



**National Advisory Council for
Environmental Policy and Technology**

March 16, 2009

Administrator Lisa Jackson
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

RE: NACEPT Report: Outlook for EPA

Dear Administrator Jackson:

The enclosed report, Outlook for EPA, from the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) contains recommendations for significant changes in the EPA's focus and operations. NACEPT was established as a federal advisory committee in 1988 to provide independent advice to the EPA Administrator on a broad range of environmental policy, technology and management issues. Administratively, it resides within EPA's Office of Cooperative Environmental Management (OCEM).

Outlook for EPA is the result of an initiative by OCEM to mark NACEPT's 20th anniversary by undertaking a broad review of the environmental issues and challenges that EPA will face over the next 10 years and the different approaches that have been proposed for how the Agency could address those issues. The report is based on three lines of effort: a review of previously completed environmental "futures" or "foresight" studies done within the Agency and by other organizations; structured interviews with 15 thought leaders from industry, academia, state and tribal government, and non-governmental organizations; and the thinking of NACEPT members as expressed in previous reports and current discussions¹.

The recommendations we are making to you are based on the remarkable degree of consensus that emerged from both the review of environmental futures reports and the interviews. There is near unanimous agreement on three "first tier" issues – *climate change, water resource sustainability, and ecosystem decline* – that must be dealt with much more effectively in order to prevent long-term catastrophic consequences on a global scale. There is also widespread agreement on many "second tier" but still very important issues such as food production, ocean health, chemical and toxic substance pollution, air pollution, deforestation and desertification.

These issues, we believe, make it imperative that EPA recognize that all of its environmental priority areas, including climate change, biodiversity, toxics, and air quality, are interconnected. They must be addressed in an integrated way rather than as isolated issues. Applying an integrative approach will enable the Agency to identify important synergies that would allow for accomplishing multiple goals simultaneously. Such an approach will also help the Agency identify and avoid the unintended consequences of well-intentioned measures. Finally, we believe a well integrated approach will clarify when trade-offs are necessary and would help the Agency explain to the public and policymakers the reason for a particular decision. This integrative model must be employed to complement the well-established reductionist approaches in all aspects of EPA's programs to enable the Agency to move toward sustainability.

The message delivered by this commonality among environmental futures reports and expert interviews is that the emerging era of environmental protection is characterized by a set of big, cross-cutting challenges that do not lend themselves to simple solutions or the Agency's traditional environmental media approaches. Climate change exemplifies this new type of challenge: it is a problem with many causes, dispersed effects, and a multitude of implications. In addition, climate change can magnify or further complicate other pre-existing challenges. Despite the complex and difficult nature of issues like climate change, this state of affairs should not be taken as discouraging. Instead, this new era of environmental challenge should be seen as an opportunity to change the way in which current and future environmental issues are viewed, enabling us to arrive at solutions that are broad-based, collaborative, and increasingly creative.

The evolving nature of the challenges that EPA will likely face in the coming years strongly suggests that the way the Agency fulfills its mission will also need to evolve. Historically, EPA has demonstrated an ability to develop and implement creative solutions to new challenges that go beyond the Agency's traditional pollution prevention and response role. For example, the Energy Star program has for many years been a particularly effective way for EPA to engage with its federal partners (most notably the Department of Energy) as well as private sector businesses and the general public to address the need for greater energy efficiency throughout our economy. In short, EPA has been successful in its efforts to move forward on what are two, occasionally converging tracks, one that focuses on the Agency's statutorily-mandated regulatory responsibilities (the primary, or "core" track), and one that exists outside the regulatory construct and leverages EPA's expertise in order to "pre-empt" degradation of environmental quality. The question that EPA must now ask is whether, and if so how, those two tracks must change in order to ensure future success.

If EPA were to defer to others with respect to the "big," multidimensional issues and were instead to remain focused only on its core regulatory mission, change might still be necessary, but it would not need to be systemic. The kind of fine-tuning that would be characterized as good

management practice would likely be sufficient. However, there is a broad consensus, articulated in the future-oriented studies completed over the past several years and validated by the interviews conducted for this effort, that EPA should in fact assume a larger, leadership role to address the big challenges. Moreover, there is widespread agreement that assumption of this role should not, and cannot, subtract from the Agency's fulfillment of its core mission.

Just as there is an extraordinary level of agreement across studies about what the next generation of environmental challenges will be, so too is there striking agreement about the kind of fundamental, systemic change that EPA should pursue as it rises to meet those challenges. NACEPT strongly urges you to give serious consideration to the recommendations for systemic change contained in this report. These changes do not require a large, disruptive process of reorganization, but they do require strong leadership to expand the Agency's focus, encourage improvements in the Agency's operations, and develop innovative strategies for collaborating more effectively with other agencies and organizations. They require changes in the Agency's organizational culture, including a willingness to share information and cooperate across the traditional Agency "silos," greater concern for outreach and communication, and more attention to identifying and responding to emerging problems early, before they become difficult and expensive to solve.

The results of the survey of futures reports and the interviews with environmental thought leaders are fully set out in Outlook for EPA, along with NACEPT's advice. Here we would like to highlight for you the Council's recommendations, which are presented in greater detail in the report.

- 1. Clarify that EPA's mission addresses environmental stewardship as an important means for achieving the environmental component of sustainability.** The Council recommends that EPA invest in building the skills and competencies necessary for stewardship and drive the practice of environmental stewardship deep into the Agency's organizational culture.
- 2. Emphasize that science and technology are cornerstones of the EPA mission elements for mitigating environmental degradation and identifying better choices that will lead to sustainability.** The Council recommends that EPA preserve the integrity of its scientific work and promote the development and recognition of scientific and technical skills within the Agency so that (1) it is regarded as a global leader in the application of the highest quality science to address both national and global environmental issues, and (2) it can take a more active role in the development and commercialization of environmentally superior technologies.
- 3. Continue to improve EPA's core regulatory functions.** The Council recommends that EPA improve permitting, enforcement, and monitoring to focus more strategically on the most important environmental issues and to foster environmental justice. EPA should also

streamline regulations to achieve more environmental protection with fewer bureaucratic obstacles, and strengthen the Agency's investment in and promotion of innovative regulatory strategies such as voluntary programs.

4. **Take a more holistic approach to environmental protection across all media.** The Council recommends that EPA employ every means possible, from training to program design and budgetary incentives, to achieve better integration and active collaboration between its programs and improve its ability to work in partnership with other federal agencies and with states, tribes and other external stakeholders to understand problems and to develop and implement solutions.
5. **Make environmental foresight or "futures analysis" a regular component of EPA's business-as-usual practices.** The Council recommends that EPA incorporate environmental foresight as a formal component of Agency strategic planning by creating a Futures Network to scan for emerging problems and opportunities, and regularly convening Look-Out Panels that include outside experts from industry, other government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and public and private research groups at the forefront of technological change.
6. **Urge the President to work with Congress to make EPA a Cabinet-level agency so that its actions and statements will command more attention and response.**
7. **Urge the President to work with Congress to draft broad organic legislation outlining the evolving mission of the Environmental Protection Agency and giving it greater flexibility to deal with broad challenges such as climate change, water resource sustainability, and ecosystem sustainability that will require the Agency to use integrative approaches on a scale it has not yet undertaken. Consideration of EPA's mission should include an assessment and decision on its role in providing US leadership internationally relative to other federal agencies with overlapping mandates.**
8. **Work with governmental and private agencies and organizations to develop strategies that link national security, environmental quality, and economic growth.** The Council recommends that EPA utilize partnerships to access technical knowledge, financial resources, and the unique perspectives of different stakeholders.
9. **Develop new, innovative and integrative ways of doing business such as collaborative problem solving (with states, tribes and stakeholders) and regulatory innovation to increase effectiveness and efficiency of environmental programs.**
10. **Expand EPA's information and communication role, with emphasis on the collection and management of environmental data and other relevant information.** EPA should also take steps to improve the measurement or estimation (modeling) of the results of environmental initiatives.

11. **Provide staff support for reaching out more actively with educational initiatives aimed at small businesses, communities and individual citizens.** The Council recommends that EPA focus specific initiatives on helping businesses, communities and individuals recognize their environmental impacts and encouraging the adoption of new technologies and behaviors to reduce those impacts.
12. **Take steps to position the Agency for improved measurement or estimation (modeling) of the results of environmental initiatives.** The Council recommends that EPA quickly evaluate prior measurement efforts, extract any useful measurement system(s) approaches, and, quickly establish core standards for measuring (and explaining) environmental progress.

The Council looks forward to providing you and EPA's senior management with consensus-based advice and recommendations on matters put before it for consideration. We commend the Agency on its remarkable record of accomplishment and look forward to helping you shape it to be even more effective. EPA provides a central point of focus for setting and achieving the Nation's environmental quality and sustainability goals. The Council is excited about EPA's prospects to create significant, positive change in this decade.

Sincerely,

//Signed//

Erik J. Meyers
NACEPT Chair

cc: Robert Olson, Workgroup Chair
Scott Fulton, Acting Deputy Administrator
Ray Spears, Deputy Chief of Staff
Robert Sussman, Senior Policy Counsel to the Administrator
Robert Goulding, Director of Operations
Maryann Froehlich, Acting Chief Financial Officer
Rafael DeLeon, Director, Office of
Cooperative Environmental Management
Sonia Altieri, NACEPT Designated Federal Officer

ⁱ These recommendations draw in particular from the following NACEPT Reports: *Encouraging Regional Solutions to Sustaining Water Sector Utilities*, March 2009; *EPA and the Venture Capital Community: Building Bridges to Commercialize Technology*, NACEPT Subcommittee on Environmental Technology, April 2008; *Everyone's Business: Working Toward Sustainability Through Environmental Stewardship and Collaboration*, March 2008; *EPA Technology Programs: Engaging the Marketplace*, NACEPT

Subcommittee on Environmental Technology, May 2007; *The Environmental Future: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities for EPA*, September 2002.



Outlook for EPA

National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT)



NACEPT Report | March 16, 2009

The National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) is an independent federal advisory committee that provides recommendations to the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on a broad range of environmental issues. This report has not been reviewed for approval by the Agency, and hence, the contents of this report do not necessarily represent the views and policies of the EPA, nor of other agencies in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute a recommendation for use. Reports of NACEPT are posted on the EPA Web Site at <http://www.epa.gov/ocem/nacept>.

