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female
GS-01	#	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	%	100%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
GS-02	#	5	3	2	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	%	100%	60.00%	40.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
GS-03	#	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	%	100%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
GS-04	#	23	9	14	1	0	5	7	3	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	%	100%	39.13%	60.87%	4.35%	0.00%	21.74%	30.43%	13.04%	21.74%	0.00%	8.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
GS-05	#	14	7	7	0	0	4	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	%	100%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.57%	28.57%	21.43%	21.43%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
GS-06	#	20	8	12	2	2	3	3	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	%	100%	40.00%	60.00%	10.00%	10.00%	15.00%	15.00%	10.00%	35.00%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
GS-07	#	114	25	89	3	12	14	27	6	46	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	%	100%	21.93%	78.07%	2.63%	10.53%	12.28%	23.68%	5.26%	40.35%	1.75%	0.88%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.63%	
GS-08	#	84	7	77	0	10	5	20	2	41	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	%	100%	8.33%	91.67%	0.00%	11.90%	5.95%	23.81%	2.38%	48.81%	0.00%	3.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.57%	
GS-09	#	319	75	244	9	28	50	112	12	84	2	11	0	1	1	4	1	4	4	
	%	100%	23.51%	76.49%	2.82%	8.78%	15.67%	35.11%	3.76%	26.33%	0.63%	3.45%	0.00%	0.31%	0.31%	1.25%	0.31%	1.25%		
GS-10	#	46	21	25	0	0	16	17	3	5	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0		
	%	100%	45.65%	54.35%	0.00%	0.00%	34.78%	36.96%	6.52%	10.87%	2.17%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	2.17%	4.35%	0.00%	0.00%		
GS-11	#	519	196	323	19	31	128	161	29	93	17	30	0	1	1	3	2	4		
	%	100%	37.76%	62.24%	3.66%	5.97%	24.66%	31.02%	5.59%	17.92%	3.28%	5.78%	0.00%	0.19%	0.19%	0.58%	0.39%	0.77%		
GS-12	#	1791	678	1113	49	108	440	542	113	360	65	78	2	3	8	15	1	7		
	%	100%	37.86%	62.14%	2.74%	6.03%	24.57%	30.26%	6.31%	20.10%	3.63%	4.36%	0.11%	0.17%	0.45%	0.84%	0.06%	0.39%		
GS-13	#	5761	2907	2854	219	229	2074	1663	317	675	241	232	1	2	37	32	18	21		
	%	100%	50.46%	49.54%	3.80%	3.98%	36.00%	28.87%	5.50%	11.72%	4.18%	4.03%	0.02%	0.03%	0.64%	0.56%	0.31%	0.36%		
GS-14	#	2577	1298	1279	89	66	1011	836	112	262	72	93	2	0	11	16	1	6		
	%	100%	50.37%	49.63%	3.45%	2.56%	39.23%	32.44%	4.35%	10.17%	2.79%	3.61%	0.08%	0.00%	0.43%	0.62%	0.04%	0.23%		
GS-15	#	2146	1154	992	57	51	952	716	70	155	62	59	2	1	7	4	4	6		
	%	100%	53.77%	46.23%	2.66%	2.38%	44.36%	33.36%	3.26%	7.22%	2.89%	2.75%	0.09%	0.05%	0.33%	0.19%	0.19%	0.28%		
All other (unspecified)	#	61	40	21	1	1	35	13	1	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	%	100%	65.57%	34.43%	1.64%	1.64%	57.38%	21.31%	1.64%	4.92%	4.92%	6.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
Senior Executive Service	#	257	143	114	9	6	117	88	12	17	4	2	0	0	1	1	0	0		
	%	100%	55.64%	44.36%	3.50%	2.33%	45.53%	34.24%	4.67%	6.61%	1.56%	0.78%	0.00%	0.00%	0.39%	0.39%	0.00%	0.00%		

Source: Datamart

Date: 10/16/2018

EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY - Pay Period 201821

Table A4-2: Participation Rates for General Schedule Grades - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex - Permanent Workforce

Table A4-2: General Schedule Feeder Pool 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018	TOTAL EMPLOYEES		RACE/ETHNICITY															
			Hispanic or Latino				Non- Hispanic or Latino											
							White		Black or African American		Asian		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		American Indian Alaska Native		Two or more races	
			All	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male
GS-01	#	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.01%	0.02%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	0.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-02	#	5	3	2	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.04%	0.05%	0.03%	0.00%	0.37%	0.00%	0.00%	0.43%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-03	#	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.03%	0.03%	0.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.14%	0.11%	0.21%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-04	#	23	9	14	1	0	5	7	3	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.17%	0.14%	0.20%	0.22%	0.00%	0.10%	0.17%	0.43%	0.28%	0.00%	0.39%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-05	#	14	7	7	0	0	4	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.10%	0.11%	0.10%	0.00%	0.00%	0.08%	0.10%	0.43%	0.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-06	#	20	8	12	2	2	3	3	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.15%	0.12%	0.17%	0.44%	0.37%	0.06%	0.07%	0.29%	0.40%	0.21%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-07	#	114	25	89	3	12	14	27	6	46	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
	%	0.83%	0.38%	1.24%	0.66%	2.20%	0.29%	0.64%	0.87%	2.62%	0.42%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%
GS-08	#	84	7	77	0	10	5	20	2	41	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
	%	0.61%	0.11%	1.07%	0.00%	1.83%	0.10%	0.48%	0.29%	2.33%	0.00%	0.58%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%
GS-09	#	319	75	244	9	28	50	112	12	84	2	11	0	1	1	4	1	4
	%	2.32%	1.14%	3.40%	1.97%	5.13%	1.03%	2.66%	1.74%	4.78%	0.42%	2.13%	0.00%	12.50%	1.49%	5.19%	3.70%	7.41%
GS-10	#	46	21	25	0	0	16	17	3	5	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0
	%	0.33%	0.32%	0.35%	0.00%	0.00%	0.33%	0.40%	0.43%	0.28%	0.21%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	1.49%	2.60%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-11	#	519	196	323	19	31	128	161	29	93	17	30	0	1	1	3	2	4
	%	3.78%	2.98%	4.51%	4.15%	5.68%	2.64%	3.82%	4.20%	5.29%	3.61%	5.81%	0.00%	12.50%	1.49%	3.90%	7.41%	7.41%
GS-12	#	1791	678	1113	49	108	440	542	113	360	65	78	2	3	8	15	1	7
	%	13.03%	10.31%	15.53%	10.70%	19.78%	9.06%	12.87%	16.38%	20.48%	13.80%	15.12%	28.57%	37.50%	11.94%	19.48%	3.70%	12.96%
GS-13	#	5761	2907	2854	219	229	2074	1663	317	675	241	232	1	2	37	32	18	21
	%	41.92%	44.22%	39.81%	47.82%	41.94%	42.73%	39.50%	45.94%	38.40%	51.17%	44.96%	14.29%	25.00%	55.22%	41.56%	66.67%	38.89%
GS-14	#	2577	1298	1279	89	66	1011	836	112	262	72	93	2	0	11	16	1	6
	%	18.75%	19.74%	17.84%	19.43%	12.09%	20.83%	19.86%	16.23%	14.90%	15.29%	18.02%	28.57%	0.00%	16.42%	20.78%	3.70%	11.11%
GS-15	#	2146	1154	992	57	51	952	716	70	155	62	59	2	1	7	4	4	6
	%	15.62%	17.55%	13.84%	12.45%	9.34%	19.61%	17.01%	10.14%	8.82%	13.16%	11.43%	28.57%	12.50%	10.45%	5.19%	14.81%	11.11%
All other (unspecified)	#	61	40	21	1	1	35	13	1	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100%	65.57%	34.43%	1.64%	1.64%	57.38%	21.31%	1.64%	4.92%	4.92%	6.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Senior Executive Service	#	257	143	114	9	6	117	88	12	17	4	2	0	0	1	1	0	0
	%	1.87%	2.18%	1.59%	1.97%	1.10%	2.41%	2.09%	1.74%	0.97%	0.85%	0.39%	0.00%	0.00%	1.49%	1.30%	0.00%	0.00%
TOTAL	#	13743	6574	7169	458	546	4854	4210	690	1758	471	516	7	8	67	77	27	54
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018

EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY - Pay Period 201821

Table B4-2: Participation Rates for General Schedule Grades - Distribution by Disability - Permanent Workforce

