



**United States
Environmental Protection Agency**

FISCAL YEAR 2022

**Justification of Appropriation
Estimates for the Committee
on Appropriations**

Tab 15: Appendix

EPA-190-R-21-002

May 2021
www.epa.gov/cj

**Environmental Protection Agency
 FY 2022 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification**

Table of Contents – Appendix

Coordination with Other Federal Agencies.....	751
Air and Radiation Programs.....	751
Water Programs.....	755
Land and Emergency Management Programs.....	758
Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention Programs.....	764
International and Tribal Affairs Programs.....	770
Central Planning, Budgeting and Finance Programs.....	772
Mission Support Programs.....	772
The Administrator’s Office.....	777
The Inspector General.....	778
Major Management Challenges.....	780
EPA User Fee Programs.....	792
Working Capital Fund	795
Acronyms for Statutory Authority.....	797
FY 2022 STAG Categorical Program Grants	801
Program Projects by Program Area	809
Eliminated Programs.....	819
Expected Benefits of E-Government Initiatives.....	820
Proposed FY 2022 Administrative Provisions.....	825
Attorney Fee and Cost Payments	829
Physicians’ Comparability Allowance (PCA) Plan.....	830
Physicians’ Comparability Allowance (PCA) Worksheet.....	833
FY 2022: Consolidations, Realignments, or Other Transfer of Resources	834
EPA Budget by National Program Manager and Major Office	836
S. 2276 – Good Accounting Obligation in Government Act	840
On-Site Inspections and Off-site Compliance Monitoring Compliance Activities from EPA’s Integrated Compliance Information System	885
Office of Enforcement Compliance Assurance (OECA) Travel Budget by Program Project FY 2016 - FY 2022¹	887
FY 2022 Administrator’s Priorities.....	888

Environmental Justice Allocated Budget..... 889

COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

Air and Radiation Programs

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) Implementation

EPA cooperates with other agencies to achieve goals related to ground level ozone and particulate matter (PM), and to ensure the actions of other agencies are compatible with state plans for attaining and maintaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The Agency works closely with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Department of the Interior (DOI), and Department of Defense (DOD) on issues such as prescribed burning at silviculture and agricultural operations. EPA, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) also work with state and local agencies to integrate transportation and air quality plans, reduce traffic congestion, and promote livable communities.

Air Quality in the Agricultural Sector

To improve EPA's understanding of environmental issues in the agricultural sector, the Agency works with the USDA and others to improve air quality while supporting sustainable agriculture. The collaborative approach to the agriculture sector includes scientific assessment, outreach and education, and implementation/compliance.

Regional Haze

EPA works with the DOI, National Park Service (NPS), and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) in implementing its regional haze program and operating the Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments (IMPROVE) visibility monitoring network. The operation and analysis of data produced by this air monitoring system is an example of the close coordination of efforts between EPA and state and tribal governments. EPA also consults with the DOI's Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on potential endangered species issues.

Air Quality Assessment, Modeling, and Forecasting

For pollution assessments and transport, EPA works with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) on technology transfer using satellite imagery. EPA further distributes NASA satellite products and NOAA air quality forecast products to states, local agencies, and tribes to provide a better understanding of daily air quality and to assist with air quality forecasting. EPA works with NASA to develop a better understanding of PM formation using satellite data. EPA also works with the Department of the Army on advancing emission measurement technology and with NOAA for meteorological support for our modeling and monitoring efforts. EPA collects real-time ozone and PM measurements from state and local agencies, which are used by both NOAA and EPA to improve and verify Air Quality Forecast models.

EPA's *AirNow* Program (the national real-time Air Quality Index reporting and forecasting system) works with the National Weather Service (NWS) to coordinate NOAA air quality forecast guidance with state and local agencies for air quality forecasting efforts and to render the NOAA model output in EPA's Air Quality Index (AQI), which helps people determine appropriate air quality protective behaviors. In wildfire situations, EPA and the USFS work closely with states to deploy monitors and report monitoring information and other conditions on *AirNow*. The *AirNow* Program also collaborates with the NPS and the USFS in collecting air quality monitoring observations, in addition to over 130 state, local, and tribal air agency observations, and with NASA in a project to incorporate satellite data with air quality observations.

EPA, the USDA, and the DOI established a collaborative framework to address issues pertaining to wildland fire and air quality. The agreement recognizes the key roles of each agency, as well as opportunities collaboration. For example, the partnership explains that the agencies seek to reduce the impact of emissions from wildfires, especially catastrophic wildfires, and the impact of those emissions on air quality. In addition, the partnership highlights opportunities for enhancing coordination among the agencies through information sharing and consultation, collaboration on tools and information resources, and working together to collaborate with state and other partners, among others on strategic goals.

Mobile Sources

EPA works with the DOT's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) on the coordinated national program establishing standards to improve fuel efficiency for light-duty vehicles. Specifically, EPA, in coordination with the DOT's fuel economy and fuel consumption standards programs, implements vehicle and commercial truck greenhouse gas standards.

To address criteria pollutant emissions from marine and aircraft sources, EPA works collaboratively with the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), as well as with other federal agencies, such as the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). EPA also collaborates with the USCG in the implementation of Emission Control Area (ECA) around the U.S., and with Mexico and Canada in the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) to evaluate the benefits of establishing a Mexican ECA.

To better understand the sources and causes of mobile source pollution, EPA works with the DOE and DOT to fund applied research projects including transportation modeling projects. EPA also works closely with the DOE on refinery cost modeling analyses to support clean fuel programs, and coordinates with the DOE regarding fuel supply during emergency situations.

For mobile sources program outreach, the Agency participates in a collaborative effort with DOT's Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to educate the public and communities about the impacts of transportation choices on traffic congestion, air quality, climate change, and human health. These partnerships can involve policy assessments and toxic emission reduction strategies in different regions of the country. EPA works with the DOE, DOT, and other agencies, as needed, on the requirements of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and the Energy Independence and Security

Act of 2007, such as the Renewable Fuel Standard. EPA also has worked with other agencies on biofuel topics through the Biomass Research and Development Institute.

To develop air pollutant emission factors and emission estimation algorithms for military aircraft, ground equipment, and vehicles, EPA partners with the DOD. This partnership provides for the joint undertaking of air-monitoring/emission factor research and regulatory implementation.

Air Toxics

EPA works closely with other health agencies such as the CDC, the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) on health risk characterization for both toxic and criteria air pollutants. The Agency also contributes air quality data to the CDC's Environmental Public Health Tracking Program, which is made publicly available and used by various public health agencies.

Addressing Transboundary Air Pollution

In developing regional and international air quality projects, and in working on regional agreements, EPA works with the Department of State (DOS), NOAA, NASA, DOE, USDA, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and with regional organizations. In addition, EPA has partnered with other organizations and countries worldwide, including the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the European Union (EU), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), the CEC, Canada, Mexico, China, and Japan. EPA also partners with environment and public health officials and provides technical assistance through UNEP to facilitate the development of air quality management strategies to other major emitters and/or to key regional or sub-regional groupings of countries.

Stratospheric Ozone

EPA works closely with the DOS and other federal agencies in international negotiations among Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, with the goal of protecting the ozone layer and through managing ozone depleting substances (ODS) it controls. EPA also supports several multinational environmental agreements to simultaneously protect the ozone layer and climate system working closely with the DOS and other federal agencies, including OMB, Office of Science Technology and Policy (OSTP), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), USDA, Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Department of Commerce (DOC), NOAA, and NASA.

EPA works with other agencies, including the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) and the Department of Commerce (DOC), to analyze potential trade implications in stratospheric protection regulations that affect imports and exports. EPA has coordinated efforts with the Department of Justice (DOJ), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Department of Treasury (U.S. Treasury), and other agencies to curb the illegal importation of ODS.

Radiation and Radiation Preparedness and Response

EPA works primarily with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), DOE, and the DHS on multiple radiation-related issues. EPA has ongoing planning and guidance discussions with DHS on emergency response activities, including exercises responding to nuclear related incidents. As the regulator of DOE's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), EPA is charged with coordinating with DOE to ensure the facility is operating in compliance with EPA regulations. EPA is a member of the Interagency Radiation Source Protection and Security Task Force, established in the Energy Policy Act, to improve the security of domestic radioactive sources. EPA also is a working member of the interagency Nuclear Government Coordinating Council (NGCC), which coordinates across government and the private sector on issues related to security, communications and emergency management within the nuclear sector.

For emergency preparedness, EPA coordinates with other federal agencies through the Federal Radiological Preparedness Coordinating Committee and the Advisory Team for Environment, Food and Health which provides federal scientific advice and recommendations to state and local decision makers, such as governors and mayors, during a radiological emergency. EPA participates in planning and implementing exercises including radiological anti-terrorism activities with the NRC, DOE, DOD, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), and DHS.

EPA is a charter member and co-chairs the Interagency Steering Committee on Radiation Standards (ISCORS), which was created at the direction of Congress. Through its activities, member agencies are kept informed of cross-cutting issues related to radiation protection, radioactive waste management, and emergency preparedness and response. ISCORS also helps coordinate U.S. responses to radiation-related issues internationally.

During radiological emergencies, EPA works with expert members of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). EPA also works with OECD's Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) on two committees: the Radioactive Waste Management Committee (RWMC) and the Committee on Radiation Protection and Public Health (CRPPH). Through participation on the CRPPH, EPA is successful in bringing U.S. perspectives to international radiation protection policy.

Climate Change

To carry out a diverse range of regulatory and partnership programs to help tackle the climate crisis, EPA works with a number of other federal agencies, including the Department of Energy (DOE), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Department of State (DOS), the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the Department of the Interior (DOI), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), and the Department of Transportation (DOT).

Climate protection partnership programs, government-wide, stimulate the development and use of renewable energy technologies, energy efficient products, and other strategies that will help reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The effort is led by EPA and DOE with significant involvement from the USDA, HUD, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

The Global Methane Initiative (GMI) is a U.S. led, international public-private partnership that brings together over 40 partner governments and over 1,000 public and private sector organizations

to advance methane recovery and use methane as a clean energy source. EPA works with the U.S. State Department on the GMI, building on the success of EPA's domestic methane programs and focusing on advancing methane reductions from agriculture, coal mines, landfills, oil and gas systems, and municipal wastewater.