EPA130-R-09-002

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Cooperative Environmental Management
<http://www.epa.gov/>

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Study Findings | 1 |
| Summary of NACEPT Recommendations | 2 |
| Introduction | 5 |
| Study Approach | 7 |
| Initial Research of Futures Literature | 7 |
| Prospective Study Interviews | 7 |
| Interview Approach | 8 |
| NACEPT Meeting | 8 |
| Trends And Themes Identified In Selected Futures Studies | 9 |
| U.S. EPA Science Advisory Board. "Beyond The Horizon: Using Foresight To Protect The Environmental Future," 1995. | 9 |
| NACEPT. "The Environmental Future: Emerging Challenges And Opportunities For EPA," 2002. | 10 |
| Environmental Council Of The States (ECOS). "Planning For The Environmental Future: Preliminary State Perspectives On The Challenges Ahead," April 2005. | 11 |
| EPA Innovation Action Council Futures Interview Summary, 2004. | 12 |
| North American Commission For Environmental Cooperation. "Future Environmental Priorities In North America," 2000. | 13 |
| EPA International Futures Project, 2000. | 14 |
| Foresight And Governance Project, Woodrow Wilson International Center For Scholars. "New Global Agenda," 2004. | 16 |
| Findings From Interviews | 21 |
| Key Trends and Issues | 22 |
| Quality of Air, Water, and Land Resources | 23 |
| Management of Chemicals In the Environment | 23 |
| Responses To Technological Development | 23 |
| EPA's Relationship With Stakeholders | 24 |
| EPA'S Current Response Capability and Performance | 24 |
| Resources | 24 |
| Scope | 24 |
| Opportunities to Improve EPA's Response Capability | 25 |
| Focus and Expertise | 25 |
| Organization | 26 |
| Approach | 26 |
| Collaboration | 27 |
| Documenting Success | 28 |

Input From NACEPT Members 29

- NACEPT Meeting 29
 - What Are The Key Challenges Facing EPA Over The Next Ten Years? 29
 - As EPA Moves To Meet These Challenges, What Are The Key Capabilities And Attributes It Needs To Develop? 30
- Additional Input From NACEPT Members 30
 - What Are Some Of The Most Critical Specific Actions Needed To Develop These Attributes And Capabilities? 31

NACEPT Recommendations 33

- Mission 33
- Structure and Practices 36
 - Organization 36
 - Partnerships 36
 - Environmental Information 37

Appendix A: NACEPT Membership List. 39

Appendix B: Compilation of Interviewee Responses 43



Executive Summary

In 1988, EPA established the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (“NACEPT” or “Council”) to provide independent advice to the EPA Administrator on a broad range of environmental policy, technology and management issues. To mark NACEPT’s 20th anniversary and its achievements over the last two decades, and to help ensure that this record of success continues, EPA asked NACEPT to identify the issues and challenges that EPA will face over the next 10 years, and the approaches the Agency might take to address those issues. This was accomplished through a review of “futures” studies conducted by various groups over the past decade, interviews conducted with leaders from the public and private sector, and the direct input of NACEPT members. This report presents NACEPT’s findings and recommendations to EPA.

Study Findings

The information sources consulted demonstrate extensive agreement about the largest or most important environmental challenges facing EPA and the United States in the next decade. As evidenced by its prominence in both the futures reports and interviews, climate change has come to the forefront of our collective environmental consciousness. Climate change was cited as a critical challenge by every futures report reviewed as well as by the vast majority of interviewees. Potential obstacles to addressing this challenge were also mentioned, including the wide-scale collaboration required to combat climate change on a global level, and the desire to find ways to reduce anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions without negatively impacting economic growth. The loss of biodiversity and decline of ecosystem health and services was another major theme cited in virtually all of the futures reports reviewed, as well as many of the interviews. Finally, the quantity and quality of water resources was cited as a critical challenge in every previous futures report, as well as many of the interviews. Challenges cited less frequently include food production, chemical and toxic substance pollution, air pollution, deforestation and desertification, and ocean health.

Interviews conducted for this study, as well as discussions that occurred during a November 2008 NACEPT meeting, highlighted a number of “programmatic” challenges that bear on EPA’s ability to meet the existing and emerging environmental challenges, including (1) the role of science in EPA’s decision making and its ability both to use technology more effectively and to advance the transfer of technology to the commercial marketplace, (2) the need to expand and enhance communication, both within EPA and with external audiences across the full range of interested parties, and (3) the need to create and promote a different frame of reference for the way EPA, and the public in general, think about and address the state of the environment.

The evolving nature of the issues and challenges that EPA will, or will likely, face in the coming years strongly suggests that the way the Agency fulfills its mission will need to evolve. Historically, EPA has demonstrated its ability to develop and implement creative solutions to new challenges, especially those that go beyond the Agency's traditional pollution prevention and response role or that cut across the traditional Agency "silos." EPA has been successful in its efforts to move forward on what are two, occasionally converging tracks, one that focuses on the Agency's statutorily-mandated regulatory responsibilities (the primary, or "core" track), and one that exists outside the regulatory construct and leverages EPA's expertise in order to "pre-empt" degradation of environmental quality. The question that EPA must now ask is whether, and if so how, those two tracks must change in order to ensure future success.

These issues, we believe, make it imperative that EPA recognize that all of its environmental priority areas, including climate change, biodiversity, toxics, and air quality, are interconnected. They must be addressed in an integrated way rather than as isolated issues. Applying an integrative approach will enable the Agency to identify important synergies that would allow for accomplishing multiple goals simultaneously. Such an approach will also help the Agency identify and avoid the unintended consequences of well-intentioned measures. Finally, we believe a well integrated approach will clarify when trade-offs are necessary and would help the Agency explain to the public and policymakers the reason for a particular decision. This integrative model must be employed to complement the well-established reductionist approaches in all aspects of EPA's programs to enable the Agency to move toward sustainability.

If EPA were to defer to others with respect to the bigger, multidimensional issues and were instead to remain focused on its core regulatory mission, change might still be necessary, but it would not need to be systemic. The kind of fine-tuning that would be characterized as good management practice would likely be sufficient. However, there is a broad consensus, articulated in the future-oriented studies completed over the past several years and validated by the interviews conducted for this effort, as well as by the input from NACEPT members, that EPA should in fact assume a larger, leadership role to address the big challenges. Moreover, there is widespread agreement that assumption of this role should not, and cannot, subtract from the Agency's fulfillment of its core mission. Furthermore, just as there is an extraordinary level of agreement across studies about what the next generation of environmental challenges will be, so too is there striking agreement about the kind of fundamental, systemic change that EPA should pursue as it rises to meet those challenges.

Summary of NACEPT Recommendations

The Council offers the following recommendations, which are set out in greater detail in this report. The recommendations are aimed at clarifying and restating the Agency's mission, and improving the Agency's organizational structure and practices in order to support that mission more effectively. Reorganization-related recommendations focus in particular on steps EPA can take to achieve greater beneficial impact and greater prominence nationally and internationally as a steward of environmental sustainability. They would allow EPA to maintain its core mission while also developing new structures and mechanisms to apply its environmental expertise in the most efficient and effective ways possible to the difficult challenges that lie ahead.

1. **Clarify that EPA's mission addresses environmental stewardship as an important means for achieving the environmental component of sustainability.** The Council recommends that EPA invest in building the skills and competencies necessary for stewardship and drive the practice of environmental stewardship deep into the Agency's organizational culture.
2. **Emphasize that science and technology are cornerstones of the EPA mission elements for mitigating environmental degradation and identifying better choices that will lead to sustainability.** The Council recommends that EPA preserve the integrity of its scientific work and promote the development and recognition of scientific and technical skills within the Agency so that (1) it is regarded as a global leader in the application of the highest quality science to address both national and global environmental issues, and (2) it can take a more active role in the development and commercialization of environmentally superior technologies.
3. **Continue to improve EPA's core regulatory functions.** The Council recommends that EPA improve permitting, enforcement, and monitoring to focus more strategically on the most important environmental issues and to foster environmental justice. EPA should also streamline regulations to achieve more environmental protection with fewer bureaucratic obstacles, and strengthen the Agency's investment in and promotion of innovative regulatory strategies such as voluntary programs.
4. **Take a more holistic approach to environmental protection across all media.** The Council recommends that EPA employ every means possible, from training to program design and budgetary incentives, to achieve better integration and active collaboration between its programs and improve its ability to work in partnership with other federal agencies and with states, tribes and other external stakeholders to understand problems and to develop and implement solutions.
5. **Make environmental foresight or "futures analysis" a regular component of EPA's business-as-usual practices.** The Council recommends that EPA incorporate environmental foresight as a formal component of Agency strategic planning by creating a Futures Network to scan for emerging problems and opportunities, and regularly convening Look-Out Panels that include outside experts from industry, other government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and public and private research groups at the forefront of technological change.
6. **Urge the President to work with Congress to make EPA a Cabinet-level agency so that its actions and statements will command more attention and response.**
7. **Urge the President to work with Congress to draft broad organic legislation outlining the evolving mission of the Environmental Protection Agency and giving it greater flexibility to deal with broad challenges such as climate change, water resource sustainability, and ecosystem sustainability that will require the Agency to use integrative approaches on a scale it has not yet undertaken. Consideration of EPA's mission should include an assessment and decision on its role in providing US leadership internationally relative to other federal agencies with overlapping mandates.**

8. **Work with governmental and private agencies and organizations to develop strategies that link national security, environmental quality, and economic growth.** The Council recommends that EPA utilize partnerships to access technical knowledge, financial resources, and the unique perspectives of different stakeholders.
9. **Develop new, innovative and integrative ways of doing business such as collaborative problem solving (with states, tribes and stakeholders) and regulatory innovation to increase effectiveness and efficiency of environmental programs.**
10. **Expand EPA's information and communication role, with emphasis on the collection and management of environmental data and other relevant information.** EPA should also take steps to improve the measurement or estimation (modeling) of the results of environmental initiatives.
11. **Provide staff support for reaching out more actively with educational initiatives aimed at small businesses, communities and individual citizens.** The Council recommends that EPA focus specific initiatives on helping businesses, communities and individuals recognize their environmental impacts and encouraging the adoption of new technologies and behaviors to reduce those impacts.
12. **Take steps to position the Agency for improved measurement or estimation (modeling) of the results of environmental initiatives.** The Council recommends that EPA quickly evaluate prior measurement efforts, extract any useful measurement system(s) approaches, and, quickly establish core standards for measuring (and explaining) environmental progress.



Introduction

In 1988, pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), P.L. 92-463, EPA established the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (“NACEPT” or “Council”) to provide independent advice to the EPA Administrator on a broad range of environmental policy, technology and management issues. The Council’s primary customers are the EPA Administrator, the program offices, and the regions. Administratively, NACEPT resides within EPA’s Office of Cooperative Environmental Management (OCEM).

To mark NACEPT’s 20th anniversary and its achievements over the last two decades, and to help ensure that this record of success continues, OCEM led an effort to:

- (1) Identify the issues and challenges that EPA will face and should focus on over the next 10 years;
- (2) Review NACEPT’s operations and accomplishments since 1988; and
- (3) Develop a strategic framework for how NACEPT can best serve EPA based on the prospective and retrospective findings.

EPA asked NACEPT to address the first component of identifying the issues and challenges that EPA will face over the next 10 years, and the approaches the Agency might take to address those issues. This report represents NACEPT’s findings and recommendations to EPA.

NACEPT has previously addressed the challenge and value of looking ahead to spotlight future trends and issues. In its 2002 report, *“The Environmental Future: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities for EPA,”* NACEPT noted that “[o]ur nation’s approach to environmental protection has been largely reactive...Futures analysis, the art and science of anticipating nascent environmental issues, encourages proactive thinking to prevent potential problems, rather than responding after the fact.”