Table B4-2 General Schedule Feeder Pool 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		Total	Total by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities									
			(04,05)	-1	(06-98)	Targeted	(16,19)	(21,23,25)	(28,30,32-38)	(64-69)	(71-79)	-82	-90	-91	-92	
			No Disability	Not Identified	Disability	Disability	Deafness	Blindness	Missing Limbs/ Extremities	Partial Paralysis	Total Paralysis	Convulsive Disorder/ Epilepsy	Mental Retardation / Severe	Mental Illness/ Psychiatr	Distortion Limb- Spine/	
GS-01	#	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.01%	0.02%	0.00%	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-02	#	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.04%	0.02%	0.52%	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-03	#	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.03%	0.03%	0.00%	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-04	#	23	18	1	4	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0
	%	0.17%	0.15%	0.26%	<b>0.36%</b>	<b>1.70%</b>	0.00%	3.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	1.49%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-05	#	14	6	0	8	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0
	%	0.10%	0.05%	0.00%	<b>0.72%</b>	<b>2.13%</b>	9.52%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	2.99%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-06	#	20	8	2	10	4	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	%	0.15%	0.07%	0.52%	<b>0.90%</b>	<b>1.70%</b>	9.52%	3.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-07	#	114	84	2	28	8	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	0
	%	0.83%	0.69%	0.52%	<b>2.53%</b>	<b>3.40%</b>	14.29%	3.45%	0.00%	1.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.48%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-08	#	84	64	0	20	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	2	0
	%	0.61%	0.52%	0.00%	<b>1.81%</b>	<b>2.55%</b>	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.23%	0.00%	13.64%	0.00%	2.99%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-09	#	321	252	16	53	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
	%	2.33%	2.06%	4.18%	<b>4.80%</b>	<b>2.13%</b>	9.52%	3.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.99%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-10	#	46	40	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.33%	0.33%	0.26%	<b>0.45%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-11	#	520	428	34	58	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	5	0
	%	3.78%	3.49%	8.88%	<b>5.25%</b>	<b>3.40%</b>	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.46%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-12	#	1792	1478	83	231	53	4	9	0	17	2	4	1	16	16	0
	%	13.03%	12.05%	21.67%	<b>20.90%</b>	<b>22.55%</b>	19.05%	31.03%	0.00%	20.99%	33.33%	18.18%	25.00%	23.88%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-13	#	5763	5179	152	432	93	6	8	2	40	2	6	0	28	28	1
	%	41.92%	42.24%	39.69%	<b>39.10%</b>	<b>39.57%</b>	28.57%	27.59%	50.00%	49.38%	33.33%	27.27%	0.00%	41.79%	100.00%	0.00%
GS-14	#	2577	2415	44	118	23	1	2	1	9	2	3	0	5	5	0
	%	18.74%	19.70%	11.49%	<b>10.68%</b>	<b>9.79%</b>	4.76%	6.90%	25.00%	11.11%	33.33%	13.64%	0.00%	7.46%	0.00%	0.00%
GS-15	#	2146	1987	36	123	24	1	5	1	10	0	4	0	3	3	0
	%	15.61%	16.21%	9.40%	<b>11.13%</b>	<b>10.21%</b>	4.76%	17.24%	25.00%	12.35%	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%	4.48%	0.00%	0.00%
All other (unspecified)	#	61	56	2	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	%	0.44%	0.46%	0.52%	<b>0.27%</b>	<b>0.85%</b>	0.00%	3.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Senior Executive Service	#	257	237	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	1.87%	1.93%	2.09%	<b>1.09%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
TOTAL	#	13749	12261	383	1105	235	21	29	4	81	6	22	4	67	67	1
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Pay Period 201821

Table A6: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex - Permanent Workforce

Table A6 Participation Rates for Major Occupations 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		TOTAL EMPLOYEES		RACE/ETHNICITY															
				Hispanic or Latino		Non- Hispanic or Latino													
						White		Black or African American		Asian		Native Hawaiian Other Pacific		American Indian or Alaska Native		Two or more races			
						male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female
	All	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female		
Environmental Protection Specialist	#	1911	764	1147	66	92	575	721	70	241	31	69	0	2	15	19	7	3	
	%	100%	39.98%	60.02%	3.45%	4.81%	30.09%	37.73%	3.66%	12.61%	1.62%	3.61%	0.00%	0.10%	0.78%	0.99%	0.37%	0.16%	
Occupational CLF	#	100%	71.82%	28.18%	2.22%	1.34%	64.84%	23.87%	2.02%	1.58%	1.79%	1.03%	0.11%	0.01%	0.60%	0.31%	0.23%	0.05%	
General Administrative	#	489	162	327	14	31	105	120	30	163	9	7	0	0	3	1	1	5	
	%	100%	33.13%	66.87%	2.86%	6.34%	21.47%	24.54%	6.13%	33.33%	1.84%	1.43%	0.00%	0.00%	0.61%	0.20%	0.20%	1.02%	
Occupational CLF	#	100%	36.71%	63.29%	2.86%	5.87%	27.06%	43.84%	3.60%	8.89%	2.57%	3.64%	0.03%	0.05%	0.33%	0.62%	0.26%	0.39%	
Management Analysis	#	1295	385	910	18	49	279	421	59	383	22	40	0	0	4	8	3	9	
	%	100%	29.73%	70.27%	1.39%	3.78%	21.54%	32.51%	4.56%	29.58%	1.70%	3.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.31%	0.62%	0.23%	0.69%	
Occupational CLF	#	100%	58.45%	41.55%	2.46%	2.14%	49.01%	32.56%	3.03%	3.80%	3.33%	2.46%	0.02%	0.04%	0.31%	0.32%	0.27%	0.24%	
Biologist	#	1092	506	586	21	35	412	437	33	57	36	48	0	0	3	6	1	3	
	%	100%	46.34%	53.66%	1.92%	3.21%	37.73%	40.02%	3.02%	5.22%	3.30%	4.40%	0.00%	0.00%	0.27%	0.55%	0.09%	0.27%	
Occupational CLF	#	100%	52.00%	48.00%	2.44%	2.17%	44.27%	39.49%	1.39%	1.59%	3.17%	4.15%	0.05%	0.05%	0.48%	0.35%	0.19%	0.20%	
Environmental Engineering	#	1548	945	603	100	68	644	373	76	73	114	80	1	0	8	6	2	3	
	%	100%	61.05%	38.95%	6.46%	4.39%	41.60%	24.10%	4.91%	4.72%	7.36%	5.17%	0.06%	0.00%	0.52%	0.39%	0.13%	0.19%	
Occupational CLF	#	100%	75.77%	24.23%	2.92%	0.89%	62.81%	19.13%	4.27%	1.95%	4.98%	1.90%	0.01%	0.12%	0.55%	0.17%	0.23%	0.06%	
Attorney	#	977	451	526	30	35	374	378	19	53	23	48	1	0	4	6	0	6	
	%	100%	46.16%	53.84%	3.07%	3.58%	38.28%	38.69%	1.94%	5.42%	2.35%	4.91%	0.10%	0.00%	0.41%	0.61%	0.00%	0.61%	
Occupational CLF	#	100%	66.70%	33.30%	2.52%	1.85%	59.68%	26.68%	2.13%	2.60%	1.82%	1.74%	0.02%	0.01%	0.31%	0.23%	0.22%	0.18%	
General Physical Science	#	2046	1152	894	79	66	932	658	56	83	71	74	0	0	13	11	1	2	
	%	100%	56.30%	43.70%	3.86%	3.23%	45.55%	32.16%	2.74%	4.06%	3.47%	3.62%	0.00%	0.00%	0.64%	0.54%	0.05%	0.10%	
Occupational CLF	#	100%	60.89%	39.11%	2.36%	1.92%	48.15%	27.82%	1.41%	2.21%	8.20%	6.74%	0.03%	0.00%	0.44%	0.18%	0.30%	0.24%	