EPA also will support the State Department as the technical lead in developing projections and compiling information on GHG mitigation policies and measures as part of the upcoming U.S. Biennial Report and National Communication as required by the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Research Supporting the Air and Radiation Program

EPA continues to coordinate with other agencies, such as NOAA, DOE, USDA, National Institutes of Health (NIH), and FHWA to develop sustainable approaches to manage risks from air pollution. In addition, the FY 2022 President's Budget for EPA funds collaborative research in climate adaptation and resilience with the new Advanced Research Projects Agency for Climate (ARPA-C) that will be located within DOE. The ARPA model of high-risk, accelerated research is uniquely meant to conduct R&D that, if successful, results in transformational technology advancements.

Water Programs

Collaboration with Public and Private Partners on Water Infrastructure Preparedness, Response and Recovery

EPA coordinates with other federal agencies, primarily DHS, CDC, FDA, and DOD, on biological, chemical, and radiological contaminants of high concern, and how to detect and respond to their presence in drinking water and wastewater systems. EPA maintains a close linkage with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and DHS, particularly with respect to ensuring the timely dissemination of threat information through existing communication networks. Additionally, throughout the pandemic, EPA worked with DHS and other federal agencies to coordinate aspects of information sharing, disseminate personal protective equipment, address shortages of treatment chemicals, provide for equipment and qualified water system operators, and recognize water system operators and associated contract personnel as critical workers.

EPA works with USACE and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to refine coordination processes among federal partners engaged in providing emergency response support to the water sector, including maintaining clear roles and responsibilities under the National Disaster Recovery Framework. EPA continues to work with FEMA, USACE, and other agencies, on the Federal Interagency Floodplain Management Task Force regarding water resources and floodplain management.

As the Agency in charge of water sector security, EPA works with DHS Cyber and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) and other government agencies on the Industrial Control System (ICS) working group to develop an ICS interagency Strategy and Implementation Plan. EPA also

collaborates with CISA on various working groups and cybersecurity issues such as roles and responsibilities, ICS supply chain, cyber workforce, cybersecurity standards, and cyber response.

Drinking Water Programs

EPA and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) established an Interagency Agreement to coordinate activities and information exchange in the areas of unregulated contaminants occurrence, the environmental relationships affecting contaminant occurrence, protection area delineation methodology, and analytical methods. This effort improves the quality of information to support risk management decision-making at all levels of government, generates valuable new data, and eliminates potential redundancies. EPA also collaborates with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to develop strategies to decrease drinking water lead exposure in homes. The partnership promotes the exchange of information, leverages funding, and reviews processes to facilitate better-informed and coordinated decisions and investments.

EPA collaborates with DHHS to better understand, characterize, and manage public health risks from Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs), with activities spanning from assessing CDC's waterborne disease surveillance data related to *legionella* and other biofilm-related pathogens to partnering with FDA on antibiotic resistance-related issues. EPA collaborates with multiple federal agencies to address Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) issues including the DOD, the Department of Energy (DOE), USDA, FDA, DHHS, the NIH, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Small Business Administration (SBA), NASA, FAA, and OMB.

Infrastructure Support for Tribal Water Systems

EPA coordinates the multi-agency tribal Infrastructure Task Force (ITF), created to develop and coordinate federal activities in delivering water infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure and solid waste management services to tribal communities. The ITF is the formal mechanism for interagency coordination among EPA, Indian Health Service, HUD, USDA, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Sustainable Rural Drinking and Wastewater Systems

EPA and USDA work together to increase the sustainability of rural drinking water and wastewater systems to ensure the protection of public health, water quality, and sustainable communities. The two agencies facilitate coordinated funding for infrastructure projects that aid in the compliance of national drinking water and clean water regulations.

National Water Sector Workforce Development: Department of Veterans Affairs

EPA and Departments of Education, Interior, Agriculture, and Veterans Affairs (VA) are building on existing collaborations, exploring new opportunities and actions, and identifying potential additional federal programs and partners to support the nation's water sector professionals.

Coordination with Department of Defense on Analytical Methods for Detecting PFAS

EPA's Clean Water Act (CWA) analytical methods program is collaborating with the DOD on their efforts to develop an analytical method for detecting certain PFAS compounds in wastewater.

Source Water Protection and Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs)

To combat HABs and hypoxia, the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Amendments Act of 2014 (HABHRCA 2014, P.L. 113-124, recently reauthorized through the National Integrated Drought Information System [HABHRCA 2017, Public Law 115-423]) emphasizes the mandate to advance the scientific understanding and ability to detect, predict, control, mitigate, and respond to HABs and hypoxia. This legislation established the Interagency Working Group on HABHRCA (IWG-HABHRCA) which tasked the group with coordinating and convening federal agencies to discuss HAB and hypoxia events in the U.S., and to develop action plans, reports, and assessments of these situations. The IWG-HABHRCA is co-chaired by representatives from EPA, NOAA, and the OSTP, and it is composed of the following member agencies and departments: CDC, FDA, NIEHS, USACE, USGS, BOEM, NPS, FWS, NASA, USDA, DOS, and the National Science Foundation (NSF).

2018 Farm Bill Source Water Protection Provisions

EPA collaborates with the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), state and utility partners to develop implementation strategies and guidance to comply with the 2018 Farm Bill provisions. These provisions dedicate at least 10 percent of total funds available for conservation programs (with the exception of the Conservation Reserve Program) to be used for source water protection. The Agency partners with NRCS to foster collaboration at the state and local levels to identify priority source water protection areas in each state to address agriculture-related impacts to drinking water sources. EPA also is collaborating with USFS in developing strategies to implement the 2018 Farm Bill (Title VIII, Subtitle D, Section 8404) Source Water Protection provisions requiring a "Water Source Protection Program" on National Forest Service (NFS) lands. EPA is supporting USFS by fostering partnerships with state, utilities, and other water stakeholders.

Source Water Collaborative

EPA participates in the Source Water Collaborative along with USDA (NRCS, Farm Service Agency (FSA), USFS), USGS, and 25 other national organizations. The goal of the collaboration is to protect sources of drinking water by combining the strengths and tools of its member organizations. EPA provides funding to support these efforts.

Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage (CCUS)

EPA participates in quarterly and ad hoc meetings with DOE, Department of Interior (DOI), Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Department of Transportation (DOT), and Department of Justice (DOJ) to share information on carbon capture and storage developments. EPA serves as a liaison to DOE's National Risk Assessment Partnership to advance its work in developing tools to improve collective understanding of risk at CO₂ storage projects and inform science and risk-based decision-making at geologic sequestration projects; and to explore opportunities to integrate the

partnership work into EPA's Class VI permitting process. EPA also will collaborate with DOE and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) on several reports and other initiatives related to carbon sequestration requested by Congress, including developing a report on Underground Injection Control (UIC) Class VI permitting.

Research to Support Water Programs

While EPA is the federal agency mandated to ensure safe drinking water, other federal and non-federal entities conduct research that complements EPA's research on priority contaminants in drinking water. Cooperative research efforts have been ongoing with the American Water Works Association, Water Research Foundation, and other stakeholders to coordinate drinking water research where the private sector is conducting research in areas such as analytical methods, treatment technologies, and the development and maintenance of water resources. EPA also has worked with the USGS to evaluate performance of newly developed methods for measuring microbes in potential drinking water sources.

Interagency coordination in research also is occurring in developing sediment criteria. Here, EPA has joint research initiatives with NOAA and USGS for linking monitoring data and field study information with available toxicity data and assessment models for developing sediment criteria.

EPA also conducts studies with the USGS to monitor the occurrence of CECs. Research efforts to monitor the effects of chemical mixtures continue, increasing our understanding of wastewater effluent impacts to human and aquatic health and prioritizing future research on developing solutions for the removal of CECs in wastewater treatment operations.

Land and Emergency Management Programs

Brownfields

EPA's Brownfields and Land Revitalization Programs partner with the NPS's River, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program to support *Groundwork USA* and individual Groundwork Trust organizations in their efforts to engage youth in brownfields redevelopment and community revitalization.

Superfund Remedial Program

The Superfund Remedial Program maintains ongoing coordination and collaboration with ATSDR, NIEHS, HUD and USACE as well as with the Federal Mining Dialogue and the Federal Remediation Technologies Roundtable, two multi-agency consortia. Interaction with these entities enhances program implementation through activities that are mutually beneficial, such as information sharing and resource leveraging. For example, ATSDR has a statutory mandate to complete health assessments on sites listed on EPA's National Priorities List while EPA conducts site characterization and remediation. Moreover, EPA site managers work with their ATSDR counterparts to coordinate public human health messaging. For NIEHS, EPA collaborates and coordinates academic research related to contaminant toxicities, site characterization and

remediation and risk communication. EPA collaborates with HUD on residential risk evaluation and mitigation, while the Agency's work with USACE spans a wide range of technical, management and acquisition support functions to implement or oversee responsible party Superfund project implementation for the remedial and removal programs. EPA's participation in the Federal Mining Dialogue has established the Agency's role in a multi-agency (e.g., DOE, DOI, etc.) partnership to address mining sites on federal and mixed ownership lands. Membership in the Federal Remediation Technologies Roundtable facilitates EPA's collaboration with multiple federal entities, such as DOD, NASA, DOT, to advance the use of innovative technologies to clean up hazardous waste contamination.

Superfund Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Program

EPA's Superfund Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Program coordinates with other Federal Agencies (OFAs); state, Tribal, and local governments; and communities to implement its statutory responsibilities to ensure protective and efficient cleanup and reuse of federally contaminated land on the Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket and the NPL. Successful coordination requires strong partnerships and enhanced engagement by having regularly scheduled and ad hoc meetings that target and resolve critical programmatic issues, emphasize selection and implementation of protective cleanups, and recognize site reuse opportunities and successes. EPA has committed to early engagement with our partners that focus on issues with a problem-solving and action-oriented approach.