Study Approach

This prospective analysis builds upon the work completed by NACEPT as well as several other groups and organizations who similarly looked ahead to identify important environmental trends and issues. The NACEPT Prospective Workgroup, a subset of the Council, was established to help the Council research this issue. The members of the workgroup and the full Council are listed in Appendix A. OCEM enlisted contractor support from Industrial Economics, Inc. (IEc) in preparing this report, which comprises three main components: a review of previously completed “futures” analyses; structured interviews with fifteen leaders from industry, academia, state and tribal government, and non-governmental organizations; and discussions with NACEPT members at, and following, a meeting in November 2008.

Initial Research of Futures Literature

As noted, NACEPT and many other groups and organizations have attempted to look ahead and identify the emerging trends and issues that will impact the environment. IEc reviewed a number of reports and studies that described how these different groups identified the issues and trends that will most likely impact the environment over the next ten years, those that would be most important for EPA to address, and how the Agency might do so.

Prospective Study Interviews

As a first step, OCEM and IEc developed a comprehensive list of interview questions with the intent to provoke thoughtful observations on future environmental issues and trends of importance, as well as EPA’s role in addressing those issues and trends.

EPA selected seventeen individuals from a variety of government, corporate, and academic positions who are all recognized, influential leaders in their respective fields.

Of the seventeen individuals selected, fifteen agreed to participate. The individuals who volunteered to share their perspectives and suggestions as part of this study are identified in the text box.

Prospective Study Interviewees

- › [George Daston](#), Research Fellow – Proctor & Gamble Company
- › [Otto Doering](#), Professor of Agricultural Economics – Purdue University
- › [Jim Greenwood](#), President and CEO - Biotechnology Industry Organization
- › [Hank Habicht](#), Managing Partner – SAIL Venture Partners
- › [Nancy John](#), Director – Cherokee Nation, Environmental Protection Commission
- › [James H. Johnson, Jr.](#), Dean of College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences - Howard University
- › [Jack Keenan](#), Chief Operating Officer – Pacific Gas & Electric
- › [Drew Kodjak](#), Executive Director – International Council on Clean Transportation
- › [Jonathan Lash](#), President - World Resources Institute
- › [Bill McDonough](#), Founding Partner - William McDonough + Partners
- › [Kim Nelson](#), Executive Director for eGovernment - Microsoft
- › [Dianne Nielson](#), Energy Advisor - State of Utah
- › [Lester Snow](#), Director – California Department of Water Resources
- › [Robert Stavins](#), Director of Harvard Environmental Economics Program - Harvard University
- › [Wilma Subra](#), President – Subra Company

In addition to the positions they hold currently, several of the interviewees have played significant roles in the environmental regulatory community. Among the interviewees were a former member of the U.S. House of Representatives, a former EPA Deputy Administrator, and a former EPA Chief Information Officer. As a result, the interviews reflect a strong awareness of EPA's past and present policies, procedures, and programs.

The prospective report presents the ideas, concerns, and suggestions offered by the interviewees, but to ensure an open dialogue in the interviews, the report does not attribute specific comments to any of the individuals.

Interview Approach

After initial contact by EPA, IEC scheduled and conducted all fifteen interviews by telephone during September 2008. EPA staff and NACEPT workgroup members were invited to join the calls, but did so almost exclusively as observers rather than participants. The interviews consisted of ten questions (see text box) that had been provided to the interviewees in advance. For consistency across interviews, IEC posed each question, in order, to each interviewee but quickly moved on when it was clear that the subject had been addressed in response to an earlier question.

The calls were not recorded, but IEC took detailed notes during each and prepared summaries that were sent to the interviewee for review, addition, and clarification as needed. The information from the notes was then compiled for analysis.

Questions for NACEPT Prospective Analysis

1. What do you consider to be the most influential long-term trends or forces (whether social, economic, technological, or otherwise) that are most likely to impact the environment over the next ten years?
2. What is your opinion on whether EPA is adequately addressing these trends or developments?
3. What steps could EPA take to improve its ability to anticipate and address these trends and related issues?
4. What do you consider to be the top environmental issues or challenges that the EPA must address in the next 10 years?
5. What might limit the Agency's ability to respond to the identified issues?
6. What are some specific steps that the Agency could take to respond to the issues and overcome the constraints?
7. What might the Agency look like ten years from now and what major changes in the way the Agency currently operates should be implemented now to achieve this ten year vision?
8. Over the next ten years, how would you define success for the EPA?
9. What measures would indicate success or failure for the Agency in the next ten years?
10. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

NACEPT Meeting

On November 13-14, 2008 NACEPT held a full committee meeting to celebrate the Council's first twenty years. A portion of the agenda included a presentation and discussion of the key findings from the interviews and reviews of futures analyses, described above. In addition, some Council members provided additional input following the meeting.



Trends And Themes Identified In Selected Futures Studies

The following summaries of selected reports are not intended to serve as comprehensive compilations of the points raised in those reports. Rather, they have been selected to illustrate the types of futures analyses that have been recently conducted and to highlight the key points raised that pertain to this study; namely emerging trends and issues and how EPA might address them in the future.

U.S. EPA Science Advisory Board. "Beyond The Horizon: Using Foresight To Protect The Environmental Future," 1995.

EPA's Science Advisory Board prepared a report that examined different methodologies used to study potential future events and trends, identified environmental issues that might emerge by 2025, and advised EPA on ways to incorporate futures research and techniques into its operations.

In addition to reviewing the social, economic, technological, and institutional forces likely to lead to influence emerging issues, the report identified 50 potential issues that could impact the environment and EPA. The report also identified five major problem areas to which EPA should pay particular attention:

- Sustainability of terrestrial ecosystems,
- Non-cancer human health effects,
- Total air pollutant loadings,
- Non-traditional environmental stressors, and
- Health of the oceans.

With regard to how EPA should integrate futures methodologies into its ongoing activities, the report suggested that

- EPA should work with other governmental and private agencies and organizations to establish a look-out panel to identify emerging issues.
- EPA should work with these agencies and organizations to develop strategies that link national security, environmental quality, and economic growth.
- EPA should encourage cooperative activities among these partners in the following:
 - Improving and integrating futures studies,

Studies Reviewed

U.S. EPA Science Advisory Board. "Beyond the Horizon: Using Foresight to Protect the Environmental Future," 1995.

NACEPT. "The Environmental Future: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities for EPA," 2002.

Environmental Council of the States (ECOS). "Planning for the Environmental Future: Preliminary State Perspectives On the Challenges Ahead," April 2005.

EPA Innovation Action Council Futures Interview Summary, 2004.

North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation. "Future Environmental Priorities In North America," 2000.

EPA International Futures Project (2000). Foresight and Governance Project, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. "New Global Agenda," 2004.

- Focusing on the underlying causes of environmental change,
- Improving environmental awareness and education, and
- Establishing a broad-based data system to anticipate future risks.

NACEPT. "The Environmental Future: Emerging Challenges And Opportunities For EPA," 2002.

NACEPT was asked to recommend a process to enhance EPA's ability to identify emerging trends and issues. As part of the process, NACEPT identified six broad themes as one way to organize the review of emerging trends, and identified opportunities for EPA within each theme. The six themes are listed below, along with opportunities in each area as noted in the report.

World Population and Demographics:

- Facilitate the export of environmentally superior technologies
- Elevate EPA's international role
- Establish an Envirocorps similar to Peace Corps

Natural Resources:

Energy

- Expand Energy Star program
- Promote market-oriented measures for reducing global warming
- Support research on carbon sequestration

Water

- Enhance efforts to include non-point sources in water management
- Support an effective market environment to minimize hazardous waste generation

Biodiversity

- Develop natural resource partnerships
- Expand efforts to control invasive species
- Develop a strategy to address health impacts of food additives

Air

- Develop a multi-pollutant approach to air pollutants
- Support research on ultra-clean coal technology

Science and Technology:

- Marshal sound science to develop and defend standards
- Promote emerging developments in biotechnology and nanotechnology

Information Management and Access:

- Expand EPA's information and communication role

Themes

- › World Population and Demographics
- › Natural Resources
- › Science and Technology
- › Information Management and Access
- › Economics and Commerce
- › Politics and Social Evolution

- Improve information coordination
- Perfect integrated monitoring technologies

Economics and Commerce:

- Continue to identify cost-effective environmental technologies
- Improve permitting to foster environmental justice
- Assist in preventing ecological-economic development failure

Politics and Social Evolution:

- Improve capacity to track state and tribal environmental performance
- Create new opportunities for NGO and stakeholder input
- Support a global reporting initiative

In addition to identifying opportunities for EPA activity within specific themes, the NACEPT group also identified a number of recommendations for ways EPA might improve its ability to anticipate and address emerging trends. These included:

- Create ongoing scanning process that involves all of the Agency
- Support ongoing work of futures activities and provide training in futures tools including scanning, scenario development, and modeling
- Incorporate futures analysis into strategic planning framework

Environmental Council Of The States (ECOS). "Planning For The Environmental Future: Preliminary State Perspectives On The Challenges Ahead," April 2005.

In a meeting facilitated by EPA's Office of the Chief Financial Officer, a group of ECOS members informally identified a number of emerging trends and resulting environmental challenges.

Forces Driving Change

The participants identified technology-driven and demographic change as major drivers. Looking at technology-driven changes, the participants identified changes that could do the most to enhance EPA's capability to protect the environment (communication, remediation, and monitoring technologies), those most likely to improve the environment (transportation-related improvements, new energy technologies, and more efficient and complete waste management technologies), and those that could do the most harm to the environment (traditional energy production, e-waste, and unwise use of nano-technology). In addition, the group recognized that some "promising" technologies could have unanticipated negative impacts. For example, an increase in the availability of hybrid vehicles might actually contribute to sprawl.

With regard to demographic changes, the group identified population shifts both on a global and more local scale, especially in environmentally sensitive areas, as a significant driver. The participants noted that an aging population will likely result in less consumption, although resulting decreases in revenues could constrain state and other governments' ability to address problems. In addition, the group noted that changing consumption patterns (increase in "green" purchasing) can also have major environmental impacts.

Emerging Issues

The participants identified major environmental concerns for the next twenty years in three categories: well-known concerns, potential surprises, and issues not on EPA's radar screen.

Well-known concerns: Water quality and quantity, air pollution, climate change, and economic change.

Potential Surprises: Energy technology changes, climate change, existing chemicals, ocean pollution, and limitations in ability to respond to problems with technology.

Issues not on EPA radar screen: Issues related to energy production and use, the need for increased coordination with other agencies in dealing with a range of issues including energy policy and water management, and other issues including land conservation, invasive species, and homeland security issues.

Incorporating Foresight Into Agency Planning

Participants identified a number of issues that needed to be addressed in EPA's Strategic Plan. These include climate change, ecosystem health and services, needed investment in monitoring and basic research. Other suggestions included increasing transparency of underlying information and increasing involvement of regions in planning process.

Nearly all participants noted the need for EPA to devote more attention to identifying emerging issues and problems. Many also pointed out the need for increased cooperation with other agencies and levels of government and increased consideration of regional views and budget sharing.

EPA Innovation Action Council Futures Interview Summary, 2004.

In the spring of 2004, 23 members of the EPA Innovation Action Council (IAC) participated in a series of interviews that collected information on their views on key environmental problems and trends that EPA will face in 2011 and 2025, the drivers and assumptions underlying these trends, and ways that EPA could address the emerging challenges. In addition, 18 members of the EPA Futures Network answered the same questions through completion of an online survey.