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018

**EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Pay Period 201821**

**Table B6: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS - Distribution by Disability - Permanent Workforce**

Table B6 Participation Rates for Major Occupations 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		Total by Disability Status					Detail for Targeted Disabilities								
		(04,05)		-1 (06-98)	Targeted	(16,19)	(21,23,25)	(28,30,32-38)	(64-69)	(71-79)	-82	-90	-91	-92	
		No Disability	Not Identified	Disability	Disability	Deafness	Blindness	Missing Limbs/ Extremities	Partial Paralysis	Total Paralysis	Convulsive Disorder/ Epilepsy	Mental Severe Intellectual	Mental Psychiatric Disability	Distortion Limb-Spine/ Dwarfism	
Environmental	#	1911	1716	36	159	30	2	6	2	10	1	2	0	7	0
Protection	%	100%	89.80%	1.88%	8.32%	1.57%	0.10%	0.31%	0.10%	0.52%	0.05%	0.10%	0.00%	0.37%	0.00%
General	#	490	413	20	57	9	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	4	0
Administrative	%	100%	84.29%	4.08%	11.63%	1.84%	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	0.41%	0.20%	0.20%	0.00%	0.82%	0.00%
Management	#	1296	1145	33	118	35	4	4	0	16	1	5	0	4	1
Analysis	%	100%	88.35%	2.55%	9.10%	2.70%	0.31%	0.31%	0.00%	1.23%	0.08%	0.39%	0.00%	0.31%	0.08%
Biologist	#	1092	971	48	73	7	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	2	0
	%	100%	88.92%	4.40%	6.68%	0.64%	0.00%	0.27%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%
Environmental	#	1549	1430	18	101	22	2	1	0	13	1	1	0	4	0
Engineering	%	100%	92.32%	1.16%	6.52%	1.42%	0.13%	0.06%	0.00%	0.84%	0.06%	0.06%	0.00%	0.26%	0.00%
	#	977	913	18	46	7	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	0
Attorney	%	100%	93.45%	1.84%	4.71%	0.72%	0.10%	0.10%	0.00%	0.20%	0.10%	0.10%	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%
General Physical	#	2047	1885	44	118	25	1	3	0	10	0	3	0	8	0
Science	%	100%	92.09%	2.15%	5.76%	1.22%	0.05%	0.15%	0.00%	0.49%	0.00%	0.15%	0.00%	0.39%	0.00%

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018

**Table A7: APPLICANTS AND HIRES FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS by Race/Ethnicity and Sex**

Table A7 Applicant Flow Data 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		Total			RACE/ETHNICITY													
					Hispanic or Latino		Non-Hispanic or Latino											
		All	Male	Female	Male	Female	White		Black or African		Asian		Native		American		Two or More Races	
							Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
<b>Job Title/Series: 0028 Environmental Protection Specialist</b>																		
Total Received	#	2180																
Voluntarily Identified	#	1787	872	915	87	87	508	481	173	220	64	95	7	0	26	15	7	17
	%	100%	48.80%	51.20%	4.87%	4.87%	28.43%	26.92%	9.68%	12.31%	3.58%	5.32%	.39%	.00%	1.45%	.84%	.39%	.95%
Qualified of those Identified	#	1475	689	786	61	77	420	422	130	181	53	83	5	0	14	12	6	11
	%	100%	46.71%	53.29%	4.14%	5.22%	28.47%	28.61%	8.81%	12.27%	3.59%	5.63%	.34%	.00%	.95%	.81%	.41%	.75%
Selected of those Identified	#	36	8	28	0	4	6	12	0	4	1	7	0	0	1	1	0	0
	%	100%	22.22%	77.78%	.00%	11.11%	16.67%	33.33%	.00%	11.11%	2.78%	19.44%	.00%	.00%	2.78%	2.78%	.00%	.00%
CLF			71.82%	28.18%	2.22%	1.34%	64.84%	23.87%	2.02%	1.58%	1.79%	1.03%	.11%	.01%	.60%	.31%	.23%	.05%
<b>Job Title/Series: 0301 Misc Administration and Program Specialist</b>																		
Total Received	#	2381																
Voluntarily Identified	#	1980	631	1349	70	112	310	444	187	700	38	37	3	2	15	17	8	37
	%	100%	31.87%	68.13%	3.54%	5.66%	15.66%	22.42%	9.44%	35.35%	1.92%	1.87%	.15%	.10%	.76%	.86%	.40%	1.87%
Qualified of those Identified	#	1368	364	1004	30	83	176	335	116	523	31	27	2	1	5	11	4	24
	%	100%	26.61%	73.39%	2.19%	6.07%	12.87%	24.49%	8.48%	38.23%	2.27%	1.97%	.15%	.07%	.37%	.80%	.29%	1.75%
Selected of those Identified	#	42	9	33	1	3	7	15	1	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1
	%	100%	21.43%	78.57%	2.38%	7.14%	16.67%	35.71%	2.38%	26.19%	.00%	2.38%	.00%	.00%	.00%	4.76%	.00%	2.38%
CLF			36.71%	63.29%	2.86%	5.87%	27.06%	43.84%	3.60%	8.89%	2.57%	3.64%	.03%	.05%	.33%	.62%	.26%	.39%
<b>Job Title/Series: 0343 Management/Program Analyst</b>																		
Total Received	#	3283																
Voluntarily Identified	#	2466	1198	1268	125	129	587	315	360	705	91	71	3	0	21	10	11	38
	%	100%	48.58%	51.42%	5.07%	5.23%	23.80%	12.77%	14.60%	28.59%	3.69%	2.88%	.12%	.00%	.85%	.41%	.45%	1.54%
Qualified of those Identified	#	1308	601	707	50	62	291	202	198	383	45	38	2	0	9	5	6	17
	%	100%	45.95%	54.05%	3.82%	4.74%	22.25%	15.44%	15.14%	29.28%	3.44%	2.91%	.15%	.00%	.69%	.38%	.46%	1.30%
Selected of those Identified	#	77	23	54	1	4	12	25	9	19	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	1
	%	100%	29.87%	70.13%	1.30%	5.19%	15.58%	32.47%	11.69%	24.68%	1.30%	6.49%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	1.30%
CLF			58.45%	41.55%	2.46%	2.14%	49.01%	32.56%	3.03%	3.80%	3.33%	2.46%	.02%	.04%	.31%	.32%	.27%	.24%
<b>Job Title/Series: 0401 General Biological Science (RESEARCH)</b>																		
Total Received	#	5246																
Voluntarily Identified	#	4425	2244	2181	209	221	1260	1155	336	452	400	316	2	0	29	23	8	14
	%	100%	50.71%	49.29%	4.72%	4.99%	28.47%	26.10%	7.59%	10.21%	9.04%	7.14%	.05%	.00%	.66%	.52%	.18%	.32%
Qualified of those Identified	#	3855	1902	1953	169	187	1079	1034	280	417	350	288	2	0	19	19	3	8
	%	100%	49.34%	50.66%	4.38%	4.85%	27.99%	26.82%	7.26%	10.82%	9.08%	7.47%	.05%	.00%	.49%	.49%	.08%	.21%
Selected of those Identified	#	120	50	70	5	7	33	41	6	13	6	7	0	0	0	1	0	1
	%	100%	41.67%	58.33%	4.17%	5.83%	27.50%	34.17%	5.00%	10.83%	5.00%	5.83%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.83%	.00%	.83%
CLF			52.01%	47.99%	2.44%	2.17%	44.27%	39.48%	1.39%	1.59%	3.17%	4.15%	.05%	.05%	.48%	.35%	.19%	.20%
<b>Job Title/Series: 0819 Environmental Engineer</b>																		
Total Received	#	1881																
Voluntarily Identified	#	1557	952	605	87	66	621	400	96	65	108	66	3	0	28	4	9	4
	%	100%	61.14%	38.86%	5.59%	4.24%	39.88%	25.69%	6.17%	4.17%	6.94%	4.24%	.19%	.00%	1.80%	.26%	.58%	.26%
Qualified of those Identified	#	1027	627	400	55	49	426	255	60	39	67	53	3	0	13	2	3	2
	%	100%	61.05%	38.95%	5.36%	4.77%	41.48%	24.83%	5.84%	3.80%	6.52%	5.16%	.29%	.00%	1.27%	.19%	.29%	.19%
Selected of those Identified	#	68	34	34	2	8	25	17	3	2	3	7	0	0	1	0	0	0
	%	100%	50.00%	50.00%	2.94%	11.76%	36.76%	25.00%	4.41%	2.94%	4.41%	10.29%	.00%	.00%	1.47%	.00%	.00%	.00%
CLF			75.80%	24.20%	2.90%	9.0%	62.80%	19.10%	4.20%	1.70%	4.70%	1.90%	.00%	.10%	.30%	.10%	.50%	.20%
<b>Job Title/Series: 0905 Attorney</b>																		
Total Received	#	1537																
Voluntarily Identified	#	1147	633	514	76	33	393	280	103	150	52	46	0	0	7	3	2	2
	%	100%	55.19%	44.81%	6.63%	2.88%	34.26%	24.41%	8.98%	13.08%	4.53%	4.01%	.00%	.00%	.61%	.26%	.17%	.17%
Qualified of those Identified	#	1097	613	484	74	31	383	266	97	141	51	42	0	0	6	3	2	1
	%	100%	55.88%	44.12%	6.75%	2.83%	34.91%	24.25%	8.84%	12.85%	4.65%	3.83%	.00%	.00%	.55%	.27%	.18%	.09%
Selected of those Identified	#	5	3	3	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100%	40.00%	60.00%	.00%	.00%	40.00%	60.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%
CLF			66.70%	33.30%	2.52%	1.85%	59.68%	26.68%	2.13%	2.60%	1.82%	1.74%	.02%	.01%	.31%	.23%	.22%	.18%
<b>Job Title/Series: 1301 Physical Scientist/Environmental Scientist</b>																		
Total Received	#	530																
Voluntarily Identified	#	442	230	212	23	25	141	131	30	32	31	19	0	1	2	2	3	2
	%	100%	52.04%	47.96%	5.20%	5.66%	31.90%	29.64%	6.79%	7.24%	7.01%	4.30%	.00%	.23%	.45%	.45%	.68%	.45%
Qualified of those Identified	#	373	193	180	15	21	126	115	20	24	28	15	0	1	1	2	3	2
	%	100%	51.74%	48.26%	4.02%	5.63%	33.78%	30.83%	5.36%	6.43%	7.51%	4.02%	.00%	.27%	.27%	.54%	.80%	.54%
Selected of those Identified	#	17	9	8	4	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	%	100%	52.94%	47.06%	23.53%	.00%	23.53%	47.06%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%	5.88%	.00%
CLF			60.89%	39.11%	2.36%	1.92%	48.14%	27.82%	1.41%	2.21%	8.20%	6.74%	.03%	.00%	.44%	.18%	.30%	.24%
Source: Monster																		
Date: 10/16/2018																		