The Program also coordinates with national organizations that help to improve engagement such as the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials (ASTSWMO), the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (ITRC), and the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS). ASTSWMO has a Federal Facilities Research Center Subcommittee that promotes and enhances state and territory involvement in the cleanup and reuse of contaminated federal facilities and fosters information exchange by and between states, territories, and OFAs. This includes identifying and researching emerging issues related to state and federal cleanup programs at federal facility sites, producing and disseminating resource documents and tools, and working with EPA and OFAs on a variety of federal facility issues and forums. Current topics of interest include addressing contaminants of emerging concern like perchlorate, PFAS and 1,4-dioxane; ensuring ARARs are identified and implemented; monitoring long-term remedies to ensure protectiveness; and participating in the implementation and oversight of the Munitions Response Program. ITRC is a state-led coalition working to reduce barriers to the use of innovative air, water, waste, and remediation environmental technologies and processes. ITRC produces documents and training that broaden and deepen technical knowledge and expedite quality regulatory decision making while protecting human health and the environment. EPA, along with OFAs and industry representatives, works through ITRC in defining continuing research needs through its teams including on topics of relevance and benefit to federal facility sites, like PFAS, 1,4-dioxane, and the remediation of complex sites.

Through the establishment of a national cleanup dialogue with the Department of Energy (DOE) and the states in coordination with ECOS, EPA supports special emphasis engagement for nuclear weapons sites, the largest and costliest portfolio of remaining federal facilities cleanup work. The

Dialogue enhances ongoing working relationships in the cleanup of DOE Environmental Management sites and focuses on topics of mutual relevance and highest priority to ensure timely advancement of protective cleanups. The Dialogue exemplifies how collaboration can advance DOE sites and foster an understanding of challenges and successes nationally.

EPA also participates with OFAs and states on the Munitions Response Dialogue, partners with DoD research and development programs on munitions management and environmental restoration. Current MRD activities include EPA, DoD, Federal Land Management Agencies and states updating and harmonizing previous munitions risk/hazard assessment methodologies. The MRD's goal is to achieve consensus on an updated munitions risk/hazard assessment methodology. EPA also co-chairs the Intergovernmental Data Quality Task Force (IDQTF) with DoD and DOE. The IDQTF works to ensure that environmental data are of known and documented quality and suitable for the intended use.

EPA actively participates in the Defense Environmental Restoration Program and Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) forums hosted by the Department of Defense (DoD). DoD's gathering of State and Federal regulators offers a unique opportunity to partner, share information, and facilitate more efficient and effective management of DoD's cleanup program. Recent forums focused on emerging issues, best practices, and lessons learned, as well as new policies and technology investments to maximize efficiencies and minimize the time it takes to complete cleanup at active, Base Realignment and Closure installations, and FUDS. Similar forums hosted by DoD service components provide EPA and states further opportunities for engagement, often focused on topics tailored to the unique aspects of the response programs of the Army, Navy or Air Force.

EPA also coordinates with OFAs on the Federal Mining Dialogue (FMD). The FMD is a cooperative initiative among federal environmental and land management agencies that provide a national-level forum for federal agencies to identify and discuss lessons learned and technical mining impact issues associated with the cleanup and reuse of abandoned and inactive hard rock mine and mineral processing sites across the country. EPA also engages with OFAs in the complementary Abandoned Uranium Mine Work Group, which focuses on investigation and cleanup of legacy uranium ore mining and mill tailing sites in the in the western U.S. Multiple program and enforcement offices participate for EPA in both venues to ensure coordinated engagement across the Agency.

RCRA Waste Minimization and Recycling: Supporting Sustainable Materials Management

Natural resource extraction and processing make up approximately 50 percent of total global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Under RCRA, EPA provides data, information, guidelines, tools, and technical assistance on resource conservation, recycling, and resource recovery. As part of this work, EPA focuses on increasing the conservation and recovery of municipal solid waste (e.g., plastics, aluminum, paper, food waste) and industrial waste (construction and demolition materials). EPA works closely with other federal agencies to advance resource conservation and recovery through EPA's 2021 National Recycling Strategy, interagency efforts to reduce food loss and waste, and implementation of the Save our Seas Act 2.0.

The Save our Seas Act 2.0, passed by Congress in December 2020, demonstrates bipartisan congressional interest and provides EPA with authority to further act on domestic recycling and address plastic waste through new grant programs, studies, and extensive federal coordination. EPA will coordinate with DOE, several offices within the Department of Commerce (NIST, NOAA, USTR and ITA); and USAID to implement Save our Seas. EPA also works with federal agencies to implement the National Recycling Strategy.

EPA works collaboratively with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to reduce food waste in support of the national goal of reducing food loss and waste by 50 percent by 2030. EPA also is providing national estimates of food waste generation and management; convening, educating, and supporting communities seeking to reduce food waste.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Programs

The RCRA Corrective Action Program coordinates closely with OFAs, primarily DOD and DOE, which have many corrective action sites. A top Agency priority is to help federal facilities meet the Program's goals of investigating and cleaning up hazardous releases. EPA also coordinates with other agencies on cleanup and disposal issues posed by PCBs under the authority of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).

Emergency Preparedness and Response

EPA plays a major role in reducing the risks that accidental and intentional releases of harmful substances and oil discharges pose to human health and the environment. EPA's leadership in federal preparedness begins with co-chairing the National Response Team (NRT) and the 13 Regional Response Teams (RRTs) with the USCG. These teams, which have member participation from 15 total federal agencies (EPA, USCG, United States Department of State, United States Department of Defense, U.S. Department of Homeland Security/Federal Emergency Management Agency, United States Department of Energy, United States Department of Agriculture, United States Department of Health & Human Services (including CDC, NIOSH, and ATSDR), United States Department of Interior, United States Department of Commerce, United States Department of Transportation, United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, United States General Services Administration, United States Department of Justice, United States Department of Labor (including OSHA), provide guidance and deliver federal assistance to state, local, and tribal governments to plan for and respond to natural disasters, acts of terrorism, and other major environmental incidents. This requires coordination with many federal, state, and local agencies. The Agency participates with other federal agencies to develop national planning and implementation policies at the operational level.

EPA supports the Weapons of Mass Destruction Strategic Group (WMDSG) crisis-action team intended to coordinate the United States Government's efforts to successfully resolve a WMD threat and support interagency senior leader decision making. The WMDSG is comprised of over 50 SMEs representing over 15 different departments and agencies. The WMDSG is on call 24/7/365 to respond to the FBI's Strategic Information and Operations Center (SIOC) within 2

hours. The WMDSG – led by the FBI – provides enhanced coordination by focusing on information sharing and operation synchronization. The WMDSG helps maintain situational awareness by working directly with FBI Counterterrorism Division (CTD) regarding investigative activities, and the National Assets Command Post (NACP) regarding crisis operations.

The National Response Framework (NRF), under the direction of the DHS, provides for the delivery of federal assistance to states to help them deal with the consequences of terrorist events, acts of malfeasance, as well as natural and other significant disasters. EPA maintains the lead responsibility for the NRF’s Emergency Support Function #10 (covering inland hazardous materials and petroleum releases) and participates in the Federal Emergency Support Function Leaders Group which addresses NRF planning and implementation at the operational level.

The National Biodefense Strategy (NBS) provides a single coordinated effort to orchestrate the full range of activity that is carried out across the United States Government to protect the American people from biological threats. With National Security Presidential Memorandum (NSPM)-14, this strategy explains how the United States Government will manage its activities more effectively to assess, prevent, detect, prepare for, respond to, and recover from biological threats, coordinating its biodefense efforts with those of international partners, industry, academia, non-governmental entities, and the private sector. The Biodefense Steering Committee, chaired by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and comprising the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, will be responsible for overseeing and coordinating the execution of the strategy and its implementation plan, and ensuring federal coordination with domestic and international government and non-governmental partners.

Oil Spills

Under the Oil Spill Program, EPA provides assistance to agencies such as FWS and the USCG and works in coordination to address oil discharges nationwide. EPA also assists agencies with judicial referrals when enforcement of violations becomes necessary. In addition, EPA and the USCG work in coordination to address oil spills nationwide. Under the authorities provided by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA) or Clean Water Act (CWA), EPA develops oil discharge response, prevention and preparedness regulations. EPA also provides compliance monitoring activities to enforce these regulations and coordinates with USCG, DOT, and BSEE in their implementation.

Strengthen Human Health and Environmental Protection in Indian Country

EPA, DOI, DHHS, USDA, and HUD work through several MOUs as partners to improve infrastructure on tribal lands. All five federal partners have committed to continue federal coordination in delivering services to tribal communities. The Infrastructure Task Force has built on prior partner successes, including improved access to funding and reduced administrative burden for tribal communities through the review and streamlining of agency policies, regulations, and directives as well as improved coordination of technical assistance to water service providers and solid waste managers through regular coordination meetings and web-based tools.

Homeland Security

EPA's Homeland Security, Preparedness and Response Program continues to develop and maintain agency assets and capabilities to respond to and support nationally significant incidents with emphasis on those involving chemical warfare agents. The Program implements a broad range of activities for a variety of internal and multi-agency efforts consistent with the NRF and the Homeland Security Presidential Directives that EPA leads or supports. This includes being the lead analytical agency for environmental sampling during a CWA incident. EPA also coordinates its preparedness activities with DHS, FEMA, FBI, and other federal, state and local agencies.

Research to Support Homeland Security

EPA collaborates with numerous agencies on Homeland Security research in order to leverage funding across multiple programs and produce synergistic results. EPA's Homeland Security Research Program works with DHS to back decisions made in its role as a lead agency responsible for cleanup during a Stafford Act declaration under ESF-10 and as the lead agency for water infrastructure. EPA also works with the DOD and its sub-organizations in its research work related to biological and chemical warfare agents. Further, EPA participates in a tri-agency research partnership (Technical Coordination Working Group [TCWG]) with the DOD and DHS that focuses on chemical and biological defense needs and gaps. TCWG activities include: information sharing; joint science and technology research projects; and complementing policies. EPA also collaborates with the CDC in conducting biological agent research.

EPA works with these aforementioned entities and others to address areas of mutual interest and concern related to both homeland security cleanup and water infrastructure protection issues. The Program conducts joint research with USDA and DOI focusing on addressing homeland security threats at the intersection of the environment/public health and agriculture/natural resources. EPA also works with DOE to access and conduct research at the DOE's National Laboratories specialized research facilities, such as to establish the Water Security Test Bed and develop analytical capabilities for biological and chemical agents in environmental matrices.

