



Appendix A

*Comprehensive Listing of
FY 2002 Program Evaluations*

APPENDIX A: COMPREHENSIVE LISTING OF PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 1, Objectives 1 and 2</p> <p>Environmental Protection: The Federal Government Could Help Communities Better Plan for Transportation That Protects Air Quality</p> <p>As Congress begins the reauthorization of the surface transportation programs, it will consider whether to continue or revise these initiatives. To help inform this work, the General Accounting Office (GAO) comments on (1) the impacts of surface transportation on air quality; (2) the benefits and limits of key federal surface transportation and clean air requirements and programs designed to mitigate these impacts; and (3) ways the federal government can use these requirements and programs to further reduce these impacts.</p>	<p>GAO had three key findings: (1) air pollution from vehicle emissions will continue to pose health and environmental risks to some communities, despite new technology and emissions limits; (2) federal laws and programs linking transportation to improved air quality have helped targeted communities control pollution but could be more comprehensive; and (3) planners have identified additional ways the federal government could help further limit transportation impacts on air quality, including financial incentives, technical assistance, and public outreach.</p>	<p>The program recognizes the importance of GAO's findings and where appropriate will incorporate them into program planning.</p>	<p>Testimony before the Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate</p> <p>GAO-02-988T</p> <p>July 30, 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.gao.gov</p>
<p>Goal 1, Objective 1</p> <p>Consistency and Transparency in Determination of EPA's Anticipated Ozone Designations</p> <p>The purpose of this Office of the Inspector General (OIG) review was to determine whether each of the EPA regional offices used a specific process, method, or approach for obtaining stakeholder input for the 1-hour ozone designations; what process, method, or approach was used for the preliminary analysis of the 8-hour ozone designations; and the potential usefulness of the Multi-criteria Integrated Resource Assessment (MIRA) decision approach.</p>	<p>The OIG found that the guidance for the preliminary 8-hour ozone designations is more comprehensive than the approach EPA used in 1990, with respect to stakeholder participation and in terms of providing criteria that states should consider if proposing larger or smaller metropolitan nonattainment boundaries. The OIG, however, states that the preliminary 8-hour ozone guidance did not provide a methodical process for the regions and states to use when considering the 11 criteria. Without a consistent regional approach, the ozone designations might not be fair or equitable throughout the Nation. The OIG recommends that EPA use an approach similar to the MIRA approach used by Region 3 to address the preliminary 8-hour ozone designations, noting that this or a similar multi-criteria approach could be useful for all EPA regions.</p>	<p>EPA's Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) stated in its response to the draft report that it does not agree with the recommendation in the report and maintains that MIRA cannot be used as the sole tool for designating areas under the Clean Air Act. OAR believes that the primary approach for assigning designations should be a case-by-case consideration and evaluation of each area's unique situation and circumstances. OAR completed its final response to the August 15, 2002, report in October 2002.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of the Inspector General</p> <p>2002-S-00016</p> <p>August 15, 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/oigearth/ereading_room/list901/Mira.Final.08-15.pdf</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 1, Objective 1</p> <p>Air: Open Market Trading Program for Air Emissions Needs Strengthening</p> <p>The objectives of the OIG's program evaluation were to determine (1) whether EPA's basis for proposing to approve selected air emissions open market trading (OMT) programs was adequate; (2) the extent of use of EPA-approved emissions quantification protocols and whether accurate, reliable data underlie OMT trades in these programs; and (3) the extent of EPA and state compliance assurance, enforcement, and oversight activities relative to OMT trades.</p>	<p>The OIG made several recommendations to the OAR based on its review of OMT programs in Michigan and New Jersey, including that EPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and propose federal regulations for OMT programs. • Ensure that shutdown credits are not allowed to be traded in OMT programs. • Require the use of EPA- and state-approved emissions quantification protocols prior to allowing trades to occur. • Develop and require the use of a risk-based targeting approach for federal and state compliance assurance, enforcement, and oversight of OMT trades. 	<p>EPA provided comments on the draft report on September 26, 2002. EPA communicated its final response verbally to the IG and a final written response was sent to the IG, at the end of January 2003.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of the Inspector General 2002-P-00019 September 30, 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/oigearth/ereading_room/omt.pdf</p>
<p>Goal 1, Objectives 1 and 2</p> <p>Environmental Protection: Federal Incentives Could Help Promote Land Use That Protects Air and Water Quality</p> <p>Congress asked GAO to examine the extent to which local transportation planners, state air quality managers, and water quality officials consider the impacts of land use on the environment and to identify actions federal agencies can take to help these officials assess land use impacts.</p>	<p>In its report, GAO recommends several key actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPA should target available financial incentives in ways that encourage transportation planners, environmental officials, and local decision makers to collaboratively consider the impacts of transportation and land use on air quality and should take more action to educate the public and local decision makers about the air quality impacts of their transportation and land use decisions. • Both EPA and the Department of Transportation should provide more access to technical tools, such as staff and user-friendly models that integrate transportation, environmental protection, and land use, and better market these tools to transportation and local decision makers. 	<p>The program recognizes the importance of GAO's findings and where appropriate will incorporate them into program planning.</p>	<p>General Accounting Office GAO-02-12 October 31, 2001</p> <p>Located at: http://www.gao.gov</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 1, Objectives 1 and 2</p> <p>Public Participation in Louisiana's Air Permitting Program and EPA Oversight</p> <p>At EPA's request, the OIG performed a review of the public participation process in Louisiana, which is covered by EPA Region 6. Specifically, the OIG performed a review of the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality's (LDEQ) Title V program. The review evaluated whether LDEQ allows for effective public participation in the implementation of its air permitting process and whether EPA Region 6 provides effective oversight of LDEQ's air permitting program.