Underlying Causes

Respondents cited the following as important trends.

- Changing demographics,
- Resource consumption,
- Sprawl,
- Technological change, and
- Cultural changes.

Emerging Problems

Both the IAC members and the members of the EPA Futures Network most frequently identified water quality and quantity as key issues. Other issues prominently listed by both groups of respondents included climate change, problems associated with energy production, and biodiversity. In addition, the IAC mem-

bers also frequently cited homeland security and global air pollution while the EPA staff also cited toxic chemicals as a looming problem.

New Strategies

Respondents encouraged EPA to take a more collaborative approach to addressing emerging problems and focus on the emerging social and demographic trends. They highlighted the following as new approaches or emphases the Agency could take:

- Incorporate social science and research why individuals and organizations make the decisions they do,
- Promote sustainability,
- Create and share knowledge,
- Encourage new technology,
- Integrate (across media, agencies, and problems) and collaborate, and
- Enhance and maintain the quality of the EPA work force.

North American Commission For Environmental Cooperation. “Future Environmental Priorities In North America,” 2000.

In 2000, the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (NACEC) conducted a questionnaire to gather input from the general public on important issues, now and in 20 years. In describing the survey on its website (<http://www.cec.org/trio/stories/index.cfm>) the CEC noted that “[t]he Future Environmental Priorities Questionnaire was posted on NACEC’s web site during September and October 2000. While the identity of the respondents is not known, the fact that they found the survey on the NACEC web site suggests that many may already have been familiar with NACEC and may therefore reasonably be assumed to possess a higher-than-average interest in environmental issues. Given that responses may have been submitted from anywhere in the world, the results cannot be considered a randomly reflective North American perspective.” Several of the questions addressed the same themes raised in this study’s interviews (as described in the next section); responses to those questions are noted below.

What Are the Two Biggest Long-Term Environmental Concerns for You?

The NACEC grouped responses into 18 different categories and the concerns identified by the greatest number of respondents were:

- Loss of habitat/biodiversity,
- Climate change,
- Water quality,
- Population, and
- Air quality.

Forty-five percent of the respondents thought the nature of these problems would get worse over the next 20 years while 22 percent noted that increased awareness of and understanding of the problems would eventually lead to better conditions.

What Needs To Be Done Differently To Better Address These (Two) Concerns?

Respondents called for more education and communication, more regulation and monitoring, and a commitment to sustainable development as the most important areas to be emphasized.

Looking Back From 2020, What Would You Describe As the Triumph of North American Environmental Policy?

There was a great deal of variation in the responses to this question, with the largest number of individuals identifying as the most likely “triumphs”:

- Increased awareness and education,
- Increased regulation and monitoring,
- Improved air quality,
- Protection of natural habitats,
- Deployment of clean technologies, and
- Improved water quality.

Interestingly, relatively few respondents identified reduction in greenhouse gases as a likely triumph despite it being ranked as the environmental problem that would deserve the most attention (see above).

EPA International Futures Project, 2000.

In an effort to gain a broad perspective on the challenges facing the country on the international front, the EPA convened two roundtable discussions on international environmental futures. Prior to the two meetings, the roundtable members were interviewed to determine their perspectives on a series of questions, summarized below.

What Do You Consider To Be the 3 Most Influential Long-Term Global Trends That Hold the Greatest Potential To Reshape the Environmental Challenges We Face In the Next 5 To 20 Years?

The most common responses, listed in decreasing order of frequency, were:

- Population growth and urbanization,
- Globalization of the economy,
- Globalization of information,
- Changes in organizational relationships,
- Technology research and development,
- Loss and degradation of renewable natural systems,
- Transportation of pollution,
- Climate change, and
- Water quality protection and the health of hydrologic systems.

What Are the Top Issues That the United States and EPA Must Address In the Next 5 To 20 Years?

The most common responses, listed in decreasing order of frequency, were:

- Climate change,
- Proliferation of chemicals,
- Sustainable development, effective resource management,
- Biotechnology,
- Changes in energy use,
- Financing infrastructure change,

- Providing tools for use by local government, and
- Biodiversity and habitat preservation.

What Steps Should EPA Take To Address These Challenges Over the Next 20 Years?

Respondents offered the following suggestions:

- Continue to improve information and data management,
- Decide if it should be an agreement broker or a scientific agency,
- Improve outreach,
- Solidify its role as purveyor of technical assistance,
- Take a more holistic approach to environmental protection across all media,
- Continue work with the private sector,
- Explore market based approaches,
- Collaborate more with other federal agencies, and
- Consider separating into science and regulatory agencies.

Roundtable Discussions

Some of the key recommendations that came out of the two days of the roundtable discussions are noted below:

- Improve the technological capabilities of EPA,
- Improve scientific analyses within the Agency,
- Increase involvement in environment and trade discussions,
- Promote EPA as a facilitator on International environmental issues,
- Increase marketing of EPA contributions and skills,
- Establish clear linkages between domestic and international issues,
- Help develop finance mechanisms for environmental projects, and
- Recognize decentralization of domestic and foreign governments and cultural differences.

Foresight And Governance Project, Woodrow Wilson International Center For Scholars. "New Global Agenda," 2004.

In a paper prepared for the Foresight and Governance Project of the Woodrow Wilson Center, the Institute for Environmental Futures reviewed nine analyses of global environmental issues and focused on how these studies analyzed three questions.

- What problems pose the most serious threats to the global environment and to continuing economic development?
- What are the underlying causes of these global environmental problems?
- What changes in governance strategies are needed to deal with global environmental problem and their underlying trends?

Studies Reviewed

- World Resources 2000-2001: People and Ecosystems: A study published by the World Resources Institute.
- Environmental Outlook: A study published by the Organisation for Economic Development and Co-operation (OECD).
- World Development Report 2003: A Study published by the World Bank.
- One with Nineveh: Politics, Consumption, and the Human Future: A book by Paul and Anne Ehrlich.
- Red Sky at Morning: America and the Crisis of the Global Environment: A book by James Gustave Speth.
- Global Environment Outlook 3: A study published by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).
- Global Trends 2015: A study published by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).
- The Environmental Future: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities for the EPA: A study published by the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT).
- Plan B: Rescuing a Planet Under Stress and a Civilization in Trouble: A book by Lester R. Brown.

The tables that follow summarize the main points of consensus among the studies as captured in the report.

TABLE 1. Consensus on Problem Areas

| Source | Major Problems | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Water Quality and Access | Climate Change | Biodiversity | Indoor Air Quality | Air Pollution | Food Production/Soil Degradation | Over-Fishing | Deforestation |
| World Resources 2000-2001: People and Ecosystems (WRI) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| OECD Environmental Outlook | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| World Development Report 2003 (World Bank) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| One with Nineveh (Paul and Anne Ehrlich) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Red Sky at Morning (Gus Speth) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Global Environment Outlook 3 (UNEP) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Global Trends 2015 (CIA) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| The Environmental Future: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities for the EPA (NACEPT) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Plan B: Rescuing a Planet Under Stress and a Civilization in Trouble (Lester Brown) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| <p>✓: Problem is a <i>serious</i> threat to the global environment and continued economic development.</p> <p>✓ : Problem is a threat to the global environment.</p> | | | | | | | | |

TABLE 2. Consensus on Underlying Causes

| Source | Major Causes | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Population Growth | Consumption Patterns | Market Failure/Policy, Political Failure | Nature of Technology | Culture, Worldviews, Values |
| World Resources 2000-2001: People and Ecosystems (WRI) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| OECD Environmental Outlook | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| World Development Report 2003 (World Bank) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| One with Nineveh (Paul and Anne Ehrlich) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Red Sky at Morning (Gus Speth) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Global Environment Outlook 3 (UNEP) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Global Trends 2015 (CIA) | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| The Environmental Future: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities for the EPA (NACEPT) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Plan B: Rescuing a Planet Under Stress and a Civilization in Trouble (Lester Brown) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| <p>✓: Problem is a <i>serious</i> threat to the global environment and continued economic development.</p> <p>✓ : Problem is a threat to the global environment.</p> | | | | | |

TABLE 3. Governance Strategies to Address Specific Underlying Causes

| Source | Roles | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Accelerate Demographic Transition | Eliminate Mass Poverty | Catalyze an Environmental Revolution in Technology | Rightly Frame Markets | Encourage Sustainable Consumption | Create and Share Knowledge |
| World Resources 2000-2001: People and Ecosystems (WRI) | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| OECD Environmental Outlook | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| World Development Report 2003 (World Bank) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| One with Nineveh (Paul and Anne Ehrlich) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Red Sky at Morning (Gus Speth) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Global Environment Outlook 3 (UNEP) | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Global Trends 2015 (CIA) | | | | | | |
| The Environmental Future: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities for the EPA (NACEPT) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Plan B: Rescuing a Planet Under Stress and a Civilization in Trouble (Lester Brown) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| <p>✓: Problem is a <i>serious</i> threat to the global environment and continued economic development.</p> <p>✓ : Problem is a threat to the global environment.</p> | | | | | | |



Findings From Interviews

This section presents findings based on the responses provided by the 15 interviewees to the 10 questions included in this study. The findings are presented in four categories: Key Trends and Issues; EPA’s Current Response Capability and Performance; Opportunities to Improve EPA’s Response Capability; and Documenting Success. Exhibit 1 illustrates how the questions map to these four categories.

EXHIBIT 1. Mapping of Interview Questions to Findings Categories

| Category | Question |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Key Trends and Issues | 1. What do you consider to be the most influential long-term trends or forces (whether social, economic, technological, or otherwise) that are most likely to impact the environment over the next ten years? |
| | 4. What do you consider to be the top environmental issues or challenges that the EPA must address in the next 10 years? |
| EPA’s Current Response Capability and Performance | 2. What is your opinion on whether EPA is adequately addressing these trends or developments? |
| | 5. What might limit the Agency’s ability to respond to the identified issues? |
| Opportunities to Improve EPA’s Response Capability | 3. What steps could EPA take to improve its ability to anticipate and address these trends and related issues? |
| | 6. What are some specific steps that the Agency could take to respond to the issues and overcome the constraints? |
| | 7. What might the Agency look like ten years from now and what major changes in the way the Agency currently operates should be implemented now to achieve this ten year vision? |
| Documenting Success | 8. Over the next ten years, how would you define success for the EPA? |
| | 9. What measures would indicate success or failure for the Agency in the next ten years? |

The interviews conducted as part of this analysis in part reaffirmed the findings of earlier assessments—most of the issues that had been identified previously as emerging challenges for EPA remain so in the eyes of the interviewees, although climate change was widely recognized as presenting an increasingly dominant set of challenges. Similarly, in the opinion of the interviewees, the steps EPA can take to prepare for and more effectively respond to these challenges are primarily associated with the application of sound science in an increasingly collaborative and cooperative manner. The main themes that emerged from the interviews include the following.