Research to Support Land and Emergency Management Programs

EPA has complementary and joint programs with the USFS, USGS, USDA, USACE, NOAA, BLM, and many others to minimize duplication, maximize scope, and maintain a real-time information flow for land and emergency management issues. EPA coordinates its research to support a range of environmental priorities at other federal agencies, including work with DOD in its Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program and the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program, and works with DOE and its Office of Health and Environmental Research. EPA also conducts collaborative laboratory research with DOD, DOI, and USGS to improve characterization and risk management options for dealing with subsurface contamination. EPA also works through the Interstate Technology Regulatory Council (ITRC) in defining continuing research needs through its teams on topics including PFAS, radionuclides, and brownfields.

Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention Programs

General Coordination for Chemical Safety

EPA established an Interagency Policy Group comprised of other Federal agencies with interest and expertise in chemical issues to hold periodic meetings to obtain input on significant actions such as the TSCA Risk Evaluations rules and potential existing chemical candidates for Prioritization under TSCA. The agencies on the Interagency Policy Group include: CPSC, DOD, OMB, NASA, DOL, SBA, NIH, FDA and CDC. EPA has utilized this group to review TSCA materials including, but not limited to, risk evaluations documents related to scoping of existing chemicals for risk evaluation and associated draft risk evaluations.

EPA also engages in biannual meetings with the OMNE¹ Committee, which includes the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), Mining Safety and Health Administration (MSHA), NIOSH, and the NIEHS. The OMNE Committee exists to provide a venue for federal agencies to share information and coordinate activities regarding proposed rules, risk assessments, and risk management strategies for controlling exposure to chemicals.

Federal Lead Action Plan

Established by Executive Order 13045, the President's Task Force on Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children comprises 17 federal departments and offices and is co-chaired by the Secretary of DHHS and the EPA Administrator. In December 2018, through cross-governmental collaboration, the Task Force unveiled the Federal Action Plan to Reduce Childhood Lead Exposures and Associated Health Impacts (Federal Lead Action Plan). The Federal Lead Action Plan is a blueprint for reducing lead exposure and associated harms by working with a range of stakeholders, including states, tribes and local communities, along with businesses, property owners and parents. In 2019, EPA released the *Implementation Status Report and the Progress Report on EPA-specific goals, objectives and actions under the Federal Lead Action Plan*. In FY 2021 and FY 2022, the Agency will continue to lead those goals and actions, coordinate with federal, state, tribal and community partners to amplify the impacts, and report on activities and implementation, as appropriate.

Participation in International Agreements addressing Chemicals and Pesticide Management

To participate more effectively in international agreements addressing chemicals and pesticide management (e.g., the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Minamata Convention, the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, etc.), EPA coordinates with other federal agencies, including USTR, DOS, DOC, USDA, DOE, and HHS, on a regular basis to develop the policy views and positions of the United States. EPA also coordinates with other parts of the U.S. Government, including ATSDR, NIH, and CPSC, on more technical international matters related to the safety and management of chemicals and pesticides. At the regional and global levels, EPA engages in bilateral cooperation and information exchange with a wide range of countries and regional organizations, such as the European Union (EU), Canada, China, Australia, Japan, Brazil, and many others.

¹ The OMNE Committee is named for the first letter in each participating agency's name.

In addition to participating in the U.S. Government trade development process, EPA also specifically engages in trilateral cooperation with Canada and Mexico through the U.S.-Mexico-Canada (USMCA) Free Trade Agreement, particularly with respect to the provisions related to agriculture, technical barriers to trade, and environment, among others. Such engagement is designed to promote further trade and regional cooperation among the three governments through targeted efforts and technical working groups. EPA also works closely with a number of countries in the context of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to further coordination amongst the OECD Member countries and observer governments. For example, OCSPP serves as the National Coordinator for the United States in support of the OECD Test Guidelines Program's mutual acceptance of data work, which aims to reduce the need to repeat health effects studies due to incompatible test protocols. Additionally, EPA is engaged in the OECD Working Group on Pesticides (WGP), which shares pesticide registration work and develop tools to monitor and minimize pesticide risk to human health and the environment, and with the Chemicals and Biotechnology Committee, which oversees eleven working groups and other subsidiary bodies in the chemicals and pesticide arenas.

Certification and Training, Worker Protection, IPM, and Environmental Stewardship

EPA will continue to coordinate with USDA, DOD, DOI, DOE, tribes, territories, and states to implement Certification Plans for pesticide applicators who use the riskiest pesticides. EPA provides technical guidance and assistance to the states and tribes in the implementation of all pesticide program activities, such as protecting workers, promoting Integrated Pest Management and environmental stewardship. EPA also provides support through grants, cooperative agreements, or interagency agreements with states, tribes and other partners, including universities, non-profit organizations, other federal agencies, pesticide users, environmental groups, and other entities, as necessary, to assist in strengthening and implementing EPA's pesticide activities, such as worker protection, pollinator protection and certifying pesticide applicators.

Assessing Potential Pesticide Risks with Supplemental Data

EPA relies on data from DHHS and USDA to supplement data from the pesticide industry in order to assist the Agency in assessing the potential risks of pesticides in the diets of adults and children. Specifically, EPA uses National Health and Nutrition Survey (NHANES) food consumption survey data developed by the DHHS, as well as pesticide residue data in food commodities generated by the USDA in its Pesticide Data Program (PDP) as inputs for dietary risk assessment.

Endangered Species & Pollinator Protection

EPA will continue collaborating with the USDA, FWS, and NMFS on protecting endangered and threatened species and improving methods for assessing potential risks and effects of pesticides to them. EPA, in cooperation with USDA, other federal agencies, state agencies, tribes, territories, and other entities, will continue to address pesticide risks to bees and other pollinators which are critical to our environment and the production of food crops.

Homeland Security – Protecting Food & Agriculture Sectors

EPA collaborates with the agencies such as DOD, DHS, USDA, FDA, FEMA, and other federal, tribal and state organizations on a variety of homeland security issues as part of the Government Coordinating Council (GCC) For Food and Agriculture. The issues focus on protecting the public and food and agriculture sector from various threats (e.g., biological agents, diseases, or natural disasters) which are vital to critical functions of the government and private sector. EPA collaborates with these organizations on many issues such as research pertaining to effective disinfectants for high threat microorganisms, planning for response to various potential incidents, training and development of policies and guidelines. In addition to GCC efforts, EPA continues to partner with the OSHA, NIOSH, and CPSC on risk assessment and risk mitigation activities.

Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC)

One of the Agency’s methods for receiving input on pesticide issues has been the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC), a Federal Advisory Committee, that brings together a broad cross-section of knowledgeable stakeholders from organizations that represent divergent views in order to discuss pesticide regulatory, policy, and implementation issues. The PPDC includes members from federal and state governments, industry/trade associations, pesticide user and commodity groups, consumer and environmental/public interest groups, and others. The PPDC provides a structured environment for meaningful information exchanges and discussions, and keeping the public involved in decisions that affect them. Dialogue with outside groups is essential for the Agency to remain responsive to the needs of its many partners.

General Research to Support Chemical Safety

EPA participates in a multi-agency effort under the *Tox21* collaboration. *Tox21* pools chemical research, data and screening tools from multiple federal agencies including EPA, and the NIH and FDA. EPA has contributed a chemical library, currently exceeding 4,000 chemicals, to the *Tox21* testing program.^{2,3} Nearly all of this library includes data from EPA’s Toxicity Forecaster (*ToxCast*TM), an effort that utilizes existing resources to develop faster, more thorough predictions of how chemicals may affect human and environmental health. The full *Tox21* library comprises approximately equal sized contributions from EPA, the National Toxicology Program (NTP), and the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS), and currently exceeds 9,000 unique substances.

Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) are a class of chemicals of emerging concern (CECs) in the environment. For most PFAS chemicals, there are little or no published toxicity data available.⁴ In collaboration with the NTP, EPA is addressing this data gap by conducting high-throughput toxicological screening assays on hundreds of PFAS chemicals. The results will be used to identify categories of PFAS chemicals having similar structural and toxicological properties that may inform the development and strength of predictive toxicological models.

² Collins, F.S., Gray, G.M., and Bucher, J.R. (2008). Transforming environmental health protection. *Science*, 319, 906–907. doi: 10.1126/science.1154619.

³ Tice, R.R., Austin, C.P., Kavlock, R.J., and Bucher, J.R. (2013). Improving the human hazard characterization of chemicals: a *Tox21* update. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 121, 756–765. doi: 10.1289/ehp.1205784.

⁴ For more information, please see: <https://www.epa.gov/pfas/epa-pfas-research>.

Resources requested in FY 2022 will build upon the research foundation formed from completed work outlined in the *PFAS Action Plan*.

Research to Support the Amended Toxic Substances Control Act

EPA collaborates globally with other federal agencies on research to accelerate the pace of chemical risk assessment and to provide greater regulatory certainty for the public. EPA is working with Health Canada and the European Joint Research Center on the development and testing of new non-animal approach methodologies to evaluate chemicals quickly and cost-effectively for safety. These new approach methods are a critical part of implementing the TSCA Strategic Plan to reduce, refine, and replace the use of vertebrates in toxicity testing and evaluation. EPA also commenced work with Health Canada and ECHA to promote sharing of non-confidential chemical safety information with the intent of advancing chemical evaluations across regulatory jurisdictions. This collaborative approach will help EPA and other federal agencies screen, prioritize and evaluate chemicals, and promote implementation of alternative methods to replace vertebrate animal testing under TSCA. Finally, EPA is engaged in multiple OECD chemical safety groups that share information, expertise, and research results related to chemical safety. Ultimately, these international efforts will work towards creating transparent data requirements for industry and reducing the regulatory uncertainty of multiple regulatory environments globally.

Research to Support Agencywide Risk Assessment Activities

EPA consults and collaborates routinely with other federal agencies about the science of individual Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) assessments, as well as efforts to prioritize and coordinate chemical evaluations. IRIS maintains an interagency working group that consists of various federal agencies (e.g., DOD, NASA, SBA, DOT, DOE, DOI, etc.), and the White House. EPA also coordinates, respectively, with: ATSDR, through an MOU on the development of toxicological reviews and toxicology profiles; NIEHS and the National Toxicology Program, on assessment methodology, software, and assay development platforms; FDA on advisories and reports; and DOD on assessment development. In addition, EPA contracts with the National Academy of Sciences' National Research Council (NRC) on very difficult and complex human health risk assessments through consultation or review. EPA also participates in the Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods (ICCVAM) to work towards increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of U.S. federal agency test method review, eliminating unnecessary duplication of effort, sharing experience among U.S. federal regulatory agencies, and reducing, refining, and replacing the use of animals in testing.

Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Programs

General Enforcement Coordination

The Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Program coordinates closely with:

- DOJ on all civil and criminal environmental enforcement matters. In addition, the Program has coordinated with other agencies on specific environmental issues as described herein;
- The Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, OSHA, and ATSDR in preventing and responding to accidental releases and endangerment situations;

- DOI's Bureau of Indian Affairs, and DHHS's IHS on issues relative to compliance with environmental laws in Indian country;
- The DOC and SBA on the implementation of SBREFA. In addition, it has collaborated with the SBA to maintain current environmental compliance information at *Business.gov*, a website initiated as an e-government initiative in 2004, to help small businesses comply with government regulations. The IRS on cases that require defendants to pay civil penalties, thereby assisting the IRS in assuring compliance with tax laws;
- USACE on wetlands issues;
- DOT's Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration on pipeline spills;
- USDA on the regulation of animal feeding operations and on food safety issues arising from the misuse of pesticides and shares joint jurisdiction with the Federal Trade Commission on pesticide labeling and advertising; and,
- United States Customs and Border Protection in order to stop the importation of internal combustion vehicles and engines that do not meet Clean Air Act requirements.

International Trade

EPA works with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) on implementing the secure International Trade Data System (ITDS) across all federal agencies and on pesticide imports and on hazardous waste and Cathode Ray Tube exports, as well as on a variety of other import/export issues under the various statutes (e.g., imports of vehicles and engines).

Coordination on Issues Involving Shared Jurisdiction

EPA and FDA share jurisdiction over general-purpose disinfectants used on non-critical surfaces and some dental and medical equipment surfaces. EPA and FDA also collaborate and share information on Good Laboratory Program inspections to avoid duplication of inspections and maximize efficient use of limited resources. The Agency has entered into an agreement with the HUD concerning enforcement of the TSCA lead-based paint notification requirements. The Agency has coordinated with the USCG under the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships, and on discharges of pollutant from ships and oil spills under the CWA. EPA also works with the DOI on CWA permit enforcement on the Outer Continental Shelf, as well as both the Interior and Transportation Departments on enforcement of CWA requirements for offshore facilities.

Criminal Enforcement

EPA's Criminal Enforcement Program coordinates with the FBI, CBP, DOL, U.S. Treasury, USCG, DOI and DOJ and with international, state, tribal, and local law enforcement organizations in the investigation and prosecution of environmental crimes. EPA also works with DOJ to establish task forces that bring together federal, state, tribal, and local law enforcement organizations to address environmental crimes. EPA has an Interagency Agreement with DOJ's Environment and Natural Resources Division to develop the first federal Environmental Crime Victim Assistance Program. This allows both agencies to meet their statutory obligations under the Crime Victims' Rights Act (CVRA) and the Victims' Rights and Restitution Act (VRRRA), to

make sure that environmental crime victims are notified of and accorded their rights under the CVRA and VRRRA. In addition, the Program has an Interagency Agreement with the DHS to provide specialized criminal environmental training to federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement personnel at the Federal Law Enforcement Center (FLETC) in Glynco, Georgia.

Monitoring the Environmental Compliance of Federal Agencies

Most environmental statutes require departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. government to comply with environmental requirements just like any other regulated entity. EPA and states inspect federal facilities and take enforcement actions, as appropriate. In addition, Executive Order 12088 on *Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards* directs EPA to monitor compliance by federal agencies with all environmental laws and provide technical assistance. The Federal Facility Enforcement Program coordinates with other federal, state, tribal, and local agencies to ensure compliance by federal agencies with all environmental laws. EPA works through the Federal Facilities Environmental Stewardship and Compliance Assistance Center (*FedCenter*) (www.fedcenter.gov), which is governed by a board of more than a dozen contributing federal agencies. EPA also partners with other federal agencies to identify ways to expedite cleanup of Superfund sites and prevent and address regulatory compliance issues. *FedCenter* works with federal agencies to plan Federal Environmental Symposia to encourage collaboration, information sharing, stewardship, and improved environmental compliance across the federal government. EPA is working with other Agencies through *FedCenter* to address Administration priorities including PFAS and environmental justice.

Superfund Enforcement

EPA oversees federal agency CERCLA cleanups for federal facilities listed on the National Priorities List (NPL) through a Federal Facility Agreement. Where appropriate, EPA takes action to enforce and coordinates with OFAs in their use of CERCLA enforcement authority. This includes the coordinated use of such authority at individual hazardous waste sites that are located on both non-federal land (EPA jurisdiction) and federal lands (other agency jurisdiction). As required by Executive Order 13016, EPA also reviews and concurs on the use of CERCLA Section 106 authority by other departments and agencies. In addition, EPA coordinates closely with Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMAs), such as BLM and USFS, at mixed ownership sites (*i.e.*, those sites located partially on privately-owned land and partially on federally owned land) pursuant to Executive Order 12580. EPA frequently enters into Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with FLMAs designed to provide a framework for agencies to coordinate response actions. Most recently, as part of the Superfund Task Force Recommendations, EPA has been working on an MOU with FLMAs to improve the efficient and effective use of federal resources to cleanup at mixed ownership mining sites. EPA also meets with DOI and USDA as part of the Federal Mining Dialogue, to discuss developments arising out of the CERCLA work at such sites.

EPA also coordinates with DOI, USDA, DOC, DOE, and DOD to ensure that appropriate and timely notices, required under CERCLA, are sent to the Natural Resource Trustees notifying them of potential damages to natural resources. EPA also coordinates with Natural Resource Trustees on natural resource damage assessments, investigations, and planning of response activities under Section 104 of CERCLA. When an enforcement action is initiated at a site where hazardous

substances are found to have caused damages to natural resources, EPA coordinates with the Trustees by including them in negotiations with potentially responsible parties concerning the releases that have caused those damages.

Under Executive Order 12580, EPA's Superfund Federal Facilities Enforcement Program assists federal agencies in complying with CERCLA, and ensures that: (1) all federal facility sites on the NPL have interagency agreements, also known as Federal Facility Agreements (FFAs) with enforceable cleanup schedules; (2) FFAs are monitored for compliance; (3) federal sites are transferred to new owners in an environmentally responsible manner; and (4) compliance assistance is available to the extent possible. This program also ensures that federal agencies comply with Superfund cleanup obligations "in the same manner and to the same extent" as private entities. To enable the cleanup and reuse of such sites, the Federal Facilities Enforcement Program also has coordinated creative solutions that help restore facilities, so they can once again serve an important role in the economy and welfare of local communities, and the country.

International and Tribal Affairs Programs

Supporting Global Policy to Reduce Pollution and Harmful Chemicals

EPA has a strong network of partners working to achieve reductions in global mercury use and emissions, particularly when adverse U.S. impacts would be likely. EPA works closely with the DOS in leading the technical and policy engagement for the U.S. in the Minamata Convention on Mercury and the multi-stakeholder Global Mercury Partnership. In addition to the DOS, EPA collaborates with several federal agencies including USGS and USAID to advance robust implementation of the Minamata Convention by other countries. EPA also continues to share information through the Arctic Council on reducing releases of mercury which disproportionately impact indigenous arctic communities.

Similarly, EPA is engaged in a multi-pronged effort to address the growing global problem of marine litter. Here, EPA works with the DOS, NOAA, Peace Corps, and USAID to advance policy and technical solutions for marine litter in global fora. EPA also is working with USDA, OMB and FDA on the on reducing food waste which includes international cooperation on measuring food waste reductions and pilot activities that can create market opportunities for U.S. technologies and innovation.

Supporting Environmental Priorities in Global Trade Policy and Implementation of Environmental Cooperation Agreements

Since the 1972 Trade Act mandated the U.S. Trade Representative to engage in interagency consultations, EPA has played a key role in trade policy development. Specifically, EPA is a member of the Trade Policy Staff Committee, the Trade Policy Review Group and relevant subcommittees – interagency mechanisms that provide advice, guidance, and clearance to the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative in the development of U.S. international trade and investment policy.

EPA continue its participation in the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC), which provides regional and international leadership to advance environmental protection, human health, and sustainable economic growth in North America. EPA also will continue work on implementation of the Environment Chapter of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) and other free trade agreements. EPA also continues active participation in the United States Trade Representative (USTR) led Interagency Environment Committee for Monitoring and Environment (IECME) established to promote Mexican and Canadian compliance with their environmental obligations. In addition, EPA continues to work with partners (including the Treasury Department, State Department, U.S. Agency for International Development, and the U.S. International Development Finance Corporation), to improve environmental governance of U.S. funded international development projects.

Addressing Transboundary Pollution

EPA collaborates with countries around the world to address foreign sources of pollution in coordination with DOS, USAID, DOJ, Treasury, and others. EPA works closely with DHHS to advance recognition of environmental risk factors of non-communicable diseases (NCDs) and how to mitigate the risks, including from lead and mercury. In addition, EPA continues to strengthen its activities in the Arctic by working with Alaska, tribes, federal agencies, and the private sector to build international support for U.S. environmental policy objectives through the Arctic Council. These objectives cover a range of topics, including reducing emissions and exposure to mercury. EPA also plays a leadership role with other agencies including NOAA, DOS, and USAID in crafting sound programs to address marine litter globally, ensuring that sound waste management and recycling strategies are advanced in key source countries.