**Table B7: APPLICATIONS AND HIRES FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS - Distribution by Disability (Permanent)**

Table B7 Applicant Flow Data for People with Disabilities 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018	Total	Total by Disability Status										Detail for Targeted Disabilities						
		No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06 - 08]	Targeted Disability	Developmental Disability [02]	Traumatic Brain Injury [03]	Deaf or Serious Difficulty Hearing [19]	Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing [20]	Missing Extremities [31]	Significant Mobility Impairment [40]	Partial or Complete Paralysis [60]	Epilepsy or Other Seizure Disorders [82]	Intellectual Disability [90]	Significant Psychiatric Disorder [91]	Dwarfism [92]	Significant Disfigurement [93]	
<b>Schedule A</b>																		
Applications	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
Hires	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
<b>Voluntarily Identified (Outside of Schedule A Applicants)</b>																		
Applications	#	17038	10438	5534	1066	540	34	47	84	69	10	48	16	36	8	254	4	11
	%	100.00%	61.26%	32.48%	6.26%	3.17%	0.20%	0.28%	0.49%	0.40%	0.06%	0.28%	0.09%	0.21%	0.05%	1.49%	0.02%	0.06%
Hires	#	353	204	139	10	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	%	100.00%	57.79%	39.38%	2.83%	0.85%	0.00%	0.00%	0.28%	0.00%	0.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.28%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Occupation Series Code (Four Digits): 0028</b>																		
Total Received	#	2180																
Voluntarily Identified	#	2180	1374	682	124	62	5	2	13	10	0	4	0	5	2	26	2	1
	%	100.00%	63.03%	31.28%	5.69%	2.84%	0.23%	0.09%	0.60%	0.46%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%	0.23%	0.09%	1.19%	0.09%	0.05%
Qualified of those Identified	#	1768	1147	524	97	48	5	0.0028281	9	7	0	4	0	4	1	18	2	1
	%	100.00%	64.88%	29.64%	5.49%	2.71%	0.28%	0.11%	0.51%	0.40%	0.00%	0.23%	0.00%	0.23%	0.06%	1.02%	0.11%	0.06%
Selected of those Identified	#	46	29	16	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	63.04%	34.78%	2.17%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	2.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Occupation Series Code (Four Digits): 0301</b>																		
Total Received	#	2381																
Voluntarily Identified	#	2381	1459	674	248	138	3	13	16	10	3	17	3	7	0	79	1	4
	%	100.00%	61.28%	28.31%	10.42%	5.80%	0.13%	0.55%	0.67%	0.42%	0.13%	0.71%	0.13%	0.29%	0.00%	3.32%	0.04%	0.17%
Qualified of those Identified	#	1624	1050	440	134	71	2	0.0012315	9	5	1	11	1	2	0	38	1	3
	%	100.00%	64.66%	27.09%	8.25%	4.37%	0.12%	0.37%	0.55%	0.31%	0.06%	0.68%	0.06%	0.12%	0.00%	2.34%	0.06%	0.18%
Selected of those Identified	#	50	33	13	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	%	100.00%	66.00%	26.00%	8.00%	4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Occupation Series Code (Four Digits): 0343</b>																		
Total Received	#	3283																
Voluntarily Identified	#	3283	1755	1260	268	124	4	17	18	27	1	15	9	10	2	52	0	4
	%	100.00%	53.46%	38.38%	8.16%	3.78%	0.12%	0.52%	0.55%	0.82%	0.03%	0.46%	0.27%	0.30%	0.06%	1.58%	0.00%	0.12%
Qualified of those Identified	#	1707	951	637	119	48	2	0.0011716	11	13	0	6	4	3	1	17	0	2
	%	100.00%	55.71%	37.32%	6.97%	2.81%	0.12%	0.23%	0.64%	0.76%	0.00%	0.35%	0.23%	0.18%	0.06%	1.00%	0.00%	0.12%
Selected of those Identified	#	98	60	36	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	61.22%	36.73%	2.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Occupation Series Code (Four Digits): 0401</b>																		
Total Received	#	5246																
Voluntarily Identified	#	5246	3465	1523	258	129	11	6	33	3	1	6	2	8	3	65	1	1
	%	100.00%	66.05%	29.03%	4.92%	2.46%	0.21%	0.11%	0.63%	0.06%	0.02%	0.11%	0.04%	0.15%	0.06%	1.24%	0.02%	0.02%
Qualified of those Identified	#	4542	3045	1285	212	103	10	0.0022017	22	0	1	5	1	8	2	54	1	0
	%	100.00%	67.04%	28.29%	4.67%	2.27%	0.22%	0.11%	0.48%	0.00%	0.02%	0.11%	0.02%	0.18%	0.04%	1.19%	0.02%	0.00%
Selected of those Identified	#	154	90	58	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	58.44%	37.66%	3.90%	1.30%	0.00%	0.00%	0.65%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.65%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Occupation Series Code (Four Digits): 0819</b>																		
Total Received	#	1881																
Voluntarily Identified	#	1881	1176	639	66	31	5	4	1	2	0	4	1	1	1	16	0	0
	%	100.00%	62.52%	33.97%	3.51%	1.65%	0.27%	0.21%	0.05%	0.11%	0.00%	0.21%	0.05%	0.05%	0.05%	0.85%	0.00%	0.00%
Qualified of those Identified	#	1253	780	435	38	13	2	0.0015962	1	1	0	3	1	1	1	3	0	0
	%	100.00%	62.25%	34.72%	3.03%	1.04%	0.16%	0.08%	0.08%	0.08%	0.00%	0.24%	0.08%	0.08%	0.08%	0.24%	0.00%	0.00%
Selected of those Identified	#	86	52	32	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	%	100.00%	60.47%	37.21%	2.33%	1.16%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.16%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Occupation Series Code (Four Digits): 0905</b>																		
Total Received	#	1537																
Voluntarily Identified	#	1537	890	568	79	45	3	5	2	17	4	0	1	4	0	12	0	0
	%	100.00%	57.91%	36.96%	5.14%	2.93%	0.20%	0.33%	0.13%	1.11%	0.26%	0.00%	0.07%	0.26%	0.00%	0.78%	0.00%	0.00%
Qualified of those Identified	#	1472	848	549	75	41	1	0.0006793	2	17	4	0	1	4	0	9	0	0
	%	100.00%	57.61%	37.30%	5.10%	2.79%	0.07%	0.27%	0.14%	1.15%	0.27%	0.00%	0.07%	0.27%	0.00%	0.61%	0.00%	0.00%
Selected of those Identified	#	9	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	44.44%	55.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Occupation Series Code (Four Digits): 1301</b>																		
Total Received	#	530																
Voluntarily Identified	#	530	319	188	23	11	3	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	4	0	1
	%	100.00%	60.19%	35.47%	4.34%	2.08%	0.57%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.19%	0.38%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%	0.75%	0.00%	0.19%
Qualified of those Identified	#	438	269	150	19	8	1	0.0022831	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	0	1
	%	100.00%	61.42%	34.25%	4.34%	1.83%	0.23%	0.00%	0.23%	0.00%	0.23%	0.23%	0.00%	0.23%	0.00%	0.68%	0.00%	0.23%
Selected of those Identified	#	27	14	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	51.85%	44.44%	3.70%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Source: Monster  
Date: 10/16/2018

EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY For Period ( 2017-10-01 TO 2018-09-30 )

Table A8: NEW HIRES BY TYPE OF APPOINTMENT - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex

Table A8 New Hires 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		TOTAL EMPLOYEES			RACE/ETHNICITY													
					Hispanic or Latino		Non- Hispanic or Latino											
							White		Black or African American		Asian		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific		American Indian or Alaska Native		Two or more races	
							male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female
	All	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	
Permanent	#	200	84	116	6	8	58	55	8	35	9	13	0	0	0	0	2	2
	%	100%	42.00%	58.00%	3.00%	4.00%	29.00%	27.50%	4.00%	17.50%	4.50%	6.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%	1.00%
Temporary	#	160	109	51	0	0	103	40	2	4	2	5	0	0	0	2	1	0
	%	100%	68.13%	31.87%	0.00%	0.00%	64.38%	25.00%	1.25%	2.50%	1.25%	3.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.25%	0.63%	0.00%
TOTAL	#	360	193	167	6	8	161	95	10	39	11	18	0	0	0	2	3	2
	%	100%	53.61%	46.39%	1.67%	2.22%	44.72%	26.39%	2.78%	10.83%	3.06%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.56%	0.83%	0.56%
Nat 2010 CLF	%	100%	51.86%	48.14%	5.17%	4.79%	38.33%	34.03%	5.49%	6.53%	1.97%	1.93%	0.07%	0.07%	0.55%	0.53%	0.26%	0.28%

CLF is based on all workers on all Census Population

Source: Datamart

Date: 10/16/2018

EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY For Period ( 2017-10-01 TO 2018-09-30 )

Table B8: NEW HIRES BY TYPE OF APPOINTMENT - Distribution by Disability

Table B8 New Hires 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		Total by Disability Status					Detail for Targeted Disabilities									
		(04,05) No Disability	-1 Not Identified	(06-98) Disability	Targeted Disability	(16,19) Deafness	(21,23,25) Blindness	(28,30,32- 38) Missing Limbs/ Extremities	(64-69) Partial Paralysis	(71-79) Total Paralysis	-82 Convulsi ve Epilepsy	-90 Mental on/ Psychiatric	-91 Mental Psychiatric	-92 Distortion Spine/		
Permanent	#	200	153	23	24	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
	%	100%	76.50%	11.50%	12.00%	1.50%	0.50%	0.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.50%	0.00%	
Temporary	#	160	136	19	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	%	100%	85.00%	11.88%	3.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
Total	#	360	289	42	29	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
	%	100%	80.28%	11.67%	8.06%	0.83%	0.28%	0.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.28%	0.00%	

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018

**Table A9: SELECTIONS FOR INTERNAL COMPETITIVE PROMOTIONS FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS by Race/Ethnicity and Sex**

Table A9 Applicant Flow Data for Disabilities 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		RACE/ETHNICITY																
		Total					Non-Hispanic or Latino											
		Hispanic or Latino					White		Black or African		Asian		Native		American		Two or More Races	
		All	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
<b>Job Series of Vacancy: 0028 Environmental Protection Specialist</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	483	230	253	32	25	121	120	36	59	18	36	6	0	13	6	4	7
Qualified	#	229	88	141	9	14	54	72	7	26	9	25	4	0	2	3	3	1
	%	100%	38.43%	61.57%	3.93%	6.11%	23.58%	31.44%	3.06%	11.35%	3.93%	10.92%	1.75%	0.00%	0.87%	1.31%	1.31%	0.44%
Selected	#	37	7	30	0	4	5	14	0	4	1	7	0	0	1	1	0	0
	%	100%	18.92%	81.08%	0.00%	10.81%	13.51%	37.84%	0.00%	10.81%	2.70%	18.92%	0.00%	0.00%	2.70%	2.70%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %																		
<b>Job Series of Vacancy: 0301 Misc Administration and Program Specialist</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	374	179	195	30	14	83	73	43	89	8	8	2	0	9	4	4	7
Qualified	#	87	31	56	4	3	10	30	10	18	4	3	1	0	2	0	0	2
	%	100%	35.63%	64.37%	4.60%	3.45%	11.49%	34.48%	11.49%	20.69%	4.60%	3.45%	1.15%	0.00%	2.30%	0.00%	0.00%	2.30%
Selected	#	24	4	20	0	1	4	10	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100%	16.67%	83.33%	0.00%	4.17%	16.67%	41.67%	0.00%	37.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %																		
<b>Job Series of Vacancy: 0343 Management/Program Analyst</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	1163	559	604	76	61	281	144	161	338	28	44	1	0	9	5	3	12
Qualified	#	390	140	250	18	15	77	83	38	129	5	20	0	0	2	1	0	2
	%	100%	35.90%	64.10%	4.62%	3.85%	19.74%	21.28%	9.74%	33.08%	1.28%	5.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.51%	0.28%	0.00%	0.51%
Selected	#	79	23	56	1	3	13	27	8	21	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1
	%	100%	29.11%	70.89%	1.27%	3.80%	16.46%	34.18%	10.13%	26.58%	1.27%	5.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.27%
Relevant Applicant Pool %																		
<b>Job Series of Vacancy: 0401 General Biological Science (RESEARCH)</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	750	390	360	30	50	263	223	48	43	35	32	0	0	11	7	3	5
Qualified	#	410	202	208	12	33	146	137	18	19	23	16	0	0	2	3	1	0
	%	100%	49.27%	50.73%	2.93%	8.05%	35.61%	33.41%	4.39%	4.63%	5.61%	3.90%	0.00%	0.00%	0.49%	0.73%	0.24%	0.00%
Selected	#	75	35	40	1	2	28	31	2	3	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	0
	%	100%	46.67%	53.33%	1.33%	2.67%	37.33%	41.33%	2.67%	4.00%	5.33%	4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %																		
<b>Job Series of Vacancy: 0819 Environmental Engineer</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	329	196	133	30	21	116	91	20	10	10	8	0	0	14	1	6	2
Qualified	#	165	89	76	15	14	52	46	11	8	7	8	0	0	3	0	1	0
	%	100%	53.94%	46.06%	9.09%	8.48%	31.52%	27.88%	6.67%	4.85%	4.24%	4.85%	0.00%	0.00%	1.82%	0.00%	0.61%	0.00%
Selected	#	47	20	27	3	7	12	13	2	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100%	42.55%	57.45%	6.38%	14.89%	25.53%	27.66%	4.26%	2.13%	6.38%	12.77%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %																		
<b>Job Series of Vacancy: 0905 Attorney</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	15	9	6	2	0	5	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Qualified	#	11	8	3	2	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
	%	100%	72.73%	27.27%	18.18%	0.00%	36.36%	27.27%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.18%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Selected	#	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %																		
<b>Job Series of Vacancy: 1301 Physical Scientist/Environmental Scientist</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	89	52	37	8	3	30	28	5	2	5	4	0	0	1	0	3	0
Qualified	#	62	36	26	5	2	21	20	3	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	3	0
	%	100%	58.06%	41.94%	8.06%	3.23%	33.87%	32.26%	4.84%	1.61%	6.45%	4.84%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.84%	0.00%
Selected	#	14	7	7	3	0	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
	%	100%	50.00%	50.00%	21.43%	0.00%	21.43%	42.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %																		
Source:		Monster																
Date:		10/16/2018																