- **Climate change presents a challenge that most of the interviewees believe will require substantial EPA involvement over the next ten years and beyond.** In fact, most of the interviewees viewed climate change not just as one issue among many environmental challenges; they described it as a long-term trend on par with, and directly linked to, other macro forces such as population growth and technological development.
- **EPA does or should play a pivotal role as the nation’s leading source of environmental science and technology and should foster collaborative and cooperative relationships with all public and private sector interests.** Many of the interviewees highlighted the need for improved lines of communication—within EPA, between the Agency and the states, and between the Agency and other public and private stakeholders—as a critical element of this role.
- **Some factors that will influence the degree to which EPA is successful over the next ten years remain largely beyond the Agency’s control.** Interviewees frequently cited the constraints imposed by authorities granted (or not granted) to the Agency by Congress and the financial resources at the Agency’s disposal.

This summary of findings captures these and other important themes that emerged from our interviews, but does not attempt to convey the full breadth of the interviewees’ comments. At least a portion of each interviewee’s comments focused on specific challenges or opportunities within his/her area of expertise (which is the primary lens through which they view EPA’s actions). Appendix B provides an expanded summary of the responses to each question, highlighting the range of interviewees’ answers as well as the frequency with which common answers were offered.

Key Trends and Issues

Several of the interviewees provided thoughts on “macro” trends, including population growth, the emergence of new global economic powers, global instabilities, and the growing recognition of the concept of “sustainability,” all of which have significant implications for environmental protection. However, most chose instead to focus on the key issues EPA is likely to face over the next decade. While interviewees tended to emphasize issues most closely related to their area of expertise, most also singled out climate change as the most significant issue that EPA must address over the next ten years. In doing so, they noted the wide array of likely climate change-related challenges ahead, from the development of new regulatory programs and resource management strategies to the need to address changing land use patterns and the alteration of natural habitats. The climate challenge also provided the context within which interviewees stressed the need for a focus on strong science, support for technological development, and close, productive relationships with other federal agencies as well as private sector interests.

The other issues that interviewees identified fall into four general categories: the quality of air, water, and land resources; management of chemicals in the environment; responses to technological development; and EPA's relationships with stakeholders.

Quality of Air, Water, and Land Resources

Many of the interviewees stressed that the issue of improving and maintaining air, water, and land quality will remain a critical one for EPA over the next decade. In addition, several commented on the ways in which the scope of these more "traditional" challenges has expanded in the face of both local and global development patterns. For example, they noted that air quality is no longer just a local or regional issue with the growth of transboundary pollution from developing world countries that is less easily influenced by EPA decisions and actions, that competition between agricultural and other users for increasingly scarce freshwater resources is growing stronger, and that climate change-induced alterations of the landscape (e.g., more regular inundation of floodplains) will affect the way in which land development occurs.

Management of Chemicals In the Environment

Several interviewees commented on the issue of chemicals in the environment, particularly EPA's ability to regulate them effectively as more and better data become available and as demands for effective response grow louder. Of particular note were references to the European Union's Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemical substances (REACH) regulations, as a potential indicator of the direction in which U.S. regulation might soon be headed. At the same time there was recognition that the classic tools and tests EPA employs may not be sufficiently sensitive to detect new classes of contaminants in the environment, such as pharmaceutical products, nor sufficiently advanced to understand in depth the toxicological profiles of the growing number of chemicals in commerce.

Responses To Technological Development

Comments that addressed technology as an important issue were almost exclusively forward-looking, with the exception of one reminder that existing environmental management infrastructure (e.g., solid waste landfills, wastewater treatment facilities) is decaying, with limited resources available for repair or replacement. The forward-looking comments expressed optimism as well as caution. On the one hand, multiple interviewees expressed the belief that we have not yet explored the extent to which technology can both solve problems and lead to more efficient uses of our resources. Within the IT industry, for example, the potential impact of developing monitoring, decision making, and "smart" tools and making them available to other industries is far greater than the impact they can have through efforts to reduce their own environmental footprints, and EPA can do more to foster that transfer. On the other hand, some of the interviewees noted that we lack full understanding of the consequences of new technology deployment (e.g., nanotechnology, the large scale deployment of renewable energy technologies), and that while the environmental benefits from their deployment may be significant, we also need to account for and properly manage any associated externalities.

EPA's Relationship With Stakeholders

Separate from strictly technical or scientific issues, the subject of collaboration, cooperation and communication with stakeholders was a common theme across interviews. Several interviewees expanded on this point, offering specific examples of the challenges EPA faces in ensuring that good decisions are made based at least in part on input from those most affected by the decisions. One of the biggest challenges revolves around accessibility to information and data. As one interviewee noted, the general population can be characterized in the simplest terms by those who are knowledgeable about environmental issues and what to do about them, and those who are not. In some communities, often the ones that face disproportionate environmental impacts, this knowledge gap, or condition of "information asymmetry," is particularly acute. Among all communities, even those with more knowledge and available tools, EPA is challenged to reach out to individual citizens to get them to recognize their own impact on the environment and to encourage their adoption of new tools and behaviors.

EPA'S Current Response Capability and Performance

This section summarizes interviewees' answers to questions that focus on how well EPA is responding to trends and, more importantly, on factors that are limiting the Agency's response capability. In response to the question, "Is EPA doing well?" the general consensus was yes, particularly in its fulfillment of statutory obligations, in its demonstration of expertise in core subject areas, and in its development of tools enabling other groups, such as states and tribes, to contribute to environmental protection. In fact, several interviewees made a point of describing EPA as the preeminent environmental agency not just in the United States but in the world, and further expressed the importance of ensuring that the Agency retains this status.

At the same time, each interviewee described at least one area of perceived weakness, usually in the context of an internal or external force that serves to limit the Agency's effectiveness. Two types of limitations were described with the greatest frequency: those associated with financial and human resources and those associated with the scope of EPA's portfolio of environmental protection responsibilities.

Resources

Many of the interviewees expressed a belief that EPA has insufficient financial resources to accomplish its mission and that, while EPA's staff is talented and committed, it is also challenged to recruit and retain the most highly qualified people and thus risks being unable to maintain the necessary level of expertise. They noted that while the Agency's resources are fully employed on the activities currently within its charge, expectations of what EPA can or should do are increasing at the same time that budgets are decreasing, forcing the Agency to think of ways to do more with less. This trend runs counter to, or at least severely constrains, the need to offer competitive salaries to the "best and the brightest" who otherwise might not consider a government career.

Scope

Some of the interviewees' comments addressed the limitation created by the tension between EPA's basic mandate and what it is authorized to do, and the expectation that the Agency can "do it all." Specifically, it was noted that:

- EPA can be limited by statute, and not just because Congress has not

granted the Agency the authority to intervene in every environment-related issue, but also because the wording of a statute that does grant authority may itself limit EPA's ability to respond effectively.

- EPA faces an "image problem" resulting from the perception that the Agency "does everything" related to the environment. This perception leads to expectations that the Agency cannot meet.
- As discussed further below, the Agency is limited to some extent by a structure that mirrors the primary environmental protection statutes and thus results in an emphasis on regulatory activity and enforcement (or as one interviewee described it, "when you have a hammer, everything looks like a nail"). This emphasis constrains the Agency's ability to address cross-cutting problems in a flexible manner or to collaborate with other agencies on issues of mutual concern.

It is also worth noting that the influence of politics on EPA's work was also described more than once as limiting the degree to which the scope of EPA's work is clearly defined and understood. As one interviewee stated, the political environment is the single biggest challenge EPA faces, as it is one of the government agencies most affected by politicized decision making; this slows the decision-making process and also prevents EPA from maximizing its effectiveness.

Opportunities to Improve EPA's Response Capability

Three questions posed to the interviewees focused on steps EPA might take to anticipate trends, respond to emerging issues, and overcome existing constraints. These questions also provided the interviewees with an opportunity to suggest alterations in the way EPA is organized that might help the Agency meet its responsibilities more effectively. The suggestions offered by the interviewees fall into four general categories: focus and expertise, organization, approach, and collaboration.

Focus and Expertise

The interviewees' opinions regarding where EPA should focus its efforts and develop and maintain expertise are varied and not internally consistent. While some see the greatest value in having EPA adhere to its traditional, "core" mission, others see an opportunity for EPA to rethink the nature of its role. Either way, several interviewees noted the need for EPA to define and be certain of its role.

The interviewees seemed to offer two general models for EPA going forward. While the two are not mutually exclusive, the challenge of implementing them both and doing so successfully, particularly in the face of resource constraints, was readily apparent from their comments. In the first model, EPA would continue doing what it does best (stay focused on its primary role of controlling pollutants; do only what the statutes require) and work to make sure it continues to perform well in that role. In the second model, EPA would maintain its core mission but would also develop new structures and mechanisms to apply its expertise in the most efficient and effective way possible to the difficult and emerging challenges that lie ahead.

On balance, more interviewees expressed support for the second model over the first or, more specifically, for the model of EPA as an organization on the leading edge of applied science and technology rather than as an organization focused only on regulation and enforcement. At the same time, they recognized the need to define boundaries, suggesting ideas such as a limited focus on the biggest or most complex challenges, with a higher degree of collaboration on "lesser" issues

that might be best served through the application of another agency's expertise. Similarly, different ideas were offered for how to build and structure the technical leadership that would be required to take on the biggest challenges, from the creative use of multidisciplinary (i.e., cross-Agency) teams to the development of "flexible," rather than targeted, expertise capable of responding to any number of issues that might arise in the context of an overarching issue.

Organization

The majority of the interviewees did not offer specific suggestions for changes in EPA's overall organization, but those who did approached this question from a variety of angles. One anecdote in particular captured the organizational challenge that EPA might consider addressing. In preparing its first Report on the Environment, it was said that EPA found itself unable to provide answers to the public's most significant environmental questions for the simple reason that the data to do so simply were not available. The reason the data were not available was that EPA's organization (dominated by media- or statute-specific "silos") was not aligned with the questions.

Among the suggestions (or wishes) for an alternative structure or for steps that would improve EPA's overall functioning were the following:

- The elevation of the EPA Administrator to Cabinet level.
- The establishment of positions for a Deputy Administrator of Regulation and a Deputy Administrator of Science.
- A six year term for the EPA Administrator in order to provide some separation from the influence of political cycles.
- A deliberate effort to improve communication and information transfer among EPA's different sections and programs, as well as between other national, state, tribal, and local partners.
- Organization by functional expertise in order to facilitate experts' ability to work on similar problems across program offices (and to minimize the perceived underutilization of its staff).
- Organization by a limited number of broad subject areas to capture related issues under common umbrellas; for example, water (including agriculture), energy (including transportation), and chemicals (including pollution prevention).

Some notes of caution were also expressed regarding organizational matters. First, an interviewee suggested that when and if Congress delegates broad authority over climate change matters to EPA, the Agency would be taking on an issue that is easily twice as large (in terms of potential economic cost) as any existing regulatory program. Such a mandate could thus require a significant change in the way the Agency operates. A second interviewee expressed more generally that a reorganization of the Agency would involve both a large investment and considerable risk; therefore, it was suggested, EPA should ask instead whether its budget could be structured to enable cross-functional initiatives without a massive reorganization.

Approach

In response to questions asking how EPA could improve its ability to address key issues and overcome existing constraints, the interviewees offered a range of suggestions for new or altered approaches to management challenges. Other than the recurring theme of collaboration (discussed below), these suggestions do not

fit easily into thematic categories (perhaps an indication of the wide range of opportunities available to EPA to build on past success), and are therefore presented below as discrete opportunities.