Working in Indian Country

EPA works under a five-federal agency MOU to better coordinate the federal government's efforts in providing access to safe drinking water and basic wastewater facilities for tribal communities. EPA, DOI, DHHS, USDA, and HUD work as the Federal Tribal Infrastructure Task Force (TITF) to use their combined authorities to maintain a framework to enhance interagency efficiency and coordination, and to cultivate greater cooperation in carrying out their tribal infrastructure responsibilities. Since 2007, the TITF has: maintained procedures necessary for a common understanding of the programs pertaining to funding infrastructure construction, solid waste management efforts, and technical assistance to tribes; worked together to improve the capacity of tribal communities to operate and maintain sustainable infrastructure; enhanced the efficient leveraging of funds; worked directly with tribes to promote an understanding of federal programs; identified ways to improve construction, operation, and maintenance of sustainable infrastructure; and worked to allow and facilitate the exchange of data and information amongst partners.⁵

⁵ For additional information, please visit: <https://www.epa.gov/tribal/federal-infrastructure-task-force-improve-access-safe-drinking-water-and-basic-sanitation>.

Central Planning, Budgeting and Finance Programs

Working with Federal Partners on Improving Management and Accountability throughout the Federal Government

EPA participates and makes active contributions to standing interagency management committees, including:

- the Chief Financial Officers Council focuses on improving resources management and accountability throughout the federal government;
- the Performance Improvement Council coordinates and develops strategic plans, performance plans, and performance reports as required by law;
- OMB-led E-Government initiatives such as the Financial Management and Budget Formulation and Execution Lines of Business;
- the Bureau of Census-maintained the Federal Assistance Awards Data System; and
- the President’s Management Council oversees developing and implementing Cross-Agency Priority (CAP) goals.

Provide Government-to-Government Employee Relocation Services

EPA provides government-to-government employee relocation services via interagency agreements through EPA’s Federal Employee Relocation Center (FERC) as a Working Capital Fund (WCF) activity. EPA-FERC provides “one-stop shop” domestic and international relocation services to other federal agencies to increase operational efficiency and save the government money. EPA-FERC currently provides relocation services internally to all EPA offices, and externally to the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), DOL, Office of Personnel Management (OPM), United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), DHHS, and the USDA. EPA also coordinates appropriately with Congress and other federal agencies, such as the U.S. Treasury, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and GSA.

Mission Support Programs

Working with Federal Partners on Improving Management and Accountability throughout the Federal Government

EPA provides leadership and expertise to government-wide activities in various areas of human resources, grants management, contracts management, suspension and debarment, and homeland security. These activities include specific collaboration efforts through:

- The Chief Human Capital Officers Council, a group of senior leaders that discuss human capital initiatives across the federal government.

- The Legislative and Policy Committee, a committee comprised of other federal agency representatives who assist OPM in developing plans and policies for training and development.
- The Chief Acquisition Officers Council, the principal interagency forum for monitoring and improving the federal acquisition system. The Council also is focused on promoting the President's specific initiatives and policies in all aspects of the acquisition system.
- The Award Committee for E-Government (E-Gov) provides strategic vision for the portfolio of systems/federal wide supporting both federal acquisition and financial assistance. Support also is provided to the associated functional community groups, including the Procurement Committee for E-Gov, the Financial Assistance Committee for E-Gov, and the Intergovernmental Transaction Working Group.

The Interagency Suspension and Debarment Committee (ISDC), a representative committee of federal agency leaders in suspension and debarment. The Committee facilitates lead agency coordination, serves as a forum to discuss current suspension and debarment related issues, and assists in developing unified federal policy. Besides participating in the ISDC, EPA: 1) provides instructors for the National Suspension and Debarment Training Program offered through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and 2) supports the development of coursework and training on the suspension and debarment process for the Inspector General Academy and the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency.

The Financial Management Line of Business (FMLoB) has been expanded to also encompass the Grants Management Line of Business. The combined FMLoB, with U.S. Treasury as the managing partner, will more closely align the financial assistance and financial management communities around effective and efficient management of funds. EPA also participates in the Grants.gov Users' Group, as well as the Federal Demonstration Partnership which is designed to reduce the administrative burdens associated with research grants.

The Partnership for Sustainable Communities initiative, a collaborative effort with HUD and DOT, improves the alignment and delivery of grant resources to communities designated under certain environmental programs. It also helps identify cases in the Program that may warrant consideration of suspension and debarment.

The Interagency Committee on Federal Advisory Committee Management (Committee Management Officer Council) provides leadership and coordination on federal advisory committee issues and promotes effective and efficient committee operations government-wide. In addition to serving on the Council, EPA works with the GSA Committee Management Secretariat to establish and renew advisory committees, conduct annual reviews of advisory committee activities and accomplishments, maintain committee information in a publicly accessible online database, and develop committee management regulations, guidance, and training. Further, EPA participates on

the GSA Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) Attorney Council Interagency Workgroup to keep abreast of developments in the statutory language, case law, interpretation and implementation of the FACA.

The Interagency Security Committee (ISC) is the leading organization for nonmilitary federal departments and agencies in establishing policies for the security and protection of federal facilities, developing security standards, and ensuring compliance with those standards. EPA participates in the ISC as a primary member and in sub-committees and workgroups to facilitate EPA's compliance with ISC standards for facilities nationwide.

The OPM Background Investigations Stakeholder Group (BISG) is a collaborative organization that is derived from the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. The BISG is comprised of senior security officials across the federal government who are responsible for the submission, adjudication and/or oversight of personnel security programs. EPA works with this group to discuss topics regarding background investigations, focusing on standardizing and improving the Agency's personnel security program.

EPA manages the Senior Environmental Employment (SEE) Program's interagency agreements with other federal agencies. The interagency agreements are with the CEQ, the FHWA, NOAA, and the Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council. SEE participants provide administrative, technical, and professional support to these agencies for projects relating to pollution prevention, abatement, and control.

EPA's Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ) partners with the USPTO, NOAA, the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, the Merit Systems Protection Board, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to serve as Presiding Officers for proceedings to adjudicate complaints brought before the partner organizations. This collaboration allows partner organizations the ability to provide constitutionally guaranteed legal due process and review without staffing and supporting their own office of Administrative Law Judges, while EPA's judges expand their experience and knowledge in the area of administrative law. The services OALJ provides to other agencies are reimbursed by the borrowing organization.

Work with the Department of Interior's Interior Business Center

In FY 2022, EPA will continue working with DOI's Interior Business Center (IBC), an OPM- and OMB-approved Human Resources Line of Business shared service center. IBC offers HR transactional processing, compensation management and payroll processing, benefits administration, time and attendance, HR reporting, talent acquisition systems, and talent management systems. EPA also continues its charter membership on the OPM HR Line of Business Multi Agency Executive Strategy Committee (MAESC), providing advice and recommendations to the Director of OPM as well as additional government-wide executive leadership, for the implementation of the HR Line of Business vision, goals, and objectives.

Partnering with GSA on the USAccess Program

EPA is partnering with GSA on the *USAccess* Program for Personal Identity Verification cards and identity credential solutions, which provides an efficient, economical and secure infrastructure to support its credentialing needs, and migrations to the Enterprise Physical Access Control System, allowing the Agency to control access in EPA space, including restricted and secure space.

Environmental Information Programs

To support EPA's overall mission, the Agency collaborates with federal, state, and tribal agencies on a variety of initiatives focused on making government more efficient and transparent in protecting human health and the environment. EPA's Environmental Information programs are primarily involved in the information technology (IT), information management (IM), and information security aspects of the projects on which it collaborates.

The Chief Information Officer (CIO) Council

The CIO Council is the principal interagency forum for improving practices in the design, modernization, use, sharing, and performance of federal information resources. The Council develops recommendations for IT/IM policies, procedures, and standards; identifies opportunities to share information resources; and assesses and addresses the needs of the federal IT workforce.

eRulemaking

The eRulemaking Program is a Federal E-Government shared Line of Business (LoB) that manages the Federal Docket Management System (FDMS) and Regulations.gov. The Program provides the public with one-stop access to electronic dockets and the ability to electronically comment on proposed rulemakings and de-regulatory actions for multiple federal agencies.

At the beginning of FY 2020, the Program Managing Organization transitioned from EPA to the GSA. EPA will continue working with GSA as a Partner Agency to improve FDMS and provide the public with access to electronic dockets and the ability to electronically comment on proposed rulemaking and de-regulatory actions.

The National Environmental Information Exchange Network (EN)

EPA's EN Program and CBP are coordinating on using the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) system. This coordination will lead to automated processing of over 8 million EPA-related electronic filings needed to clear legitimate imports and exports. With the move from paper filings to electronic filings combined with automated processing through ACE, filing time can be reduced from weeks/days to minutes/days. This significant processing improvement directly impacts the movement of goods into commerce and the economy while helping to ensure compliance with environmental and CBP laws and regulations. It also helps the U.S. Government keep pace with the speed of business.

Automated Commercial Environment/International Trade Data System (ACE/ITDS)

ITDS is the electronic information exchange capability, or "single window," through which businesses will transmit data required by participating agencies for the import or export of cargo. ACE is the system built by CBP to ensure that its customs officers and other federal agencies have the information they need to decide how to handle goods and merchandise being shipped into or out of the United States. It also will be the way those agencies provide CBP with information about potential imports/exports. ITDS eliminates the need, burden, and cost of paper reporting. It also allows importers and exporters to report the same information to multiple federal agencies with a single submission and facilitates movement of cargo by automating processing of the import and exports. ITDS provides the capability for industry to consolidate reporting for commodities regulated by multiple agencies. For these consolidated reports, the industry filers will receive the appropriate status response when their filings meet each agency's reporting requirements. Once all agency reporting requirements have been met, filers can receive a coordinated single U.S. government response to proceed into the commerce of the United States.

EPA has the responsibility and legal authority to make sure pesticides, toxic chemicals, vehicles and engines, ODS, and other commodities entering and hazardous waste exiting the country meet its human health and environmental standards. EPA's ongoing collaboration with CBP on the ACE/ITDS effort will improve the efficiency of processing these shipments through information exchange between EPA and CBP and automated processing of electronic filings. As resources permit, EPA will continue to work with CBP to automate the manual paper review process for admissibility so that importers and brokers (referred to collectively as Trade) can know before these commodities are loaded onto an airplane, truck, train, or ship if their shipment meets EPA's reporting requirements. Because of this automated review, Trade can greatly lower its cost of doing business and customs officers at our nation's ports will have the information on whether shipments comply with our environmental regulations. EPA will continue to collaborate with CBP to support regulatory changes and integrate with new ACE capabilities for streamlining the import and export processes for America's businesses.