**Table B9: SELECTIONS FOR INTERNAL COMPETITIVE PROMOTIONS for Major Occupations by Disability**

Table B9 Applicant Flow Data for Disabilities 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018	Total	Total by Disability Status					Detail for Targeted Disabilities											
		No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-98]	Targeted Disability	Developmental Disability [02]	Traumatic Brain Injury [03]	Deaf or Serious Difficulty Hearing [19]	Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing [29]	Missing Extremities [31]	Significant Mobility Impairment [40]	Partial or Complete Paralysis [90]	Epilepsy or Other Seizure Disorder [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Significant Psychiatric Disorder [91]	Dwarfism [92]	Significant Disfigurement [93]	
<b>Series: 0028 Environmental Protection Specialist</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	648	342	277	29	13	0	0	3	3	0	2	0	1	1	5	0	1
	%	100.00%	52.78%	42.75%	4.48%	2.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.46%	0.46%	0.00%	0.31%	0.00%	0.15%	0.15%	0.77%	0.00%	0.15%
Qualified	#	305	160	138	7	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	%	100.00%	52.46%	45.25%	2.30%	0.66%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.66%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.33%
Selected	#	47	29	17	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	61.70%	36.17%	2.13%	2.13%	0.00%	0.00%	2.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %	%																	
<b>Series: 0301 Misc Administration and Program Specialist</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	483	253	168	62	41	0	3	6	4	2	3	3	2	0	25	0	1
	%	100.00%	52.38%	34.78%	12.84%	8.49%	0.00%	0.62%	1.24%	0.83%	0.41%	0.62%	0.62%	0.41%	0.00%	5.18%	0.00%	0.21%
Qualified	#	115	62	48	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
	%	100.00%	53.91%	41.74%	4.35%	2.61%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.87%	0.87%	0.87%	0.87%	0.00%	0.87%	0.00%	0.00%
Selected	#	32	19	10	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	%	100.00%	59.38%	31.25%	9.38%	3.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.13%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %	%																	
<b>Series: 0343 Management/Program Analyst</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	1591	821	640	130	66	1	14	8	7	1	12	4	5	2	31	0	1
	%	100.00%	51.60%	40.23%	8.17%	4.15%	0.06%	0.88%	0.50%	0.44%	0.06%	0.75%	0.25%	0.31%	0.13%	1.95%	0.00%	0.06%
Qualified	#	505	282	205	18	9	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	0	0
	%	100.00%	55.84%	40.59%	3.56%	1.78%	0.00%	0.00%	0.59%	0.20%	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	1.19%	0.00%	0.00%
Selected	#	101	60	39	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	59.41%	38.61%	1.98%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %	%																	
<b>Series: 0401 General Biological Science (RESEARCH)</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	997	484	462	51	26	1	0	7	3	0	2	1	1	1	13	0	1
	%	100.00%	48.55%	46.34%	5.12%	2.61%	0.10%	0.00%	0.70%	0.30%	0.00%	0.20%	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	1.30%	0.00%	0.10%
Qualified	#	554	244	293	17	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	0	0
	%	100.00%	44.04%	52.89%	3.07%	1.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%	0.18%	0.00%	0.90%	0.00%	0.00%
Selected	#	99	51	45	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	51.52%	45.45%	3.03%	1.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %	%																	
<b>Series: 0819 Environmental Engineer</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	412	239	168	5	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0
	%	100.00%	58.01%	40.78%	1.21%	0.97%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.24%	0.00%	0.49%	0.24%	0.00%	0.00%	0.24%	0.00%	0.00%
Qualified	#	207	120	85	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	57.97%	41.06%	0.97%	0.97%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.97%	0.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Selected	#	59	39	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	66.10%	33.90%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %	%																	
<b>Series: 0905 Attorney</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	23	7	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	30.43%	60.87%	8.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Qualified	#	19	3	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	15.79%	73.68%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Selected	#	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %	%																	
<b>Series: 1301 Physical Scientist/Environmental Scientist</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	124	61	60	3	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	%	100.00%	49.19%	48.39%	2.42%	2.42%	0.00%	0.00%	0.81%	0.00%	0.81%	0.81%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.81%
Qualified	#	83	41	39	3	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	%	100.00%	49.40%	46.99%	3.61%	3.61%	0.00%	0.00%	1.20%	0.00%	1.20%	1.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.20%
Selected	#	20	10	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	50.00%	45.00%	5.00%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %	%																	
Source:	Monster																	
Date:	10/16/2018																	

EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY For Period ( 201821 )

Table A10: NON-COMPETITIVE PROMOTIONS - TIME IN GRADE - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex

Table A-10 Non Competitive Promotions 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018	TOTAL WORKFORCE		RACE/ETHNICITY															
			Hispanic or Latino		Non- Hispanic or Latino													
					White		Black or African American		Asian		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific		American Indian Alaska Native		Two or more races			
					male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female
All	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female		
Total Employees Eligible for Career Ladder	#	983	421	562	37	53	290	344	46	95	34	57	0	1	7	7	6	3
	%	100%	42.83%	57.17%	3.76%	5.39%	29.50%	34.99%	4.68%	9.66%	3.46%	5.80%	0.00%	0.10%	0.71%	0.71%	0.61%	0.31%
<b>Time in grade in excess of miniumum</b>																		
1-12 Months	#	59	25	34	2	3	16	16	5	8	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	0
	%	100%	42.37%	57.63%	3.39%	5.08%	27.12%	27.12%	8.47%	13.56%	0.00%	11.86%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.39%	0.00%
13-24 Months	#	19	7	12	0	1	5	5	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100%	36.84%	63.16%	0.00%	5.26%	26.32%	26.32%	5.26%	21.05%	5.26%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
25 + months	#	24	13	11	2	0	8	9	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100%	54.17%	45.83%	8.33%	0.00%	33.33%	37.50%	12.50%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018

**EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Pay Period 201821**

**Table B10 - Non-Competitive Promotions - Time in Grade - By Disability - Permanent Workforce**

Table B-10 Non Competitive Promotions 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		Total	Total by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities								
			(04,05) No Disability	-1 Not Identified	(06-98) Disability	Targeted Disability	(16,19) Deafness	(21,23,25) Blindness	(28,30,32- 38) Missing Limbs/ Extremiti	(64-69) Partial Paralysis	(71-79) Total Paralysis	-82 Convulsi ve Disorder/ Enilepsy	-90 Mental Retardation / Severe	-91 Mental Illness/ Psychiatr	-92 Distortio n Limb- Spine/
Total Employees Eligible	#	983	804	61	118	15	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	9	0
for Career Ladder	%	100%	81.79%	6.21%	12.00%	1.53%	0.10%	0.10%	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	0.20%	0.00%	0.92%	0.00%
<b>Time in Grade Excess of Minimum</b>															
1-12 Months	#	59	42	2	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	%	100%	71.19%	3.39%	25.42%	1.69%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.69%	0.00%
13-24 Months	#	19	16	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100%	84.21%	5.26%	10.53%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
25 + Months	#	24	19	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
	%	100%	79.17%	12.50%	8.33%	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	