</p>	<p>The OIG found that LDEQ minimally met the public participation requirements for air permitting. However, the OIG states that LDEQ's records were often unorganized, incomplete, missing, or inaccessible. In addition, LDEQ did not clearly define the role of its public participation group; as a result, the public was unable to access, or had difficulty accessing, key records needed to effectively review, evaluate, and comment on facilities' proposed operations, thus hindering the public's ability to effectively comment on proposed permits. The OIG also found that EPA Region 6 did not perform adequate oversight of LDEQ's public participation activities. The OIG said that Region 6 generally did not review public comments before LDEQ issued permits because the Region did not require LDEQ to provide such comments to the Region until after the permit had been issued. It also asserted that Region 6 did not take a proactive approach to oversight of public participation issues or perform a thorough on-site review at LDEQ.</p>	<p>By November 5, 2002, EPA will have in place an Action Plan that responds to the OIG report. In addition, Region 6 will conduct an in-depth program review by the end of December 2002.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of the Inspector General 01351-2002-P-00011 August 7, 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/oigearth/ereading_room/2002P00011.pdf</p>
<p>Goal 1, Objectives 1 and 2</p> <p>Evaluation Report: EPA and State Progress in Issuing Title V Permits</p> <p>The objectives of this OIG evaluation were to identify (1) factors delaying the issuance of Title V permits by selected state and local agencies and (2) practices contributing to more timely issuance of permits by selected state and local agencies.</p>	<p>The basic findings of this OIG report are as follows: (1) lack of state resources, complex EPA regulations, and conflicting priorities contributed to permit delays; (2) EPA oversight and technical assistance had limited impact; and (3) management support, partnerships, and site visits contributed to more timely issuance of Title V permits.</p>	<p>In general, OAR agreed with the OIG's conclusion that more could be done to improve EPA and state progress in issuing Title V permits. On July 11, 2002, EPA issued a memorandum to the OIG that responds to the OIG's recommendations and documents the OAR action plan for implementing the recommendations. OAR has continued to support the implementation of state operating permit programs, and at the end of FY 2002 more than 14,000 sources (73 percent) are operating under Title V permits.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of the Inspector General 2002-P-00008 March 29, 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/oigearth/ereading_room/TitleV.PDF</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 1, Objectives 1, 2, and 4</p> <p>Estimating the Public Health Benefits of Proposed Air Pollution Regulations</p> <p>In 2000 Congress directed EPA to have the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) conduct a study on health benefits analysis methodology and recommend to the Agency a common methodology to be followed in all future analyses. Specifically, the Committee was asked to do the following: (1) consider issues important in estimating the health-risk-reduction benefits of air pollution regulations, including the scientific data, risk assessment approaches, populations affected, baseline used, assumptions, analysis of uncertainty, and identification of key indicators of exposure and population health status; (2) critically review methods used for recent estimates of regulatory health benefits; (3) identify methods used by federal regulatory agencies and others, recommend standard good-practice guidelines and principles for estimating health benefits, and delineate the data-gathering required to better assess health benefits in the future; (4) identify approaches to estimating regulatory health benefits when relevant information is limited; and (5) where applicable, recommend areas for further research and monitoring.</p>	<p>The findings of the National Research Council are centered around the key methodological issues in benefits analyses, including (1) regulatory options, boundaries, and baselines; (2) exposure assessment; (3) health outcomes; (4) concentration-response function; (5) analysis of uncertainty; and (6) presentation of results. Overall, the committee found that EPA has generally used a reasonable framework for conducting health benefits analysis when estimating the health benefits of proposed air pollution control regulations. In addition, the committee made recommendations on how EPA's implementation of the steps could be improved.</p>	<p>Although there is no formal response to this study, EPA is encouraged by NAS's affirmation of the methodology that EPA uses in its health benefits analyses of air pollution regulations. Estimating the health benefits of EPA's rules is an important component of the Agency's air quality management program, and EPA continuously works to ensure that it uses the best available methods to determine how its actions will protect the American public. The report confirms that EPA is doing a good job of analyzing the benefits of its regulations and gives the Agency a number of suggestions on how to further improve those analyses. EPA will study the recommendations and talk further with Academy members as it works to make its health benefits analyses the best possible.</p>	<p>National Academies, National Research Council, Committee on Estimating the Health-Risk-Reduction Benefits of Proposed Air Pollution Regulations and Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology</p> <p>September 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.nap.edu/books/0309086094/html/</p>
<p>Goal 1, Objectives 1, 2, and 4</p> <p>Tribal Air Capacity Evaluation</p> <p>The purpose of this evaluation was to assess how effectively the program is using its resources to achieve the key objectives of building tribal capacity, addressing air quality problems, and providing the necessary tools.</p> <p>Contributors included numerous tribes across the United States; several tribal non-governmental organizations (the American Indian Science and Engineering Society, the Institute for Tribal Environmental Professionals, and the National Tribal Environmental Council); and EPA headquarters, regional, and program office staff.</p>	<p>The evaluation findings focused partly on the success the program has had since 1995, increasing the number of participating tribes from 9 to 117, and partly on the significant remaining needs for support, expertise, and coordination. The report provided 30 recommendations in the areas of building capacity, guidance and policy development, resources, and technical assistance. Resource issues were noted as constraints, but not specifically addressed.</p>	<p>Many of the recommendations were being implemented before the evaluation was complete, and several more will be implemented over time. EPA's Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) is also holding discussions with regional offices to ensure that the appropriate recommendations are adopted. Most recommendations have been or will be adopted or incorporated into the program in an ongoing manner.