- EPA should continue and make more regular use of outlook panels to explore future trends, but should expand their scope beyond purely research issues to address regulatory issues as well.
- EPA might consider instituting an Office of Clean Technology Deployment and taking steps to educate the public about the relative “greenness” of consumer products, as it does so effectively for consumer appliances.
- Given financial resource constraints and the need to increase productivity, the Agency should explore ways to take advantage of computational power in ways that may not have been considered, such as maximizing modeling and simulation efforts as substitutes for more time-consuming and expensive approaches (e.g., data-intensive environmental monitoring).
- From a design perspective, a regulation is a signal of design failure, meaning that when there is a need to regulate there is something wrong. EPA should adopt a design frame of mind (for example, promoting green chemistry) in order to embrace opportunities for new approaches to problems.
- EPA could put more of a focus on what it could do to drive technology adoption into other sectors. Where technology already exists, EPA is needed to implement standards and aggregate information to facilitate its adoption. Efforts in this regard could include a technology advisory board or more emphasis through NACEPT.
- Citizens have become accustomed to performing the functions of their personal life online and they expect to be able to move their interactions with the government (e.g., getting their driver’s license) online as well. The government should look to create an environment of openness using emerging concepts such as enterprise social networking, which involves tools similar to Facebook and other forms of social networking. Enterprise social networking tools would let EPA and other government agencies enlist more public involvement in its activities.
- EPA could learn from the example of the Cherokee “Earth Watchers” who embrace the mindset of being a steward of the environment, using funding effectively, implementing programs correctly, and planning for future generations.

Collaboration

One of the most widely held views among the interviewees was that EPA can and should work toward greater collaboration with other federal agencies, state and tribal organizations, industry, local communities and the general public, and international partners. Several interviewees noted that at the federal level collaboration would include instances in which EPA shares responsibility in a clear and organized fashion as well as instances in which the Agency defers to a sister agency and assumes a more supportive role. As an example of the former, an interviewee highlighted a provision in the 2007 Energy Bill, which has several biofuels opt-out provisions phrased in such a way that the EPA Administrator, Secretary of Agriculture, and Secretary of Energy would be required to reach decisions jointly. The message conveyed by interviewees regarding collaboration with non-federal parties was simple and consistent: absent opportunities for direct

input into decision-making processes, structured in a way that does not provide an advantage to one stakeholder over another, EPA's management of environmental challenges will be sub-optimal.

Documenting Success

This section presents interviewees' responses to the questions asking how to define success for EPA and how to measure whether or not EPA has been successful in fulfilling its mission. Consistent with responses to other categories of questions, the interviewees suggested definitions of success that range from the general to the more specific. The common theme among the more general definitions is straightforward: EPA is successful if it fulfills its mission to protect human health and the environment, as demonstrated by quantifiable improvements in air and water quality. Beyond the general definition, the responses offered several different ways to think about success, though many addressed the belief that EPA would be successful if it were to position itself as the widely acknowledged thought leader on issues of science and technology. Others stressed the need to think about success in terms of both quantifiable environmental quality metrics and institutional frameworks; that is, taking credit for success in forming partnerships as well as for the results that the partnership produced. Perhaps the most straightforward response to the question of how EPA might define success came from the interviewee who defined it as the ability to provide relevant, accurate data that address the questions the public wants answered.

As with the definition of success, interviewees approached the question of how to measure success from multiple angles. Most focused on measurement concepts rather than individual metrics, though several of the latter were noted (e.g., pollutant concentrations in air and water, coral reef health, number of industrial facilities located in environmental justice communities). For example, it was suggested that EPA could measure its success by its ability to attract and maintain a good staff, by looking retrospectively at the "bets" it made on the types of expertise it would need and seeing a very high "success" rate, and by demonstrating that it has implemented elements of its strategic plans that incorporate the needs of all stakeholding interests. Two comments capture the general perspective on performance measurement offered by the interviewees: on the one hand, there is a sense that insufficient attention is paid to concrete measures of a regulation's success in improving environmental quality or human health (e.g., the way the phase-out of lead in gasoline was shown to be clearly beneficial), but on the other hand, measures of progress must be defined in terms other than simple bean counting; "blue sky measures" are also appropriate for setting long-term goals.



Input From NACEPT Members

On November 13 and 14, 2008 NACEPT celebrated its first 20 years at a full Council meeting held in National Harbor, Maryland. As part of the November 13 agenda, Council members discussed the key findings from the interviews and from the review of previously conducted futures analyses. The discussion focused on three questions:

1. What are the key challenges facing EPA over the next ten years?
2. As EPA moves to meet these challenges, what are the key capabilities and attributes it needs to develop?
3. What specific actions should the Agency take to develop these attributes and challenges?

NACEPT Meeting

What Are The Key Challenges Facing EPA Over The Next Ten Years?

EPA Administrator Steve Johnson framed the discussion by highlighting five general challenges:

- Making smarter decisions with respect to energy use and supply, especially given the close connections between energy and the issues EPA does, or will, address – namely, “traditional” pollution regulation and climate change.
- Ensuring the availability of clean water.
- Having a more meaningful impact at the community level.
- Supporting and promoting emerging technologies.
- Building international partnerships and providing assistance to developing economies.

In the ensuing discussion, members identified a wide range of additional challenges that EPA should be prepared to address:

- Non-point source pollution.
- Environmental security.
- Integrating problem solving across media and agencies.
- Promoting sustainability as a different, more systemic way of looking at environmental problems that includes a temporal component (i.e., addresses issues over the long-term and recognizes both secondary and tertiary impacts).
- Advancing sciences such as epigenetics, genomics, and toxicogenomics that enhance our ability to understand the health consequences of environmental insults.

- Communicating the value of the environment at all levels.
- Finding the proper balance between technological solutions and solutions based on changes in behavior, practices, and operational methods—and developing ways to define “acceptable” risks and to realistically evaluate relative risks.
- Creating a positive vision of the environment as a growth area that runs counter to today’s generally negative environmental paradigm of dangers to be avoided and problems to be solved.
- Achieving environmental justice and creating a new, green economy that provides more opportunity for all and does not burden the poor with a disproportionate share of environmental impacts.

As EPA Moves To Meet These Challenges, What Are The Key Capabilities And Attributes It Needs To Develop?

Council members identified several key capabilities and attributes, including:

- Increased skills in “collaborative governance”; EPA does not control investment and cannot itself finance large-scale research and development efforts, so it needs to focus on being influential within a larger network in order to help create better choices.
- Increased capacity for collaboration across media and organizational levels, both within EPA and with other federal and state agencies.
- Improved monitoring and data management, including widespread utilization of advanced sensor technologies; EPA needs the capacity to understand what it needs to measure.
- An adaptive management capability that utilizes the full range of information gathered from real time sensing.
- Greater staff support for the Science Advisor.
- Greater staff support for public outreach.
- A special fund for environmental improvement created out of fines collected through enforcement activities.

Additional Input from NACEPT Members

Following the November 13-14 meeting, Council members were offered the opportunity to provide individual input through responses to the following questions:

1. As EPA strives to contribute more to meeting the difficult challenges ahead, what do you believe are the key attributes and capabilities it needs to develop?
2. What are some of the most critical specific actions needed to develop these attributes and capabilities?

The responses echoed, but in many instances expanded upon, the earlier discussion.

As EPA Strives To Contribute More To Meeting The Difficult Challenges Ahead, What Are The Key Attributes And Capabilities It Needs To Develop?

- Leadership on the environment and related issues.
- International leadership on the many critical issues that the world faces including, but not limited to, habitat destruction, over-harvesting of fisheries, low level toxins, and climate change.

- Continuously promoting the development of environmental skills within the Agency.
- Emphasizing the need for good science.
- EPA has some of the finest minds available to tackle the difficult and complex problems of our time, but getting that information to local communities still presents a major challenge. Distributing key information to the general public is going to take many collaborations on many levels. Over the years EPA has cut back on personnel and programs targeted toward communities and put in place replacement programs geared more towards large regional issues. Local community leaders do not have the EPA support they used to and as a result lose out on the plethora of information and resources that used to be available. While those resources may still exist, few if any know about them or how to access them. In order to implement the many priority programs the EPA aspires to it needs to engage and support front-line providers in order to promote their priorities at the “kitchen table level.” Local communities are the true workhorses and implementers of environmental policy.

What Are Some Of The Most Critical Specific Actions Needed To Develop These Attributes And Capabilities?

- A recommitment to transparency and partnerships, with technical excellence and external leadership.
- The President, his Cabinet, and EPA leadership should host a series of summits addressing global environmental problems.
- EPA should offer more assistance to developing countries.
- A renewal of the commitment to train new and existing staff.
- Establish rules to ensure that scientific findings are not influenced by political appointees and to ensure that clear lines are drawn between science and environmental policy decisions.
- EPA needs to develop new, innovative ways of doing business such as collaborative problem solving (with states, tribes and stakeholders) and regulatory innovation. Much can and should be learned from the states. EPA is using old, sometimes outdated and inefficient tools to address a new set of issues and has not taken bold steps to try new approaches that may provide more protection with less process.
- EPA needs to speed up modernization of its information management systems to enable electronic reporting, data sharing, and public reporting. Leadership from the top is needed to expedite office-specific data issues.
- EPA needs to develop clearer links between and integration of its strategic plan, national program managers guidance and budget decisions (operational issues), and its Report on the Environment. Currently they are too disconnected, overly complicated, opaque, and cumbersome.
- Climate change will be the major emerging issue and EPA needs to exert clear leadership on it and embrace it as an opportunity to unify the agency and catalyze cross-agency integration.
- Better distribution of resources at the regional and state level and a return to the policy of supporting local groups. The Regional Geographic Initiatives program was one of many ways that the EPA supported local projects. The support of Section 208 of the Clean Water Act is another way to build the important collaborations needed for total integrated watershed management. In the 1990s, EPA watershed coordinators traveled

throughout states and regions; their disappearance is a loss both for EPA and for local communities.

- EPA needs to streamline its regulations, getting more clean up and prevention with less bureaucratic obstacles.
- EPA needs to work with environmental groups to get more action on the ground and less in lobbying for causes, raising money, and litigating. EPA could also improve its work with communities and involved industries to reduce emissions/discharges and to engage in voluntarily prevention and clean up activities, which is not only the ethical and right thing to do but also a way to save money and reduce the consternation of local citizens.



NACEPT Recommendations

The Council offers the following recommendations aimed at clarifying and restating EPA's mission and improving the Agency's organizational structure and practices in order to support that mission more effectively. The recommendations focus on steps EPA can take to achieve greater impact and greater prominence nationally and internationally as a steward of environmental sustainability. They would allow EPA to maintain its core mission while also developing new structures and mechanisms to apply its environmental expertise in more effective ways to the difficult challenges ahead.