Geospatial Information

EPA works with 31 federal agencies through the activities of the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) and the OMB Geospatial Line of Business (Geo LoB). EPA also participates in the FGDC Steering Committee. A key component of EPA's work with FGDC is developing and implementing the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and the National *GeoPlatform*. The key objective of the NSDI is to make a comprehensive array of national spatial data – data that portrays features associated with a location or tagged with geographic information and can be attached to and portrayed on maps – easily accessible to both governmental and public stakeholders. Use of this data, in tandem with analytical applications, supports several key EPA and government-wide business areas. These include ensuring that human health and environmental conditions are represented in the appropriate contexts for targeting and decision making; enabling the assessment, protection, and remediation of environmental conditions; and aiding emergency first responders and other homeland security activities. EPA supports geospatial initiatives through efforts such as EPA's GeoPlatform, EPA's Environmental Dataset Gateway, the Exchange Network, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Assist, EJScreen, the EPA Metadata Editor,

Facilities Registry System (FRS) Web Services, and *My Environment*. EPA also works closely with its state, tribal, and international partners in a collaboration that enables consistent implementation of data acquisition and development, standards, and technologies supporting the efficient and cost-effective sharing and use of geographically based data and services.

The Administrator's Office

Regulatory Management and Economic Analyses

EPA's Policy Office (OP) interacts with federal agencies during its rulemaking activities. Per governing statutes and agency priorities, OP submits "significant" regulatory actions to OMB for interagency review prior to signature and publication in the *Federal Register*. In addition, OP coordinates EPA's review of other agency's regulatory actions submitted to OMB for review. Under the Congressional Review Act, rules are submitted to each chamber of Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States. For regulations that may have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, OP collaborates extensively with SBA and OMB. OP also collaborates with other federal regulatory and natural resource agencies to collect data used in economic cost-benefit analyses of environmental regulations and policies and to foster improved interdisciplinary research and reporting. Activities include representing EPA on interagency workgroups or committees tasked with measuring the economic costs and benefits of federal policies and programs. Occasionally, OP also provides technical reviews of other agencies research and analyses.

Children's Health

The Administrator of EPA and the Secretary of DHHS co-chair the President's Task Force on Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks to Children. The Task Force comprises 17 federal departments, agencies and White House offices. A senior staff steering committee, co-chaired by the Director of EPA's Office of Children's Health Protection (OCHP), coordinates interagency cooperation on Task Force priority areas. As part of this effort, OCHP coordinates with other agencies to improve government-wide support in implementing children's health legislative mandates and outreach, including providing children's environmental health expertise on interagency activities and coordinating EPA expertise. OCHP also coordinates with ATSDR to support provision of training and hands on consultations with doctors, nurses, and other medical professionals to address issues of potential exposures of children to environmental contaminants, such as lead and asthma triggers including mold and vermin. OCHP also works with other federal agencies to address emerging risks to children's environmental health and supports federal interagency information exchange and cooperation, such as on lead and wildfires.

Environmental Justice

Presidential Executive Order (EO) 14008 on *Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad* enhanced and expanded several important means of interagency coordination and collaboration related to environmental justice. EO14008 elevated the existing Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice, formerly chaired by EPA, to the White House Environmental Justice

Interagency Council (IAC), chaired by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). This executive order also established a White House Environmental Justice Advisory Council (WHEJAC) to provide advice and recommendations to the IAC and CEQ on environmental justice recommendations for the entirety of the executive branch of the federal government. The IAC will be the primary venue for inter-agency coordination of executive branch federal activities related to environmental justice. Through the Justice40 initiative, also mandated in EO14008, the IAC will work to achieve the goal that forty percent of federal resources for climate change benefit disadvantaged communities and will publish an annual public performance scorecard on implementation by federal agencies. The IAC will likewise coordinate recommendations on further updates to EO12898 and provide leadership to interagency efforts to address current and historic environmental injustices. As stipulated in EO14008, EPA will provide all support necessary for administration of the WHEJAC and is one of three agencies charged with providing support to CEQ for administration of the IAC. EPA also will play a prominent membership role within the IAC as a participating agency.

National Climate Task Force

The Administrator of EPA is a member of the National Climate Task Force. The Task Force shall facilitate the organization and deployment of a Government-wide approach to combat the climate crisis. This Task Force shall facilitate planning and implementation of key Federal actions to reduce climate pollution; increase resilience to the impacts of climate change; protect public health; conserve our lands, waters, oceans, and biodiversity; deliver environmental justice; and spur well-paying union jobs and economic growth. As necessary and appropriate, members of the Task Force will engage on these matters with State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments; workers and communities; and leaders across the various sectors of our economy.

The Inspector General

Work with the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE)

EPA's Inspector General is a member of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), an organization comprised of federal Inspectors General (IGs), GAO, and the FBI. The CIGIE coordinates and improves the way IGs conduct audits, investigations, and internal operations. The CIGIE also promotes joint projects of government-wide interest and reports annually to the President on the collective performance of the IG community.

Activity Coordination, Information Exchange and Training

EPA's OIG coordinates criminal investigative activities with other law enforcement organizations such as the FBI, Secret Service, and DOJ. In addition, the OIG participates with various inter-governmental audit forums and professional associations to exchange information, share best practices, and obtain or provide training. The OIG also promotes collaboration among EPA's partners and stakeholders in its participation of disaster response and its outreach activities.

Collaborative Work with Inspectors General and Other Partners

EPA's OIG initiates and participates in collaborative audits, program evaluations, and investigations with OIGs of agencies with an environmental mission such as the DOI, USDA, as well as other federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies as prescribed by the IG Act, as amended.

Statutory Duties

As required by the IG Act, EPA's OIG coordinates and shares information with the GAO. EPA's OIG currently serves as the Inspector General of the U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigations Board (CSB). EPA's OIG will continue to perform its duties with respect to the CSB until otherwise directed.

MAJOR MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

Introduction

As required by the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000, the Office of Inspector General identifies issues they consider as the Environmental Protection Agency's top management challenges and assesses progress in addressing those challenges. EPA recognizes that management challenges, if not addressed adequately, may prevent the Agency from effectively meeting its mission. EPA remains committed to addressing all management issues in a timely manner and to the fullest extent of its authority.

The following discussion summarizes each of the FY 2020 management challenges identified by the OIG and presents the Agency's responses.

Maintaining Operations During Pandemic and Natural Disaster Responses

***Summary of Challenge:** The OIG notes that EPA needs to maintain human health and environmental protection, business operations, and employee safety during the coronavirus pandemic and future natural disasters.*

Agency Response: During this time of COVID-19, the Agency continues to carry out management, operational, and statutory responsibilities in the face of the unprecedented challenge represented by the pandemic. EPA worked with its partners and maintained a robust posture for its Response Support Corps and several Special Teams ready to respond to local and national emergencies and time-critical removals. Through innovation, flexibility where appropriate to allow for easier adaptation to the evolving circumstances posed by the virus, and ongoing systematic implementation of performance management and evaluation, the Agency has continued its important work. EPA recognizes the current COVID-19 pandemic does create new challenges for the Agency to successfully respond to its primary mission essential functions and ensure that its employees are able to operate in a safe manner. The Agency's resilience, robust management systems and a committed workforce ensures EPA continues to perform its work at a high level.

EPA has relied on its performance management and evaluation system to monitor progress towards outcomes. The Agency established a variety of organizational goals to drive progress toward key mission outcomes. These strategic goals articulate clear statements of what the Agency wants to achieve to advance its mission and address relevant national problems, needs, challenges, and opportunities. Strategic objectives define the outcome or management impact the Agency is trying to achieve. Each strategic objective is tracked through long-term performance goals, annual performance goals, indicators, and other evidence. EPA's FY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR) described progress towards the strategic goals and objectives outlined in the *FY 2018-2022 EPA Strategic Plan*, available at <https://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/strategicplan>. This APR presented results toward the annual performance goals and targets in the Agency's FY 2020 Annual Performance Plan (APP) and Congressional Justification (CJ) as updated in the FY 2021 APP and CJ.

EPA has made significant progress toward a broad range of policy outcomes including significant improvements in performance over recent years. The Agency will continue progress toward its performance targets to improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of its operations.

In parallel, each regional emergency response program is continuously evaluating the availability of On-Scene Coordinators and Special Teams in light of the COVID-19 pandemic to inform decision-making of future deployments as necessary. The emergency response program leadership team will, prior to significant personnel deployments, discuss steps which the Agency can take to mitigate risk and adhere to the latest field activities guidelines.

The Office of Mission Support (OMS) continues providing leadership on agency operations in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic: ensuring the safety of the workplace through enhanced cleaning and safety protocols; implementing CARES Act Section 3610 contracting provisions; supporting the workforce through implementation of workforce flexibilities; and supporting agency leadership on the regarding ongoing operations. OMS' goal and focus are to prevent and/or limit COVID-19 from impeding the mission of the Agency despite the significant and far-reaching impacts of the pandemic on the Agency and workforce.

Additionally, actions the Agency has adapted to continue to protect human health and the environment amid the pandemic are highlighted below:

- Ensuring that all Americans have safe water by working closely with the water sector and the Agency's federal and state partners to support drinking water and wastewater services that are essential to helping reduce the spread of COVID-19. The Agency focused its efforts on critical threats such as water sector worker absenteeism, supply chain disruptions, and financial impacts – both immediate and long-term.
- Working closely with Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to jointly develop guidance for cleaning and disinfecting public spaces, workplaces, businesses, and homes.
- Expanded indoor air quality outreach and technical assistance to schools, tribes and the general public to improve ventilation and filtration practices as a key component to COVID-19 interventions.
- Expanded work under the Emerging Viral Pathogens Guidance for Anti-microbial Pesticides program, where EPA deployed, for the first time against SARS-CoV-2, expedited review of submissions from companies requesting to add emerging viral pathogen claims to their already registered surface disinfectant labels.
- Working with the Federal Tribal Infrastructure Task Force to identify available federal resources, information, and programs to support tribal water systems.
- Establishing a variety of compliance monitoring guidance documents and innovative processes to ensure a continued field presence, albeit virtual.
- Developing COVID-19 Interim Guidelines for Inspections for conducting inspections during the COVID-19 public health emergency.
- Developed key Off-Site Compliance Monitoring Guidance.
- The Office of Civil Enforcement continues to initiate and conclude civil administrative and judicial enforcement actions; issue information requests; conduct settlement discussions and negotiations; and oversee implementation of consent decrees. National policy development continues with additional efficiencies.