</p>	<p>Industrial Economics, Incorporated, and Ross & Associates</p> <p>June 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/oar/tribal/announce.html</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 1, Objectives 1, 2, and 4</p> <p>Memorandum Report: Clean Air Design Evaluation Results</p> <p>The purpose of this evaluation was to (1) identify and document the design of the Clean Air Program to achieve its Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) goals; (2) identify any opportunities for improving the design of the program; and (3) recommend specific evaluations and audits to be conducted over a period of time to evaluate EPA's success in meeting Clean Air goals.</p>	<p>The OIG report presents several broad findings: (1) EPA might not be able to demonstrate achievement of long-term strategic goal under the current GPRA structure; (2) outcome information is available but not used within the GPRA framework for the Acid Rain Goal; (3) EPA's Annual Performance Report could be more focused on environmental outcomes; and (4) the role of enforcement is not linked to the Clean Air program.</p>	<p>EPA has made no formal response to the OIG report. OAR is continuing to work on demonstrating the link between annual work and long-term strategic goals in various documents. The work under way to revise the Agency's Strategic Plan will provide the key platform for improving these linkages.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of the Inspector General 2002-M-000013 April 23, 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/oigearth/ereading_room/AirEval042302.pdf</p>
<p>Goal 1, Objective 4</p> <p>Air Pollution: Emissions from Older Electricity Generating Units</p> <p>In May 2001 the administration issued <i>National Energy Policy</i>, a report that cited needs forecast by the Energy Information Administration for additional power plants over the next 20 years. In September 2001 the Committee on Environment and Public Works asked GAO to provide information on air emissions from future electricity generation. This report transmits information on emissions in 2000 (the most current data available at the time) from existing units that burned fossil fuel.</p>	<p>In this report, GAO identified (1) the proportions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and carbon dioxide emitted and electricity generated by older fossil-fuel units (as a group) relative to newer units (as a group) in 2000, as well as the locations and type of fuel burned by units responsible for the majority of the emissions, and (2) the proportions of older fossil-fuel units that, in 2000, emitted sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides at rates above the new source standards applicable to newer units, the location of these additional emissions, and the type of fuel burned by these units. GAO analyzed data on air emissions and electricity generation from units with a generating capacity greater than 15 megawatts. GAO obtained these data from Platts/RDI, a private vendor that integrates data on air emissions from EPA with data on electricity generation and the age of individual units from the Energy Information Administration. Although these data were the most comprehensive available, they might understate the total emissions from fossil-fuel units because some units are not required to report their emissions to regulatory agencies. The units that did not report emissions, however, generated less than 1 percent of the electricity from older units in 2000. Of the 1,396 operating older units, 1,157 (83 percent) reported emissions data in 2000.</p>	<p>There is no planned response.</p>	<p>General Accounting Office GAO-02-709 June 12, 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.gao.gov</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 2, Objective 1</p> <p>Drinking Water: Key Aspects of EPA's Revolving Fund Program Needed to Be Strengthened</p> <p>The purpose of the evaluation was to assess (1) the accuracy of EPA's assessment of drinking water infrastructure needs; (2) EPA's efforts to monitor states' implementation of the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) program; and (3) the extent to which states use the optional disadvantaged assistance provision in the DWSRF program.</p>	<p>GAO reported that (1) users of the needs assessment cannot get a sense of the estimate's accuracy because EPA did not calculate the level of precision achieved; (2) EPA is not taking full advantage of oversight tools because it has not yet finalized and consistently applied financial management and other program measures to assist in the annual review of state performance; (3) untimely and inconsistent preparation of program evaluation report reviews has hampered the Agency's ability to identify common or recurring problems; and (4) gaps in the financial audit coverage and a limited review of the completed audits undermine EPA's ability to fully assess the financial conditions of state DWSRF programs.</p> <p>GAO also noted that states were making limited use of the disadvantaged assistance provisions under the DWSRF, but made no recommendations in this area.</p>	<p>First, EPA has gone to great lengths to ensure accuracy in the surveys by requiring extensive documentation for reported needs and costs, conducting site visits to small systems, and performing quality assurance reviews of the responses to the survey questionnaire. With respect to the second and third findings, EPA has finalized financial measures and is developing program measures to assist in program oversight and is also working with its regional offices to address review shortcomings identified by GAO. Finally, the Office of Water is working with the Inspector General to initiate DWSRF audit coverage and improve interoffice communication of results of independent audit quality reviews.</p>	<p>General Accounting Office GAO-02-135 January 24, 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.gao.gov</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 2, Objectives 1, 2, and 3</p> <p>A Review of Statewide Watershed Management Approaches</p> <p>EPA's Office of Water (OW) conducted an evaluation of eight states' experiences with different models of the statewide watershed management approach. The study focused on the impact of the watershed approach on federal and state program management and coordination, public involvement, and the implementation of six core programs under the CWA and the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA). The evaluation approach consisted of discussion sessions with managers and staff in selected states, EPA regions, and state watershed organizations.</p>	<p>The evaluation found that most state managers were positive about their states' experience with the watershed approach and identified specific benefits: (1) an increase in the quality and quantity of monitoring data, (2) better-focused water quality assessments and planning, (3) more efficient and equitable permitting programs, (4) improved coordination and integration of state water program functions and goals, and (5) greater public involvement in state water quality program decision making. State water quality monitoring and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting programs are most involved and have received the greatest benefits from a statewide watershed approach. States identified several constraints, however, to effective implementation of statewide watershed approaches: (1) programmatic requirements under the CWA and SDWA can sometimes conflict with states' efforts to plan and implement core programs on a basin or watershed basis and (2) more EPA involvement at the watershed level would enhance states' watershed efforts and provide EPA with a better understanding of local/basin issues.