Mission

- **Clarify that EPA's mission addresses environmental stewardship as an important means for achieving the environmental component of sustainability.**

NACEPT's March 2008 report, *Everyone's Business: Working Towards Sustainability Through Environmental Stewardship and Collaboration*, calls for EPA to become the world's premier environmental stewardship model and catalyst. The report defines environmental stewardship as "an ethic and practice of shared responsibility for environmental quality," a key requirement for moving toward sustainability, the characteristic of natural and human systems that embodies "the possibility of flourishing forever."¹

- We recommend that EPA invest in building the skills and competencies necessary for stewardship and drive the practice of environmental stewardship deep into the Agency's organizational culture. A wide variety of environmental stewardship strategies are available to address the Administration's goals for energy and the environment such as eliminating oil imports from the Middle East and Venezuela within ten years, creating millions of new green jobs, and cutting greenhouse gas emissions 80 percent by 2050. Achieving these ambitious goals will require EPA and other agencies to use the full toolbox of strategies, not one or two tools.
- **Emphasize that science and technology are cornerstones of the EPA mission elements for mitigating environmental degradation and identifying better choices that will lead to sustainability.**
 - Preserve the quality and integrity of the scientific work of the EPA.

¹ This definition of sustainability comes from John Ehrenfeld (2008), *Sustainability by Design*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

- As a first step, publically recommit the Agency to being the Gold Standard for science on the environment and restate EPA's core function such that science and technology R&D are equal in importance to the Agency's role as principal environmental regulator. Quality environmental science will be informed by and contribute to the understanding of global environmental conditions, so EPA science and technology activities should strive for global contribution and recognition.
 - Establish clear guidelines to insure that scientific findings and reports are not influenced or changed within the Agency or elsewhere in the administrative branch in order to assure that environmental policy decisions are properly based on scientific information.
- Continuously promote the development and recognition of environmental scientific and technical skills within the Agency.
 - Enhance and maintain the quality of the EPA work force by encouraging unfettered presentation of their work and interaction with the scientific community, among other strategies.
 - Renew the commitment to keep the Agency on the leading edge of fast moving developments in science and technology by attracting new highly qualified staff and by providing training opportunities to new and existing staff.
 - Provide staffing levels throughout the Agency adequate to achieve the scientific and technical progress necessary to accomplish broad EPA objectives.
- As recommended in the NACEPT reports on Environmental Technology, support the more active roles that EPA can play in R&D and in supporting the commercialization of environmentally superior technologies. EPA can be most effective not by trying to do everything on its own but rather by playing a lead role in developing ideas and then working in partnership with others.
 - Within EPA, forge and sustain communications with the early-stage technology investment community; strengthen financial support (e.g. loan guarantees, grants, revolving loan funds) and reduce regulatory risks for new technology development during the commercialization process; streamline permitting for commercial scale-up of innovative new environmental technologies; and support better performance evaluation of new technologies. As an example of deployment support, a "Green Seal" program based on an expansion of the Energy Star program could be used to identify and encourage the development and marketing of greener products.
 - Explore possibilities for partnerships with other agencies on major projects, e.g. cooperation with the Department of Energy on an "Environmental Advanced Research Projects Agency" (EARPA), or cooperation with the Small Business Administration on "Clean Tech Business Incubators." Similarly, an "X-Prize for Green Technologies," could be established in partnership with the Department of Commerce with some elements of the Malcolm Baldrige Prize to recognize the best examples of green technology incorporating some existing practices within the EPA Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge.

- **Continue to improve EPA’s core regulatory functions.**
 - Improve permitting, enforcement, and monitoring to focus more strategically on the most important environmental issues and to foster environmental justice.
 - Streamline regulations to achieve more environmental protection with fewer bureaucratic obstacles.
 - Strengthen EPA’s investment in and promotion of innovative regulatory strategies. Over the past decade, EPA has been promoting voluntary programs and regulatory innovations implemented by industry and states. Several of these initiatives have achieved significant environmental results; however, very few, if any, have metamorphosed from incubation to mainstream practice within EPA. Expanding these initiatives would signify major strides in EPA’s evolution from playing the role of cheerleader to being a starting player on the new field of challenges for which leadership is needed to realize positive change. Examples of opportunities to put this recommendation into practice include:
 - Applying the Environmental Results Program (ERP), used in 18 states and supported by the Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, to an EPA core program such as Underground Storage Tank compliance;
 - Applying the Kaizen approach (used by several states with EPA support) within cumbersome EPA permitting programs such as NPDES or RCRA; and
 - Taking the mercury strategy (road map) from a nebulous document to real collaborative agreements on key mercury sectors.

- **Take a more holistic approach to environmental protection across all media, recognizing that many of the challenges ahead are multi-media or not even directly connected to the Agency’s traditional environmental media approaches.**
 - Employ every means possible, from training to program design and budgetary incentives, to help the Agency achieve better integration and active collaboration between its programs and improve its ability to work in partnership with other federal agencies and with states, tribes and other external stakeholders to understand problems and to develop and implement solutions.
 - Embrace climate change as an opportunity to catalyze a new level of cross-Agency integration. In doing this, examine the model provided by the Agency’s recent work on biofuels. In 2007 NACEPT recommended that EPA initiate an Agency-wide dialogue on its role in the national biofuels mission and develop an integrated, collaborative, multi-media biofuel strategy. Over 90 people from all parts of the Agency worked together to develop the Biofuels Strategic Plan. The success of that effort is not yet assured, since it is only beginning to move into an implementation phase, but it demonstrates the kind of cross-Agency integration that is possible with strong support from the Administrator.

- **Make environmental foresight or “futures analysis” a regular component of EPA’s business-as-usual practices.**

As the Science Advisory Board’s *Beyond The Horizon* report and NACEPT’s *The Environmental Future* report both emphasize, better look-ahead capabilities are essential for foreseeing potential uses and risks of emerging tech-

nologies and for identifying and responding to emerging problems early, before they become difficult and expensive to solve or have irreversible impacts. Better foresight is also critical for pursuing opportunities to influence the development of emerging technologies in order to shape a green technological infrastructure with dramatically lower environmental impacts.

- Incorporate environmental foresight as a formal component of Agency strategic planning.
- Create an ongoing process of scanning for emerging problems and opportunities that involves a Futures Network of people throughout the Agency; as appropriate, utilize modeling, scenarios, and other foresight methodologies.
- Provide a shared reporting framework, training activities, and other appropriate support for the work of this Network.
- Make regular use of Look-Out Panels to forecast environmental change, clarify its underlying causes, and identify risks and opportunities associated with emerging technologies. Panels should include outside experts from industry, other government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and public and private research groups at the forefront of technological change.

Structure and Practices

In order to assure that EPA is best equipped and positioned to achieve its mission, the Council recommends several potential steps to enhance the Agency's organizational structure and internal functioning, including:

Organization

- **Urge the President to work with Congress to make EPA a Cabinet-level agency so that its actions and statements will command more attention and response.**
- **Urge the President to work with Congress to draft broad organic legislation outlining the evolving mission of the Environmental Protection Agency and giving it greater flexibility to deal with broad challenges such as climate change, water resource sustainability, and ecosystem sustainability that will require the Agency to use integrative approaches on a scale it has not yet undertaken. Consideration of EPA's mission should include an assessment and decision on its role in providing US leadership internationally relative to other federal agencies with overlapping mandates.**

Partnerships

NACEPT's *Everyone's Business* report states that EPA can best foster stewardship by providing leadership in collaborative governance and partnerships. Through partnerships, EPA can access technical knowledge, financial resources, and the unique perspectives of different stakeholders. Partnerships also offer the potential to increase the legitimacy of EPA's actions. One of EPA's greatest contributions is to serve as a convener and catalyst for partnerships. It can also leverage its limited resources by joining partnerships initiated by others. Specifically, NACEPT recommends that EPA:

- **Work with governmental and private agencies and organizations to develop strategies that link national security, environmental quality, and economic growth.** NACEPT's new report, *Encouraging Regional Solutions to Sustaining Water Sector Utilities*, provides examples of this approach to developing strategies that simultaneously address multiple goals.

- **Work toward greater collaboration for specific cross-cutting environmental ends with other federal agencies, state and tribal organizations, industry, environmentalists, local communities, and international partners on both regulatory and voluntary programs.** To do this, EPA will need to develop more clearly defined, collaborative relationships with other federal entities, with state and tribal governments, with the private sector, and with the international community, and EPA will need to increase capacity for collaboration across media and organizational levels, both within EPA and with other federal and state agencies. On a global level, EPA can contribute much and learn much through collaboration with other nations on complex issues. To achieve this, the Agency should identify clear strategies to work with the Department of State and other federal agencies to facilitate and encourage such international collaboration.
- **Develop new, innovative and integrative ways of doing business such as collaborative problem solving (with states, tribes and stakeholders) and regulatory innovation to increase effectiveness and efficiency of environmental programs.**

Environmental Information

The collection and management of environmental data and other relevant information will continue to be a critical element of the Agency's work going forward. Equally important will be the way in which EPA shares information, and communicates in general, with the wide range of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders. NACEPT's *Everyone's Business* report emphasizes EPA's key role in providing information people need to understand the environmental impacts of their and others' actions. In this context, the Council offers the following recommendations.

- **Expand EPA's information and communication role.**
 - Continue to improve data collection by making it more accurate and more current, taking full advantage of advanced sensor systems and other data collection technologies as they become available.
 - More fully utilize and provide funding for the Agency's information management system, particularly the Central Data Exchange, to enable full functionality for electronic reporting, data sharing and web-based public information exchange across all EPA programs. Tools such as the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI), Environmental Compliance History On-Line (ECHO), and the Permit Compliance System (PCS) are necessary for evaluation of EPA policies and facility environmental performance.
- **Provide staff support for reaching out more actively with educational initiatives aimed at small businesses, communities and individual citizens.**
 - These initiatives should all convey a positive vision of the opportunities ahead, such as the potential for creating a more competitive Green Economy with improved technologies, new opportunities for entrepreneurship and growth, millions of new Green Collar jobs, better health, and dramatic improvements in environmental quality.
 - Focus specific initiatives on helping businesses, communities and individuals recognize their environmental impacts and encouraging the adoption of new technologies and behaviors to reduce those impacts.
 - Create an environment of openness and transparency using emerging concepts such as enterprise social networking to enlist more public involvement in EPA's activities.

- **Take steps to position the Agency for improved measurement or estimation (modeling) of the results of environmental initiatives.**

In the past, much time has been spent on development of performance measures, among them: state grant review templates, Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) reviews, and various Office of Management and Budget (OMB) assessments. These past efforts, while well intended, have consumed a great deal of time. Some knowledgeable observers in and outside the Agency have questioned whether these types of reviews and assessments have contributed to improved results. NACEPT strongly recommends that EPA's new administrator:

- Quickly evaluate these prior measurement efforts, extract any useful measurement system(s) approaches, and quickly establish core standards for measuring (and explaining) environmental progress. Accountability and transparency in public administration are essential, but measurement for results should not channel scarce resources away from essential programs nor cripple innovative approaches to improving environmental quality. EPA should move quickly to set the bar for performance measurement against its agenda to expedite a shift in staff focus, areas of emphasis, and direction. Doing so will create a powerful message that defines expected performance and measures results against the Administration's priorities.
- Integrate more clearly the Agency's *Report on the Environment* with the Strategic Plan and guidance and budget decisions of its national program managers.
- Develop an adaptive management capability that utilizes the full range of information gathered from real time sensing. Improve monitoring capabilities and practices, including widespread utilization of advanced sensor technologies, and data management so that EPA has the capacity to understand what it needs to measure.
- Explore ways to take advantage of computational power for increased modeling and simulation efforts as substitutes in some situations for time-consuming environmental monitoring.