Source: Datamart

Date: 10/16/2018

**Table A11: INTERNAL SELECTIONS FOR SENIOR LEVEL POSITIONS (GS 13/14, GS 15, and SES) by Race/Ethnicity and Sex**

Table A11 By Grade Levels 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		Total			RACE/ETHNICITY													
					Hispanic or Latino		Non- Hispanic or Latino											
		All	Male	Female	Male	Female	White		Black or African		Asian		Native		American		Two or More Races	
							Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
<b>13</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	1269	709	560	100	62	354	229	146	197	54	47	7	1	38	11	10	13
	%	100%	55.87%	44.13%	7.88%	4.89%	27.90%	18.05%	11.51%	15.52%	4.26%	3.70%	0.55%	0.08%	2.99%	0.87%	0.79%	1.02%
Qualified	#	415	205	210	29	23	111	102	36	50	19	29	4	1	6	3	0	2
	%	100%	49.40%	50.60%	6.99%	5.54%	26.75%	24.58%	8.67%	12.05%	4.58%	6.99%	0.96%	0.24%	1.45%	0.72%	0.00%	0.48%
Selected	#	127	61	66	7	7	37	30	10	15	6	12	0	1	1	1	0	0
	%	100%	48.03%	51.97%	5.51%	5.51%	29.13%	23.62%	7.87%	11.81%	4.72%	9.45%	0.00%	0.79%	0.79%	0.79%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %																		
<b>14</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	1757	920	837	119	90	469	350	219	295	82	84	2	0	15	5	14	13
	%	100%	52.36%	47.64%	6.77%	5.12%	26.69%	19.92%	12.46%	16.79%	4.67%	4.78%	0.11%	0.00%	0.85%	0.28%	0.80%	0.74%
Qualified	#	801	360	441	37	47	200	216	76	126	36	45	2	0	5	2	4	5
	%	100%	44.94%	55.06%	4.62%	5.87%	24.97%	26.97%	9.49%	15.73%	4.49%	5.62%	0.25%	0.00%	0.62%	0.25%	0.50%	0.62%
Selected	#	128	42	86	3	4	27	53	11	19	1	9	0	0	0	1	0	0
	%	100%	32.81%	67.19%	2.34%	3.13%	21.09%	41.41%	8.59%	14.84%	0.78%	7.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.78%	0.00%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %																		
<b>15</b>																		
Total Applications Received	#	784	471	313	62	42	274	152	98	96	21	14	0	0	6	5	10	4
	%	100%	60.08%	39.92%	7.91%	5.36%	34.95%	19.39%	12.50%	12.24%	2.68%	1.79%	0.00%	0.00%	0.77%	0.64%	1.28%	0.51%
Qualified	#	382	191	191	17	16	134	112	24	52	9	9	0	0	3	2	4	0
	%	100%	50.00%	50.00%	4.45%	4.19%	35.08%	29.32%	6.28%	13.61%	2.36%	2.36%	0.00%	0.00%	0.79%	0.52%	1.05%	0.00%
Selected	#	74	32	42	1	3	23	30	6	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
	%	100%	43.24%	56.76%	1.35%	4.05%	31.08%	40.54%	8.11%	9.46%	1.35%	2.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.35%	0.00%
Relevant Applicant Pool %																		
Source:	Monster																	
Date:	10/16/2018																	



**Table B11: INTERNAL SELECTIONS FOR SENIOR LEVEL (GS 13/14, GS 15, and SES) POSITIONS by Disability**

Table B11 By Grade Levels 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018		Total	Total by Disability Status				Detail for Targeted Disabilities											
			No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06 - 98]	Targeted Disability	Developmental Disability [02]	Traumatic Brain Injury [03]	Deaf or Serious Difficulty Hearing [19]	Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing [20]	Missing Extremities [31]	Significant Mobility Impairment [40]	Partial or Complete Paralysis [60]	Epilepsy or Other Seizure Disorders [82]	Intellectual Disability [90]	Significant Psychiatric Disorder [91]	Dwarfism [92]	Significant Disfigurement [93]
<b>Grade: 13</b>																		
Relevant Applicant Pool %	%																	
Total Applications Received	#	1660	890	616	154	79	0	15	15	7	1	12	3	4	4	37	0	2
	%	100.00%	53.61%	37.11%	9.28%	4.76%	0.00%	0.90%	0.90%	0.42%	0.06%	0.72%	0.18%	0.24%	0.24%	2.23%	0.00%	0.12%
Qualified	#	544	298	224	22	14	0	0	4	0	0	4	1	1	1	7	0	2
	%	100.00%	54.78%	41.18%	4.04%	2.57%	0.00%	0.00%	0.74%	0.00%	0.00%	0.74%	0.18%	0.18%	0.18%	1.29%	0.00%	0.37%
Selected	#	157	96	58	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	61.15%	36.94%	1.91%	1.91%	0.00%	0.00%	1.27%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.64%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Grade: 14</b>																		
Relevant Applicant Pool %	%																	
Total Applications Received	#	2385	1211	1074	100	49	2	8	7	3	0	11	4	4	0	26	0	2
	%	100.00%	50.78%	45.03%	4.19%	2.05%	0.08%	0.34%	0.29%	0.13%	0.00%	0.46%	0.17%	0.17%	0.00%	1.09%	0.00%	0.08%
Qualified	#	1062	544	500	18	13	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	1	0	6	0	0
	%	100.00%	51.22%	47.08%	1.69%	1.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.28%	0.09%	0.09%	0.00%	0.56%	0.00%	0.00%
Selected	#	177	98	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	55.37%	44.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
<b>Grade: 15</b>																		
Relevant Applicant Pool %	%																	
Total Applications Received	#	1033	510	473	50	32	3	4	4	7	1	6	2	0	0	24	0	4
	%	100.00%	49.37%	45.79%	4.84%	3.10%	0.29%	0.39%	0.39%	0.68%	0.10%	0.58%	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	2.32%	0.00%	0.39%
Qualified	#	497	235	255	7	4	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	
	%	100.00%	47.28%	51.31%	1.41%	0.80%	0.00%	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	0.40%	0.00%	0.20%	
Selected	#	98	45	50	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	100.00%	45.92%	51.02%	3.06%	1.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.02%	1.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Source:		Monster																
Date:		10/16/2018																

**EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY For Period ( 2017-10-01 TO 2018-09-30 )**

**Table A13 - Employee Recognition and Awards - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex - Permanent Workforce**

Table A13 - Employee Recognition and Awards 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018	TOTAL EMPLOYEES		RACE/ETHNICITY															
			Hispanic or Latino		Non- Hispanic or Latino													
					White		Black or African American		Asian		Native Hawaiian Other Pacific		American Indian Alaska Native		Two or more races			
					male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female
All	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female		
<b>Time-Off Awards - 1-9 hours</b>																		
	#	3535	1638	1897	138	161	1175	1066	180	498	115	136	0	1	22	23	8	12
Total Time-Off Awards Given	%	100%	46.34%	53.66%	3.90%	4.55%	33.24%	30.16%	5.09%	14.09%	3.25%	3.85%	0.00%	0.03%	0.62%	0.65%	0.23%	0.34%
Total Hours		24090	11233	12857	910	1015	8050	7334	1268	3376	796	906	0	8	158	131	51	87
Average Hours		7	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	8	7	6	6	7
<b>Time-Off Awards - 9+ hours</b>																		
	#	4148	1651	2497	93	167	1261	1535	184	588	94	153	2	1	10	29	6	23
Total Time-Off Awards Given	%	100%	39.80%	60.20%	2.24%	4.03%	30.40%	37.01%	4.44%	14.18%	2.27%	3.69%	0.05%	0.02%	0.24%	0.70%	0.14%	0.55%
Total Hours		95352	37124	58228	1975	3866	28995	37421	3770	11991	1977	3699	36	16	255	640	106	579
Average Hours		23	22	23	21	23	23	24	20	20	21	24	18	16	26	22	18	25
<b>Cash Awards - \$100 - \$500</b>																		
	#	3183	1383	1800	86	123	1014	1095	159	435	106	117	1	1	11	15	5	14
Total Cash Awards Given	%	100%	43.45%	56.55%	2.70%	3.86%	31.86%	34.40%	5.00%	13.67%	3.33%	3.68%	0.03%	0.03%	0.35%	0.47%	0.16%	0.44%
Total Amount		\$1,079,079	\$461,624	\$617,455	\$30,583	\$39,634	\$337,948	\$371,323	\$51,799	\$152,991	\$35,963	\$42,934	\$250	\$250	\$3,500	\$5,123	\$1,381	\$5,200
Average Amount		\$339	\$334	\$343	\$356	\$322	\$333	\$339	\$326	\$352	\$339	\$367	\$250	\$250	\$318	\$342	\$276	\$371
<b>Cash Awards - \$501+</b>																		
	#	12707	6067	6640	411	504	4535	3952	605	1580	422	472	7	10	63	80	22	41
Total Cash Awards Given	%	100%	47.75%	52.25%	3.23%	3.97%	35.69%	31.10%	4.76%	12.43%	3.32%	3.71%	0.06%	0.08%	0.50%	0.63%	0.17%	0.32%
Total Amount		\$26,067,593	\$12,783,034	\$13,284,559	\$862,785	\$944,130	\$9,745,968	\$8,197,548	\$1,146,455	\$2,977,958	\$855,584	\$915,461	\$14,034	\$20,590	\$117,555	\$140,648	\$38,404	\$86,678
Average Amount		\$2,051	\$2,107	\$2,001	\$2,099	\$1,873	\$2,149	\$2,074	\$1,895	\$1,885	\$2,027	\$1,940	\$2,005	\$2,059	\$1,866	\$1,758	\$1,746	\$2,114
<b>Senior Executive Service Performance Awards</b>																		
	#	197	114	83	6	2	94	69	10	10	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
Total Cash Awards Given	%	100%	57.87%	42.13%	3.05%	1.02%	47.72%	35.03%	5.08%	5.08%	1.52%	1.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.51%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total Amount		\$2,708,256	\$1,621,302	\$1,086,954	\$67,045	\$21,000	\$1,335,952	\$905,718	\$157,037	\$129,438	\$48,895	\$30,798	\$0	\$0	\$12,373	\$0	\$0	\$0
Average Amount		\$13,747	\$14,222	\$13,096	\$11,174	\$10,500	\$14,212	\$13,126	\$15,704	\$12,944	\$16,298	\$15,399	\$0	\$0	\$12,373	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Quality Step Increases(QSI)</b>																		
	#	378	171	207	6	13	139	135	15	40	9	18	0	0	1	0	1	1
Total QSIs Awarded	%	100%	45.24%	54.76%	1.59%	3.44%	36.77%	35.71%	3.97%	10.58%	2.38%	4.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.26%	0.00%	0.26%	0.26%
Total Benefit		\$1,250,880	\$562,803	\$688,077	\$20,450	\$41,544	\$455,141	\$456,575	\$48,439	\$128,765	\$32,800	\$57,961	\$0	\$0	\$2,461	\$0	\$3,512	\$3,232
Average Benefit		\$3,309	\$3,291	\$3,324	\$3,408	\$3,196	\$3,274	\$3,382	\$3,229	\$3,219	\$3,644	\$3,220	\$0	\$0	\$2,461	\$0	\$3,512	\$3,232