</p>	<p>EPA's OW plans to integrate a number of the study's recommendations into its current strategies and planning documents.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of Water</p> <p>April 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/owow/watershed/approaches_fr.pdf</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 2, Objective 2</p> <p>2002 National Estuary Program Implementation Review</p> <p>The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the progress made by 19 of 28 National Estuary Programs in implementing their Comprehensive Conservation Management Plans developed under section 320 of the CWA. The findings are used to determine whether an estuary program is eligible for continued funding under CWA section 320. The next implementation review for these estuary programs will take place in 2005.</p>	<p>The evaluation findings identified one estuary program that was required to respond to substantial concerns raised by EPA in order to be eligible for continued funding under section 320. The other 18 estuary programs were found to be making substantial progress implementing their management plans and therefore are eligible for continued funding. The review results are documented in letters to each of the estuary programs and include EPA's recognition of outstanding achievements as well as identification of challenges each program faces in its continued efforts to implement management plans to protect and restore its estuary.</p>	<p>Some challenges are common to most, if not all, of the estuary programs. For example, most estuary programs are struggling with developing a user-friendly system to track their progress in implementing their management plans. Another common challenge is finding the financial resources needed to implement the numerous recommended estuary protection and restoration action plans contained in the management plans. To help the estuary programs address common challenges such as these, EPA provides training and technical assistance.</p>	<p>Various headquarters and regional NEP Coordinators</p> <p>The 2002 National Estuary Program Implementation Review results are documented in letters addressed to each of the estuary programs. Copies of the letters are kept on file in the Coastal Management Branch (CMB) of EPA.</p> <p>Contact: 202-566-1240</p>
<p>Goal 5 Objective 1</p> <p>Information Technology—Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) Data Quality Report</p> <p>The objective of this audit was to determine whether CERCLIS data for active and archived sites were accurate and reliable (timely, complete, and consistent).</p>	<p>This audit evaluated the accuracy, completeness, timeliness, and consistency of the data entered into CERCLIS. The weaknesses identified were caused by the lack of an effective quality assurance process and adequate internal controls over CERCLIS data quality.</p> <p>The report provided 11 recommendations to improve controls over CERCLIS data quality.</p>	<p>OSWER concurs with the recommendations contained in the audit. Due to the extended period of time since the inception of this audit, many of the identified problems have been corrected or actions that would address these recommendations are under way.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of the Inspector General 2002-P-00016 September 30, 2002 http://www.epa.gov/oigearth/eroom.htm</p>
<p>Goal 5, Objective 1</p> <p>Lessons Learned in the Aftermath of September 11, 2001</p> <p>Challenges Faced During the Environmental Protection Agency's Response to Anthrax and Recommendations for Enhancing Response Capabilities: A Lessons Learned Report</p> <p>The reports were commissioned so EPA could examine the successes and shortfalls of technical and oversight activities following the responses to September 11 and the detection of anthrax contamination across the United States and apply that knowledge to future responses.</p>	<p>These reports conclude that overall the Agency did an excellent job responding to these unprecedented acts of terrorism and successfully carried out its mission to protect human health and the environment.</p> <p>Recommendations were provided in the reports to help improve the Agency's response to similar situations in the future.</p>	<p>The Agency has taken numerous key actions to respond to the recommendations in the reports. In addition, many recommendations were incorporated into the Agency's Strategic Plan for Homeland Security, which was released October 2, 2002.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response September 11 Report: February 2002 Anthrax Report: September 2002 Contact: Barbara Grimm-Crawford 202-566-0177 Helen DuTeau 703-603-8761</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 5, Objective 1</p> <p>RCRA Hazardous Waste Delisting: The First 20 Years—Outcomes and Impacts of the Hazardous Waste Delisting Program Under the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)</p> <p>This evaluation describes the rationale for conducting a program evaluation, the results and outcomes of the delisting program. This evaluation was undertaken as part of EPA's implementation of GPRA.</p>	<p>The delisting program distinctly demonstrates a significant economic impact: reductions in deadweight loss to the economy totaling over \$100 million each year. Continued efficiencies and refinements in the delisting petition review process should only improve those results. The environmental impacts are not as clear, although EPA does not have reason to suspect that delisted wastes are causing environmental problems.</p>	<p>None currently identified.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of Solid Waste</p> <p>EPA-530-R-02-014</p> <p>June 2002</p> <p>http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/id/delist/index.htm</p>
<p>Goal 5, Objective 1</p> <p>Superfund Mega-Sites</p> <p>The preliminary research was directed toward answering the following questions: (1) How does achievement of the new GPRA environmental indicators for Superfund affect management of mega-site cleanups? (2) What resources are being spent and have been spent? What criteria are used in determining when and how resources are to be spent? How effectively are resources being spent? (3) What management practices have been used at mega-sites? Which management practices are best in efficiency, effectiveness, and cost?</p>	<p>The evaluation focused on two draft Superfund Environmental Indicators (EIs). EIs are specific measures of program performance used to assess progress toward cleaning up a hazardous waste site. This review was the initial component of the OIG's program evaluation of Superfund mega-sites. The draft EIs, Human Exposure Under Control and Contaminated Groundwater Migration Under Control, are measures of interim progress of Superfund program goals for all Superfund sites, including mega-sites. In general, the IG found that the indicators meet the needs of the program but gave specific implementation recommendations.</p>	<p>Many of the recommendations were being implemented before the evaluation was complete, and several more will be implemented over time. Most recommendations have been or will be adopted or incorporated into the program in an ongoing manner.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of the Inspector General</p> <p>2002-P-3</p> <p>December 27, 2001</p> <p>Contact: 202-566-2888</p>