NACEPT believes that implementation of these recommendations would position EPA to continue to build upon its past accomplishments and contributions to improvement of human health and the environment in the nation and throughout the world. In part, the Agency's past successes have led to deepened awareness and understanding of the changing challenges that lie ahead. NACEPT stands ready to work with EPA in providing perspective and additional recommendations as the Agency moves forward.

Appendix A: NACEPT Membership List

* Indicates Member of the Prospective Workgroup

Dr. Paul Anastas

Director
Center for Green Chemistry and
Engineering
Yale University

Mr. Joel Bolstein

Partner
Environmental Law Practice Group
Fox Rothschild LLP

Mr. Jeffery Crane

Executive Director
Colorado Watershed Assembly

Dr. Richard Cruse

Director
Iowa Water Center
Agronomy Department
Iowa State University

Ms. Carolyn Green

Vice President
Health, Environment and Safety
Regulatory Affairs
Sunoco, Inc.

Mr. Robert Gruenig

Senior Policy Analyst
National Tribal Environmental Council

Mr. William Holmberg

Chairman
Biomass Coordinating Council
American Council on Renewable Energy

Mr. Stan Laskowski

Lecturer/Advisor
Masters of Environmental Studies Program
University of Pennsylvania

Mr. Clayton Matt

Department Head
Natural Resource Department
Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes

Mr. William Mullican

Deputy Executive Administrator
Texas Water Development Board

*** Ms. Jennifer Nash**

Director of Policy and Programs
Product Stewardship Institute, Inc.

*** Mr. Howard Neukrug**

Director, Office of Watersheds
City of Philadelphia Water

*** Ms. Arleen O'Donnell**

Board of Directors
Massachusetts Environmental Trust

*** Mr. Robert L. Olson**

Workgroup Chair
Senior Fellow
Institute for Alternative Futures

Mr. Scott Sklar

President
The Stella Group, Ltd.

Dr. Bradley Smith

Dean
Huxley College of the Environment
Western Washington University

*** Mr. Frank M. Stewart**

President and Chief Operating Officer
American Association of Blacks in Energy

Mr. David Struhs

Vice President
Environmental Affairs
International Paper

Ms. Victoria Jean Tschinkel

Executive Committee Member
1000 Friends of Florida

*** Dr. Dan Watts**

Research Professor
New Jersey Institute of Technology
University Heights
York Center for Environmental Engineering
and Science

NACEPT Chair

John Howard

NACEPT Chair, January 2006–January 2009
Partner
Vinson & Elkins, LLP

Erik Meyers

NACEPT Interim Chair
Vice President
Sustainable Programs
The Conservation Fund

Designated Federal Officer

Ms. Sonia Altieri

Office of Cooperative Environmental
Management (OCEM)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: (202) 564-0243

E-mail: altieri.sonia@epa.gov

Acknowledgments

The Council would like to thank the members of the Prospective Workgroup, led by Bob Olson, for completing this important report on an accelerated schedule. Former NACEPT Chair John Howard and current Interim Chair Erik Meyers provided valuable assistance, as did Workgroup members Jennifer Nash, Howard Neukrug, Arleen O'Donnell, Frank Stewart, and Dan Watts. The Council and Workgroup also acknowledge the outstanding support they receive from Rafael DeLeon, the Director of the Office of Cooperative Environmental Management (OCEM) and his staff, including Megan Moreau, Mark Joyce and especially the Council's Designated Federal Officer (DFO), Sonia Altieri. In addition, the Council expresses its appreciation to Bob Kerr, of Pure Strategies, Inc., for his contribution at a critical phase of this report's development. Finally, we thank Andrew Schwarz, John Weiss, and Maggie Clary of Industrial Economics, Inc. (IEc) for their invaluable technical assistance and management support throughout the project, as well as IEc's subcontractor Eastern Research Group for their report design and layout services.

Appendix B: Compilation of Interviewee Responses

Theme 1: Key Trends and Issues (Questions 1 and 4)

Common responses (and the number of interviewees who offered the response) include:

Climate change [14]
Quality of air, water, and land resources [9]
Management of chemicals in the environment [6]
Responses to technological development [4]
EPA's relationship with stakeholders [3]
Global economic development [6]
Population growth [4]
Rising demand for secure energy resources [2]

Additional responses addressing key trends and issues include:

- The shift away from petroleum use in energy production, plastics, and transportation.
- The development of an active market for carbon, resulting in renewable energy technologies becoming economically competitive.
- The environmental effects of the wide-scale deployment of renewables.
- The depletion of ocean resources such as fish and coral reefs.
- Plastics in the oceans which come from US storm-water systems.
- Ocean acidification.
- Green chemistry.
- Habitat loss.
- The increasing burden on our nation's food supply and the environmental implications of agricultural expansion.
- The disruption of the nitrogen cycle leading to a significant increase in nitrogen emissions into the environment, from fertilizers and energy sources.
- Our nation's decaying infrastructure.
- Global instability due to religious and cultural divisions.
- Policy constraints.
- The permitting process as it relates to environmental justice issues.
- Recycling.
- Major economic institutions' recognition of the importance of sustainability, and the corresponding flow of resources into this area.
- The need to develop sustainable communities that not only have a lower environmental impact, but that are also livable and affordable.

Theme 2: EPA's Current Response Capability and Performance (Questions 2 and 5)

Common responses (and the number of interviewees who offered the response) include:

Lack of financial resources [8]
Lack of staff resources [4]
Limitation imposed by the scope of EPA's mandate [3]
Political constraints [6]
Need for more strategic planning [4]
Need for more collaboration with states, tribes, and other agencies [7]
EPA is meeting its statutory obligations [2]
Limited imposed by EPA's conflicting roles of regulator and researcher [2]
Need to develop and maintain technical capacity to keep up with science [2]
EPA should be more active internationally [3]

Additional responses addressing EPA's current performance and capability include:

- EPA must focus on developing and maintaining core expertise in a limited number of areas.
- EPA often limits tribes' ability to implement their own programs.
- EPA is not responding well enough to current issues, as most programs are delegated to the states.
- The Agency should aid communities in standing up to pressure from industry.
- With regards to climate change, EPA has been missing in action. The Agency needs to pursue strategies of both mitigation and adaptation.
- EPA should look to increase its efforts in design for the environment, environmentally-friendly purchasing, and green chemistry initiatives.
- EPA scientists need the freedom to function, and science needs to be taken seriously.
- Turf issues within the Agency remain a significant barrier to good management.
- The Agency should be attentive to doing things on schedule.
- EPA is not sufficiently keeping pace with trends and issues.
- The Agency needs to look at problems in a broader context.
- EPA's role as a regulator in maintaining compliance with existing laws enforces the level playing field that is necessary for companies to compete fairly.
- EPA's role as a promoter of voluntary partnership programs allows companies to receive credit and recognition for their environmental initiatives.

Theme 3: Opportunities to Improve EPA's Response Capability (Questions 3, 6, and 7)

Common responses (and the number of interviewees who offered the response) include:

Work collaboratively with other Agencies [10]
Invest more in scientific research and development [4]
Increase use of advisory panels and forums to seek stakeholder input [4]

Improve communication with and information transfer to the public [4]
Change organizational structure to allow for more flexibility and collaboration [3]
Obtain the statutory authority to address climate change [4]
Put more thought into how the Agency shares responsibility with the states and Regions [3]
Look at issues with a more broad-based, systematic approach [2]
Focus on pollution prevention [2]
Serve as a clearinghouse for best practices [2]
Attract employees who are the “best and brightest” [2]

Additional responses addressing opportunities for improved capabilities include:

- EPA should focus its attention on developing “flexible” expertise capable of responding to whatever challenges rise to the forefront.
- EPA should pick a few areas to specialize in, and work with other agencies which have developed expertise in other areas.
- EPA needs to take more creative steps without sacrificing responsibility.
- EPA should try to increase productivity with the same budget, possibly through increased modeling and simulation efforts.
- EPA should improve the communication and information transfer among its different sections and programs, as well as between the national, state, and local levels.
- EPA must deal with the interplay between the executive and legislative branches.
- EPA should implement better management strategies.
- The Agency needs a high-level strategy for accountability.
- EPA needs to provide alternate standards for the accountability of R&D programs.
- EPA should analyze the grant projects it funds and assess which projects provide the best returns.
- EPA should assess what partnerships best position the Agency to achieve its long-term goals.
- EPA should reconsider its conflict of interest rules, as they potentially prevent the most qualified and experienced individuals from participating in advisory forums.
- The strategic planning process is extremely important and it is necessary, going forward, to include tribal specific language in the Strategic Plan.
- EPA could engage economists to aid environmental justice communities.
- The permitting process needs to be looked at from a sector perspective, or through the consideration of ambient air and water quality.
- EPA could put more of a focus on what it could do to drive technology adoption into other sectors.
- EPA should promote healthy competition among companies to encourage environmental improvements.
- EPA needs to ask itself whether the budget could be structured to enable cross-functional initiatives without a massive reorganization.
- EPA could change its organizational structure to include an Administrator, Deputy Administrator of Regulation, and a Deputy Administrator of Science.

- EPA's structure could be to detached from political cycles, for example with a six year term for the Administrator.
- Ten years from now, it would be nice to see the Agency at the Cabinet level.

Theme 4: Documenting Success (Questions 8 and 9)

Common responses (and the number of interviewees who offered the response) include:

Measurable improvements in ambient water and air conditions [7]

Increased investment in technology [4]

Develop a reputation as a source of credible science [4]

Develop and maintain a qualified staff, including scientists [4]

Acquire the authority and set regulatory standards for GHG emissions [3]

Success for EPA can be defined as the fulfillment of its mandate [3]

Additional responses addressing the definition and measures of success include:

- The provision of basic environmental and public health protection.
- Reduced impact of environmental issues on humans and ecosystems.
- Success for EPA would be having the agency on the cutting edge, making policies that address the issues we're facing.
- EPA needs to get its house in order, chart a path forward, and pursue collaboration aggressively.
- EPA needs a broad range of success options across the board, one of which should be institutional.
- Metrics and indicators oriented on the desired end state of environmental improvement should be coupled with other quality of life metrics to show a balanced picture.
- Better and more comprehensive modeling.
- An increased level of strategic planning implemented by the Agency, including tribal-specific language in all the goals.
- Progress in enhancing energy security.
- Decreased dependence on foreign petroleum.
- Infrastructure improvements.
- Measure the health of coral reefs in U.S. territorial waters and make clear the connection between terrestrial activity and impacts on the reefs.
- The implementation of programs to address nutrient buildups in important areas such as the Mississippi basin and the Chesapeake Bay, and an effective system for screening and controlling toxic chemicals.
- Fewer industrial facilities sited near environmental justice communities.
- A change in the public consciousness around the fact that human artifice could be a good thing instead of a bad thing.
- EPA should contribute to a significant increase in environmental literacy and consideration of environmental issues.
- EPA should set a good example by "living its mission" through the reduction of its own waste streams and its environmental footprint.
- EPA should stand for hope for the children, as an agency that is leading the way to a clean, green future.