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018

**EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY For Period ( 2017-10-01 TO 2018-09-30 )**

**Table B13 - Employee Recognition and Awards - Distribution by Disability - Permanent Workforce**

Table B13 - Employee Recognition and Awards 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018	Total	Total by Disability Status					Detail for Targeted Disabilities								
		(04,05)	-1	(06-98)	Targeted	(16,19)	(21,23,25)	(28,30,32-38)	(64-69)	(71-79)	-82	-90	-91	-92	
		No Disability	Not Identified	Disability	Disability	Deafness	Blindness	Missing Limbs/	Partial Paralysis	Total Paralysis	Convulsive Disorder/	Mental Retardation	Mental Illness/	Distortion Limb-	
<b>Time-Off Awards - 1-9 hours</b>															
Total Time-Off Awards	#	3535	3142	112	281	76	8	8	1	20	0	12	1	25	1
Given	%	100%	88.88%	3.17%	7.95%	2.15%	0.23%	0.23%	0.03%	0.57%	0.00%	0.34%	0.03%	0.71%	0.03%
Total Hours		24090	21337	787	1966	523	51	64	8	143	0	67	8	174	8
Average Hours		7	7	7	7	7	6	8	8	7	0	6	8	7	8
<b>Time-Off Awards - 9+ hours</b>															
Total Time-Off Awards	#	4148	3679	130	339	74	3	11	1	29	0	6	1	23	0
Given	%	100%	88.69%	3.13%	8.17%	1.78%	0.07%	0.27%	0.02%	0.70%	0.00%	0.14%	0.02%	0.55%	0.00%
Total Hours		95352	84423	3175	7754	1678	62	265	25	687	0	112	20	507	0
Average Hours		23	23	24	23	23	21	24	25	24	0	19	20	22	0
<b>Cash Awards - \$100 - \$500</b>															
Total Cash Awards	#	3183	2845	78	260	69	3	5	1	20	1	10	3	25	1
Given	%	100%	89.38%	2.45%	8.17%	2.17%	0.09%	0.16%	0.03%	0.63%	0.03%	0.31%	0.09%	0.79%	0.03%
Total Amount		\$1,079,079	\$964,314	\$26,710	\$88,055	\$24,344	\$1,289	\$1,800	\$400	\$6,680	\$500	\$3,650	\$1,075	\$8,550	\$400
Average Amount		\$339	\$339	\$342	\$339	\$353	\$430	\$360	\$400	\$334	\$500	\$365	\$358	\$342	\$400
<b>Cash Awards - \$501+</b>															
Total Cash Awards	#	12707	11457	315	935	204	15	27	3	76	3	25	1	53	1
Given	%	100%	90.16%	2.48%	7.36%	1.61%	0.12%	0.21%	0.02%	0.60%	0.02%	0.20%	0.01%	0.42%	0.01%
Total Amount		\$26,067,593	\$23,759,693	\$609,292	\$1,698,608	\$364,207	\$20,695	\$58,310	\$4,333	\$135,618	\$4,465	\$47,364	\$1,500	\$90,613	\$1,309
Average Amount		\$2,051	\$2,074	\$1,934	\$1,817	\$1,785	\$1,380	\$2,160	\$1,444	\$1,784	\$1,488	\$1,895	\$1,500	\$1,710	\$1,309
<b>Senior Executive Service Performance Awards</b>															
Total Cash Awards	#	197	181	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Given	%	100%	91.88%	3.05%	5.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total Amount		\$2,708,256	\$2,496,131	\$74,473	\$137,652	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Average Amount		\$13,747	\$13,791	\$12,412	\$13,765	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Quality Step Increases(QSI)</b>															
Total Cash Awards	#	378	343	12	23	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Given	%	100%	90.74%	3.17%	6.08%	0.79%	0.00%	0.26%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.26%	0.00%	0.26%	0.00%
Total Amount		\$1,250,880	\$1,137,793	\$40,018	\$73,069	\$10,444	\$0	\$4,493	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,232	\$0	\$2,719	\$0
Average Amount		\$3,309	\$3,317	\$3,335	\$3,177	\$3,481	0	\$4,493	0	0	0	\$3,232	0	\$2,719	0

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018

EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY For Period ( 2017-10-01 TO 2018-09-30 )

Table A14 - Separations by Type of Separation - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex - Permanent Workforce

Table A-14 Separations 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018	TOTAL EMPLOYEES		RACE/ETHNICITY															
			Hispanic or Latino				Non- Hispanic or Latino											
							White		Black or African American		Asian		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		American Indian Alaska Native		Two or more races	
			All	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male	female	male
Voluntary	#	790	408	383	14	27	330	237	37	85	24	28	1	1	2	3	0	1
	%	100%	51.65%	48.48%	1.77%	3.42%	41.77%	30.00%	4.68%	10.76%	3.04%	3.54%	0.13%	0.13%	0.25%	0.38%	0.00%	0.13%
Involuntary	#	22	10	13	1	2	5	5	2	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	%	100%	45.45%	59.09%	4.55%	9.09%	22.73%	22.73%	9.09%	18.18%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.55%	0.00%	0.00%	
RIF	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total separation	#	812	418	396	15	29	335	242	39	89	26	28	1	1	2	4	0	1
	%	100%	51.48%	48.77%	1.85%	3.57%	41.26%	29.80%	4.80%	10.96%	3.20%	3.45%	0.12%	0.12%	0.25%	0.49%	0.00%	0.12%

EPA - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY For Period ( 2017-10-01 TO 2018-09-30 )

Table B14 - Separations by Type of Separation - Distribution by Disability - Permanent Workforce

Table B-14 Separations 10/01/2017 to 09/30/2018	Total	Total by Disability Status							Detail for Targeted Disabilities							
		(04,05)	-1	(06-98)	Targeted	(16,19)	(21,23,25)	(28,30,32-38)	(64-69)	(71-79)	-82	-90	-91	-92		
		No Disability	Not Identified	Disability	Disability	Deafness	Blindness	Missing Limbs/Extremities	Partial Paralysis	Total Paralysis	Convulsive Disorder/ Epilepsy	Mental Retardation/ Severe	Mental Illness/ Psychiatric	Distortion Limb-Spine/ Dwarfism		
Voluntary	#	791	672	28	91	26	0	0	1	16	0	1	0	7	1	
	%	100%	84.96%	3.54%	11.50%	3.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.13%	2.02%	0.00%	0.13%	0.00%	0.88%	0.13%	
Involuntary	#	23	13	2	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		
	%	100%	56.52%	8.70%	34.78%	8.70%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.70%	0.00%		
RIF	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		
Total Separations	#	814	685	30	99	28	0	0	1	16	0	1	0	9	1	
	%	100%	84.15%	3.69%	12.16%	3.44%	0.00%	0.00%	0.12%	1.97%	0.00%	0.12%	0.00%	1.11%	0.12%	

Source: Datamart  
Date: 10/16/2018