<p>Goal 5, Objective 2</p> <p>Underground Storage Tank Operation and Maintenance: An Assessment of Available Training and Outreach</p> <p>The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the greatest training needs for underground storage tank (UST) inspectors, owners, and facility operators, and to recommend approaches for meeting those training needs.</p>	<p>The evaluation identified a number of training needs, including a need for facility-specific training/guidance, training that can reach people throughout the country, and practical field experience along with classroom training. The report provided numerous recommendations, with primary emphasis on developing computer-based training and customized outreach/education material.</p>	<p>Many of the recommendations are being implemented or are being seriously considered. EPA is developing a state/EPA work group to determine short-term and long-term training priorities. This report will serve as a foundation for the work group's discussions.</p>	<p>Industrial Economics, Incorporated, and Marasco Newton Group, with assistance from various EPA and state inspectors and program managers, as well as UST industry contacts and trainers.</p> <p>May 2002</p> <p>Contact: 703-603-7141</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 5, Objective 2</p> <p>Environmental Contamination— Many Uncertainties Affect the Progress of the Spring Valley Cleanup</p> <p>The purpose of this evaluation was to obtain information about the roles and responsibilities of the government entities involved in addressing Spring Valley, assess the progress of environmental restoration, and estimate the cost of cleanup.</p>	<p>The government entities involved in the cleanup of Spring Valley have formed an active partnership to make cleanup decisions. Continued progress at the site will depend on this partnership.</p> <p>The government entities have identified and removed a large number of hazards, but the extent of remaining hazards is unknown. The primary health risks at Spring Valley are the possibility of injury or death from exploding or leaking ordnance and containers of chemical warfare agents and potential long-term health problems from exposure to arsenic-contaminated soil.</p> <p>The U.S. Army estimated that the remaining cleanup activities at Spring Valley would cost \$71.7 million and take 5 years to complete, but the reliability of these estimates is uncertain.</p>	<p>The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is the lead agency at the site, and it is responsible for addressing the recommendations.</p> <p>EPA will continue to support the partnership and work closely with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the District of Columbia.</p>	<p>General Accounting Office</p> <p>GAO-02-556</p> <p>May 20, 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.gao.gov</p>
<p>Goal 5, Objective 2</p> <p>Chemical Safety: Emergency Response Community Views on the Adequacy of Federally Required Chemical Information</p> <p>The purpose of this GAO report was to satisfy a mandate under Public Law 106-40 requiring GAO to report to Congress on the adequacy of chemical information required to be submitted to local emergency response personnel to help them respond to chemical incidents, the adequacy of delivery of that information, and the level of compliance with the requirement to submit the information.</p>	<p>GAO found that local responders in most of the communities contacted believe federal information required to be reported under section 112(r) of the Clean Air Act and Title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act generally meets their needs, but a few said that it was not adequate to help them respond to chemical incidents; representatives of national organizations were divided in their opinions on the adequacy of the information. Both local responders and national organization representatives made suggestions that they believe would improve the usefulness of the information.</p> <p>Other than reporting recommendations from survey respondents, GAO did not provide specific recommendations to EPA or Congress to address any of its findings.</p>	<p>As noted, the report generally finds that EPA is succeeding in its mission to provide chemical hazard information. The report does not contain specific GAO recommendations for Agency action. Some recommendations from members of the public are contained in the report, but GAO does not indicate which of those recommendations are appropriate for Agency action. Nevertheless, EPA is already acting on some of those recommendations to the extent they are consistent with Agency policies and resources (e.g., electronic reporting and availability of chemical inventory forms).</p>	<p>General Accounting Office</p> <p>GAO-02-799</p> <p>July 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.gao.gov</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 6, Objective 1</p> <p>Great Lakes: EPA Needs to Define Organizational Responsibilities Better for Effective Oversight and Cleanup of Contaminated Areas</p> <p>Determination of EPA progress developing and implementing Remedial Action Plans (RAPs) and assessing effectiveness of EPA's RAP efforts.</p>	<p>All of the Great Lakes "Areas of Concern" have defined their environmental problems and half have selected measures to address the problems; however, none have been fully restored. EPA is not effectively fulfilling its Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement responsibilities to ensure that RAPs are developed and implemented and has not clearly delineated RAP oversight responsibility. Oversight was transferred from the Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) to regional offices, and resources were reduced.</p> <p>GAO recommends that the EPA Administrator (1) clarify which office within EPA is responsible for ensuring RAP implementation and (2) identify actions, time periods, and resources for EPA to fulfill its RAP oversight responsibilities.</p>	<p>On September 25, 2002, EPA determined that GLNPO would assume overall program management by providing oversight, coordination, and reporting on RAP implementation. EPA proposes to identify additional means of enhancing RAP progress, being cognizant of existing fiscal constraints, Agency priorities and requirements, and the need to consult with Great Lakes states.</p>	<p>General Accounting Office</p> <p>GAO-02-563</p> <p>May 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.gao.gov</p>
<p>Goal 6, Objective 1</p> <p>The Challenge to Restore and Protect the Largest Body of Fresh Water in the World</p> <p>Biennial assessment by the International Joint Commission (IJC) of progress of the governments of the United States and Canada under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA).</p>	<p>The United States and Canada should continue to make progress under the GLWQA, particularly on (1) monitoring, assessing, and reporting on the state of the Great Lakes ecosystem; (2) cleanup of contaminated sediments; and (3) prevention and control of alien aquatic invasive species. The IJC report also includes findings regarding persistent, bioaccumulative toxic (PBT) goals on discharge reduction and elimination, persistent air toxics transport and deposition, groundwater protection, aging nuclear power plants, and other major GLWQA issues where EPA and Environment Canada work cooperatively with the public and private sectors.</p>	<p>EPA's Great Lakes National Program Office will draft a formal U.S. Government policy response to the recommendations.</p>	<p>International Joint Commission</p> <p>September 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.ijc.org/ijcweb-e.html</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 6, Objective 1</p> <p>2002 LakeWide Management Plans (LaMP) Updates</p> <p>Assessment of goals, progress to date, and next steps in restoration and protection of the Great Lakes.</p>	<p>Progress has been made in the past 2 years in areas such as publication of fish advisories and beach closures, decreased toxics, and contaminated sediment cleanup. Governmental partners on LaMP committees have identified and prioritized “next steps” to achieve long-term goals, including addressing exotic species, restoring natural flow to tributaries, continuing to address contaminated sediments, and addressing air toxics from outside the basin.</p>	<p>EPA will work with state and local partners to identify additional means of enhancing LaMP progress, being cognizant of existing fiscal constraints and Agency priorities and requirements.</p>	<p>LaMP Committees</p> <p>April 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/gl2000/lamps/index.html</p>
<p>Goal 6, Objective 1</p> <p>Mining Ideas 2</p> <p>Evaluation of 106 GLNPO habitat projects totaling more than \$17 million awarded 1992–2001.</p>	<p>The projects were to protect, restore, inventory, assess, classify, monitor, and study more than 17 million acres of the Great Lakes Basin. The projects were supported by 650 federal, state, local, tribal, non-governmental, and academic partners. Thus, for about a dollar an acre, more than 6,400 acres were protected from a variety of threats; the process of restoring more than 7,300 acres was begun; more than 900 people volunteered more than 3,800 hours for project activities; 1,250 schoolchildren and adults were educated and informed about Great Lakes ecosystems, and 62 full- and part-time jobs were created.</p>	<p>Response will be developed in early 2003.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Great Lakes National Program Office, Ecosystem Team</p> <p>EPA-905-R-02-006</p> <p>September 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 6, Objective 5</p> <p>An Evaluation of EPA’s Safe Drinking Water Program in Central America</p> <p>This evaluation looks at the four components of the Program that were implemented in three countries—El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Honduras.</p>	<p>The Program led to improvements in four main areas of drinking water quality improvement. For instance, it (1) helped improve drinking water laboratories technically and managerially and (2) effectively demonstrated and taught the use of an analytical tool necessary for the national water utility to collect and analyze information needed to make sound decisions regarding existing plant operations and priorities for plant improvements.</p> <p>Example of recommendation regarding specific Program components: Additional support should be provided to strengthen the technical capacity of key drinking water analytical laboratories and assist these laboratories in achieving accreditation for analyses of critical importance to public health.</p> <p>Example of lessons learned regarding Program transferability: Develop aid programs through use of partnerships rather than top-down approaches.</p>	<p>The implementation of the recommendations related specifically to the Central America Program will depend on available funds and office priorities and are to be determined.</p> <p>These lessons learned are being applied and will be applied to future international water programs.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of International Affairs, with consulting support from Industrial Economics, Incorporated, Marasco Newton Group, and U.S. EPA, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation</p> <p>December 2002</p> <p>Contact: Eric Marsh 202-566-2198</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 7, Objective 1</p> <p>Regulatory Reform: Compliance Guide Requirement Has Had Little Effect on Agency Practices</p> <p>The purpose of this study was to examine the implementation of section 212 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA) in selected agencies, one of which was EPA.</p>	<p>The evaluation findings focused on whether the agencies have published small entity compliance guides (SECGs) for each covered rule published in selected years and described how the agencies developed the guides and made them available to small entities affected by the rules, focusing on rules published during years 1999 and 2000.</p> <p>Although GAO found that “EPA had the narrowest view of the scope of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) and section 212,” EPA provided GAO with SECGs for “three rules that appeared to have been prepared in recognition of the compliance guide requirement and meticulously described how to satisfy the rules’ provisions.”</p> <p>GAO found that “there needs to be greater clarity and consistency with regard to how key terms in the RFA are defined and implemented.” They also stated that “changes are needed with regard to the requirements in section 212.”</p>	<p>GAO’s recommendations were directed at Congress; EPA does not need to respond.</p> <p>EPA found the report to be mostly favorable to the Agency.</p>	<p>General Accounting Office</p> <p>GAO-02-172</p> <p>December 2001</p> <p>Located at: http://www.gao.gov</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 7, Objective 2</p> <p>Evaluation of Laboratory Quality Systems and Practices</p> <p>The Quality Staff coordinated and led technical reviews of EPA's National Program Office and Office of Research and Development Laboratories. The purpose of the assessments was to document implementation of quality practices supporting the data used by the Agency to make programmatic decisions and determine management and staff awareness of the Agency's position on improper laboratory practices.</p>	<p>The technical reviews identified (1) laboratory quality system and performance weaknesses that produce inadequate-quality analytical data, (2) inconsistencies in practices used to promote implementation, and performance, and (3) lack of established methods to detect and deter misconduct in laboratories.</p> <p>The findings identified weaknesses in the laboratory quality systems. In corrective action, a work group consisting of both EPA and non-EPA members developed a training course, <i>Tools to Detect Improper Laboratory Practices</i>, to assist laboratory assessors in evaluating laboratory systems and practices. The training course was presented for the first time in July 2002 at the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference (NELAC) annual conference, and it was repeated at the Region 6 Annual Quality Assurance Conference and the joint New York and Pennsylvania Environmental Laboratory Association Conference. A measurable outcome of this evaluation and training is evidenced in the NELAC standards, which now require ethics programs for all accredited laboratories.</p>	<p>The Quality Staff continues to work with the environmental laboratory community, including the industry trade association, and the American Council of Independent Laboratories to ensure that laboratory managers and staff understand the Agency's position on laboratory Quality Systems and their role in deterring and detecting improper practices. The course materials are to be posted on the Quality Web Site, and additional training sessions will be conducted as needed. This effort supports the Goal 7 objective of <i>providing access to tools for using environmental information and ensuring that the environmental data collected and used by the Agency are of the appropriate quality for their intended use.</i></p>	<p>Final reports on the technical reviews were issued in July 2002. Corrective actions resulting from the evaluations will rest with each laboratory's parent organization. Evaluations will be summarized in a capping report, which is expected by December 2002.</p> <p>Contact: Nancy Wentworth 202-564-6830 Fred Siegelman 202-564-5173</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 7, Objective 3</p> <p>Government Information Security Reform Act (GISRA) Annual Security Program Review</p> <p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency FY 2002 Report to OMB on the Government Information Security Reform Act (GISRA)</p> <p>The purpose of this evaluation was to review the effectiveness of the Agency's security program in accordance with requirements included in GISRA.</p>	<p>This evaluation consists of two separate but related efforts. The first is an assessment conducted by the Chief Information Officer, in conjunction with EPA's senior program officials, of the Agency's 168 general support systems and major applications. Agency system owners, using the Security Self-Assessment for Information Technology Systems methodology developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, assessed the status of security of the systems under their control. Simultaneously, the OIG conducted an independent evaluation of the Agency's overall security program. This assessment confirmed that the Agency has continued to improve its security program and highlighted where resources should be focused in FY 2003 to ensure continued progress.</p>	<p>The Agency is developing a comprehensive Agency corrective action plan in response to the weaknesses identified in the self-assessments. The Agency's action plan will consist of individual plans of action with milestones (POA&Ms) prepared in accordance with OMB direction. The POA&Ms will define specific tasks, when the work will begin, when the task will end, and resource needs.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of Environmental Information and Office of the Inspector General</p> <p>2002-S-00017</p> <p>September 16, 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/oigearth/ereading_room/gisrafinalv2.pdf</p>
<p>Goal 8, Objective 7</p> <p>Project XL 2001 Comprehensive Report: Directory of Project Experiments and Results</p> <p>Summarizes objectives and results for 51 innovative pilot projects.</p>	<p>Each project has made progress in meeting the commitments outlined in the formal Final Project Agreements. However, each project faces unique issues and challenges in achieving the innovations. The results are based on data collected between August and November 2001.</p>	<p>The Agency continues to monitor and address issues with the individual projects as appropriate. The Agency continues to seek opportunities for successful innovations and lessons learned to be applied to broader system change.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation</p> <p>EPA-100-R-01-003</p> <p>December 2001</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/projectxl/01report.htm</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 8, Objective 7</p> <p>Project in Excellence and Leadership: New England Universities' Laboratories</p> <p>Mid-Term Evaluation: Piloting Superior Environmental Performance in Labs</p> <p>Earns lessons learned from the unique approach to laboratory management being tested and highlights opportunities to improve the overall environmental performance of the universities for the remainder of the project period.</p>	<p>It was clear that a heavy investment of time and resources had resulted in progress. At the same time, there was some frustration at the lack of movement in distinct areas of the universities' Environmental Management Plans that would lead to improved environmental performance.</p> <p>The primary lesson learned is that universities' environmental health and safety staff, EPA, and the states need to work within the challenges of an academic culture while also capitalizing on the benefits of an academic culture. It is evident that it is extremely challenging to achieve the stated pollution prevention goals within the culture of research, with its demands for chemical purity and scientifically acceptable protocols.</p>	<p>The Agency is working with the states and universities to address the challenges faced in implementing this innovation pilot.</p> <p>Also, the Agency is reviewing the results of this evaluation to assess how the lessons learned in this pilot should be incorporated into a proposed rulemaking being planned for FY 2003 under the RCRA.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation and EPA–New England</p> <p>September 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/evaluate</p>
<p>Goal 8, Objective 7</p> <p>Evaluation of the Environmental Justice Collaborative Model</p> <p>An evaluation of the Environmental Justice Collaborative Model currently being used in demonstration projects sponsored by the Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice.</p>	<p>The Model provides an important vehicle for the many institutions that are seeking to provide community assistance but lack effective mechanisms for doing so. Recognizing a community's vision for redevelopment can enable service providers to tailor their programs and services to better suit community needs and save resources. Several of these partnerships have faced and continue to face challenges in using the Model. Cooperation and coordination in support of partnership efforts within and among federal agencies could be enhanced. Much of the success of these efforts can be attributed to community, regional non-governmental organization, or government-level individuals, who pulled together diverse groups.</p>	<p>The Federal Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice and the Office of Environmental Justice have used the results described in the draft report to make some midcourse changes to the criteria and guidelines, which will be used to review the nomination proposals for the Interagency Working Group's Environmental Justice Revitalization Projects in FY 2003.</p>	<p>Prepared for the Federal Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice by U.S. EPA, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation</p> <p>September 2002</p> <p>(Draft for Public Comment)</p> <p>Located at: http://www.epa.gov/evaluate/DRAFT-EJCM-Eval-Rpt090402.pdf</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 8, Objective 7</p> <p>Democracy On-Line: An Evaluation of the National Dialogue on Public Involvement in EPA Decisions</p> <p>Resources for the Future evaluates the Dialogue as a case study of electronic public participation. It examines the dynamics of the participation process and how participants felt about it. It describes the quality of communication when public participation moves from the meeting room to the computer screen. Finally, it looks at how participants and EPA benefitted from the process.</p>	<p>The evaluation found that the online public participation, the Dialogue, was highly successful. The Dialogue turned a static commenting process into an interactive and dynamic discussion. It involved vastly more (and different) people than had previously provided input in the Public Involvement Policy. Unlike any other form of public participation, it allowed people to participate as much or as little as they wanted to without any sort of selection process or agency control. Many of the problems that arose during the Dialogue can largely be addressed through future changes in design, software, and norms of participation. Others may be addressed through societal trends in computer ownership, use, and familiarity.</p>	<p>EPA agrees with Resources for the Future that like any new format for participation, online dialogues need to evolve through an iterative process of experimentation and learning. The Agency will seek additional opportunities to use</p>	<p>the approach as appropriate.</p> <p>Resources for the Future</p> <p>January 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.rff.org/reports/PDF_files/democracyonline.pdf</p>
<p>Goal 8, Objective 7</p> <p>Reinventing Environmental Regulation: Lessons from Project XL</p> <p>Resources for the Future's publication assesses the difficult negotiations needed to implement Project XL at a 3M tape manufacturing plant.</p>	<p>The book discusses the conflicting goals of participants, the influences of personality and organizational culture, and complications caused by changes in 3M's external business environment. The 3M case is compared with EPA negotiations with Intel, Merck, and Weyerhaeuser. Stressing the need for continued innovation, it suggests more successful outcomes through clearer definitions and expectations, better communication, and a negotiation process that keeps pace with changes in the world beyond.</p>	<p>The Agency continues to assess lessons learned about developing successful innovation projects. The Agency continues to seek opportunities for successful innovations and ways to apply lessons learned to broader system change.</p>	<p>Resources for the Future</p> <p>August 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.rff.org/</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 8, Objective 7</p> <p>Environmental Protection: Overcoming Obstacles to Innovative State Regulatory Programs</p> <p>GAO identifies the major avenues that states have used to obtain EPA's approval of innovative approaches to environmental protection and the major obstacles that impede states from pursuing innovative approaches needing EPA's concurrence. The report also discusses EPA's recent efforts to facilitate innovative approaches to environmental protection.</p>	<p>Officials in most of the states contacted stated that they faced significant challenges before they were in a position to submit proposals to EPA, including resistance from within the state environmental agency and a lack of adequate resources to pursue innovative approaches. But although obstacles at the state level played an important role, environmental officials from 12 of the 15 states said that federal obstacles—including the need to comply with detailed EPA regulations, policies, and guidance, as well as a perceived cultural resistance to change among EPA staff—were more significant.</p>	<p>EPA has recognized the need to improve its strategy to encourage innovative environmental approaches by states and other entities. Toward this end, the Agency has (1) issued a broad-based strategy on Innovating for Better Environmental Results and (2) adopted the recommendations of an internal Task Force on Improving EPA Regulations, which, among other things, advocates the consideration of innovative alternatives as new regulations are developed.</p>	<p>General Accounting Office GAO-02-268 January 2002</p> <p>Located at: http://www.gao.gov</p>
<p>Goal 10, Objective 2</p> <p>Managing for Improved Results</p> <p>A steering group of EPA senior managers was convened to examine the Agency's current management practices—how EPA sets its priorities; plans and budgets; tracks, measures, and reports on its performance; and uses performance and other information to adjust its strategies—with an eye toward improvement.</p>	<p>The Steering Group recommended that the Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop simplified strategic goals, focused on end results. • Collaborate with states on developing out-year performance targets and multiyear strategies for achieving them. • Commit to regional and goal-specific strategic plans. • Build regional/state priorities into annual plan and budget before submission to OMB and Congress. • Accelerate improvements to performance measures. • Streamline the process for annual program guidance/Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs). • Shift approach to accountability. • Ramp-up support to national programs, regions, and states to build capacity for results-based management. 	<p>The Agency will begin implementation in FY 2003.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of the Chief Financial Officer Fall 2002</p> <p>Contact: Wendy Lubbe 202-564-3827</p>

EPA GOAL AND OBJECTIVE(S) COVERED BY EVALUATION, TITLE, AND SCOPE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	PLANNED RESPONSE	AUTHOR, REPORT NUMBER, ISSUE DATE, AND WHERE TO OBTAIN A COPY
<p>Goal 10, Objective 2</p> <p>EPA Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds</p> <p>The purpose of this evaluation was to review the processes and controls over State Revolving Fund disbursements and determine whether any erroneous payments had occurred.</p>	<p>The evaluation found controls to be effective and that based on audits and performance evaluation reviews, only isolated instances of erroneous payments have occurred in the two State Revolving Funds. For the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, the erroneous payment rate was 0.13 percent; for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, the rate was 0.04 percent. Actions to correct these erroneous payments have been completed or are under way.</p>	<p>Recommendations are aimed toward ensuring that erroneous payments are properly monitored and the erroneous payment rate remains low. Once the report is finalized, the Office of Water and the Office of the Chief Financial Officer will begin implementation.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of the Chief Financial Officer</p> <p>Fall 2002</p> <p>Contact: Bob Cluck 202-564-4917</p>
<p>Goal 10, Objective 2</p> <p>Management Oversight/Validations Reviews</p> <p>In FY 2001 EPA designated an Agency weakness entitled "Improved Management of Assistance Agreements," and in response the Office of Grants and Debarment (OGD) conducted validation reviews.</p>	<p>The evaluation reviews showed that headquarters and regional offices had made progress in improving grants management; however, the reviews found that although post-award monitoring is occurring, project officers need to do a better job of documenting monitoring in the project file and proactively identifying potential performance issues. The reviews also found that some offices had not submitted their post-award monitoring plans on time.</p>	<p>The OGD plans to continue and expand the Management Oversight/Validation Reviews in FY 2003. OGD is using the results of the FY 2002 reviews to develop a long-term strategic plan for grants management. The strategic plan will focus on enhancing the skills of the grants workforce; promoting grant competition; participating in e-government initiatives and making effective use of information technology; improving resource management, accountability, and oversight; providing technical assistance and training to nonprofit and tribal recipients; developing grant work plans that address environmental results; and strengthening the Agency's internal evaluation systems for grants management.</p>	<p>U.S. EPA, Office of Administration and Resources Management</p> <p>Contact: Martha Monell 202-564-5387</p>