- Establishment of a framework for addressing the impact of the COVID-19 public health emergency on site remediation enforcement programs. In April 2020, the Office of Land and Emergency Management and the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance issued a joint memorandum titled *Interim Guidance on Site Field Work Decisions Due to Impact of COVID-19*. The interim guidance addresses response field activities, non-field activities, and cleanup enforcement issues at “sites across the country under a range of EPA authorities including, but not limited to, the Superfund Program, RCRA corrective action, TSCA PCB cleanup provisions, the Oil Pollution Act, and the Underground Storage Tank Program.”
- Developing a plan to maintain Emergency Radiation Air Monitoring Capabilities during a pandemic.
- Understanding Adaptations to Nuclear Power Plant Public Safety Plans through working with state partners and the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program to understand how pandemic considerations were being considered for public health decision-making for a nuclear power plants.

FY 2021 Spring Update: The coronavirus pandemic necessitated unexpected and sudden changes to EPA’s management, administrative, and programmatic operations to protect human health and the environment. In early March 2020, EPA switched over to virtual workplace within a span of two to three weeks. The shift initially had negative impacts on performance. Subsequently, much of the Agency’s work recovered to appropriate performance levels, but some activities have had sustained negative impacts. EPA will continue to monitor the effects of the pandemic on performance.

The FY 2020 APR addressed impacts of the pandemic on annual performance goals, finding direct or indirect impacts on 12 out of the 45 (about 27%) total annual performance goals. The negative impacts on EPA’s performance were primarily in operational areas that require the field presence of EPA staff, partners, or contractor personnel. In addition, a complete and sudden transition of EPA’s entire workforce and its operations required development and implementation of IT solutions at a rapid pace. While this rapid transformation created some positive benefits (e.g., increased participation in online technical assistance, conversion of paper-based processes to digital processes, etc.), it also highlighted some of the issues for disadvantaged communities that could not take advantage of the changes because of their lack of internet connections.

Agency leadership will continue to engage in discussions with program and regional office leadership on COVID-19 and anticipated potential risks associated with achieving strategic objectives based on performance data moving forward. Discussions also will continue as part of the Agency’s Quarterly Performance Reviews to assess performance and identify actions to mitigate impacts as appropriate.

Responsible Agency Official: David Bloom, Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Chief Financial Officer; and Donna Vizian, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Mission Support

Complying with Key Internal Control Requirements

Summary of Challenge: *According to the OIG, EPA faces overarching challenges with implementing and operating internal controls that establish and maintain an effective work environment. This includes developing internal control risk assessments; ensuring data quality; and effective operational policies and procedures.*

Agency Response: EPA continues to comply with key internal control requirements to ensure programs are operating effectively and efficiently. The GAO *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government* (known as the Green Book) serves as the overall framework for establishing and reporting on the effectiveness of EPA's internal controls. As outlined in the Agency's annual guidance, program and regional offices are required develop and maintain an Internal Control Matrix for key program and processes within their respective organizations. The matrix is based on the Green Book standards and provides the basis for the Assistant and Regional Administrator's attestation to the soundness of internal controls for the organization. Furthermore, the matrix describes the risks that may impede the organization from accomplishing its goals and objectives and includes the associated controls (e.g., policies, procedures, measures, etc.) in place to address the identified risks. In developing the matrix, program and regional offices consider all risk factors—strategic, operational, and fraud—and assess the impact and likelihood to the program if the risk were to occur. Additionally, the Agency performs risk assessments for its strategic objectives and uses the results of the assessment to inform the Agency Risk Profile, which is required by OMB Circular A-123, *Management's Responsibility for Enterprise Risk Management and Internal Control*.

To strengthen the Agency's process, OCFO developed a template to assist organizations in identifying internal controls and conducting reviews of those controls. The template allows managers and staff to describe the details of the review and the procedures used to determine if controls are operating as intended and sufficient in responding to risk identified. In addition, this year, as part of its oversight responsibility for EPA's Management Integrity Program, OCFO plans to perform internal control reviews in various program offices. The results of the review, as well as information reported in the templates, will assist in determining whether controls are designed, implemented, and operating effectively. The results also will support development of the Administrator's statement of assurance on the overall effectiveness of internal controls for the agency.

In response to the OIG audit, *EPA Needs to Conduct Risk Assessments When Designing and Implementing Programs*, Report 20-P-0170, May 18, 2020, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer has made available on-line training modules that provide awareness and key information on EPA's Management Integrity Program. The training is targeted for managers and staff and focuses on roles and responsibilities for implementing and overseeing internal controls. The AA and RA must report completion of the training for all appropriate staff in their annual assurance letters.

In reference to improving data quality, under the Clinger Cohen Act (1996), the EPA Chief Information Officer in the Office of Mission Support has delegated authority for environmental information including oversight responsibility for the Agency's Quality Program, as described in

the Agency's Quality Policy and Procedure. The Agency's Quality Program is decentralized and implemented by the program offices and regions with specific responsibilities for assuring the quality of environmental information collected, produced, evaluated or used is appropriate for their programmatic decisions. OMS has developed a long-term corrective action plan to address the 15 findings identified in the OIG audit, EPA Needs to Address Internal Control Deficiencies in the Agencywide Quality System, Report No. 20-P-0200, June 22, 2020. The plan includes steps to increase effective information and communication.

Responsible Agency Officials: Jeanne Conklin, Controller, Office of the Controller; and Jeff Wells, Director, Office of Enterprise Information Programs

EPA Needs to Improve Oversight of States, Territories and Tribes Authorized to Accomplish Environmental Goals

Summary of Challenge: The OIG notes that while the Agency has made important progress, it continues to face challenges in improving oversight of, and results from state, territory, and tribal environmental programs that EPA oversees.

Agency Response: EPA takes its role seriously in overseeing state, territorial, and tribal implementation of federal environmental programs to carry out EPA's mission of protecting public health and the environment. Effective oversight is critical in protecting all Americans, including those in communities that have been historically marginalized, underserved, and overburdened by pollution. Upon being confirmed and sworn in, Administrator Michael S. Regan made a strong commitment to EPA's oversight role in remarks before the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS) on March 16, 2021, stating: "[T]he heart of our work is about protecting public health and the environment. There will be certain baseline standards we're going to expect states to meet to ensure we're fulfilling that responsibility."

Protection of the environment and of communities is a shared goal and responsibility of EPA and the states, territories, and tribal nations who are our co-regulator partners. Federal oversight is important to identify any program deficiencies and implement solutions to ensure human health and the environment are protected in every zip code. To this end, Acting Assistant Administrator of the Office of Environment Compliance Assurance (OECA) Larry Starfield issued a memorandum on April 30, 2021, regarding strengthening EPA's enforcement in communities with environmental justice concerns. He stated: "[I]f there is a situation where a community's health may be impacted by noncompliance, and our co-regulator is not taking timely or appropriate action, we should not hesitate to step in and take necessary action." EPA's role is to ensure the protection of communities regardless of where a person lives.

The Agency is committed to meeting its oversight responsibilities, addressing disparities, and executing on its mission for all Americans. The Agency has oversight programs for several major programs that continuously oversee states, territories, and tribes, such as the OECA's State Review Framework reviews. Additionally, the Office of Water's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit reviews, the Office of Water's Safe Drinking Water Act annual reviews, the Office of Air and Radiation's Clean Air Act Title V program reviews, and the Office of Land and Emergency Management's RCRA program reviews all contribute to this goal. In 2021, EPA

plans to reconvene the Agency's internal Oversight workgroup to review and consider improvements to its oversight programs.

Additional activities to address state oversight issues include the following:

- OECA reviews all state CAA Title V, CWA NPDES, and RCRA Subtitle C compliance and enforcement programs once every five years through the State Review Framework.
- In 2018, OECA initiated a focused effort to complete recommended state improvement actions identified in the prior reviews, resulting in the completion of 619 out of 669 (over 90%) recommendations by mid-2021.

Responsible Agency Official: Robin Richardson, Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations

EPA Needs to Improve Its Workload Analysis to Accomplish Its Mission Efficiently and Effectively

***Summary of Challenge:** According to the OIG, EPA has not executed the required workforce plan to ensure that the Agency is well-staffed to achieve its goals and objectives of protecting human health and the environment. EPA needs ongoing and comprehensive workload analysis to adequately respond to and prepare for future staffing gaps and shortages in essential positions.*

Agency Response: EPA has addressed the workforce planning requirements of 5 CFR Part 250, Subpart B, Strategic Human Capital Management by completing the EPA FY 2019 Human Capital Operation Plan (HCOP) and issuing its FY 2020-2023 Workforce Plan. EPA also is using workload analyses as one factor in planning workforce levels and examining critical processes.

EPA is implementing the Agency's FY 2020-2023 Workforce Plan, which describes human capital strategies for full-time, part-time, "at will," and wage employees and will update its HCOP after OPM issues new guidance this summer. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) is assessing ongoing workload efforts and examining critical work processes through Monthly Business Reviews and Lean implementation efforts. The Agency discusses workforce and workload planning strategies at senior level management meetings.

EPA is updating its workforce and workload strategies following the new Administration's priorities and initiatives. Specific activities include:

- Developed and deployed a Talent Enterprise Diagnostic Tool to assess skills gaps, especially those among EPA's agency-specific Mission Critical Occupations.
- Developed, maintained, and enhanced EPA's Workforce Demographics Dashboard and Diversity Dashboard.
- Hired additional workforce planning staff.
- Reviewing planned outcomes and processes for three ongoing workload projects (Superfund FTE, Regional labs, and air regional work) to gather lessons learned and insights that could apply to broader processes, such as data collection, methodology, program variability, and implementation strategies.

- EPA’s workforce planning performance metrics are tracked through periodic reports, such as HR Stat.
- Agency workforce and workload strategies are regularly discussed at Agency senior managers’ meetings and process improvements are tracked and reported at managers’ Monthly Business Reviews.

Responsible Agency Official: Maria Williams, Director, Office of Budget

Enhancing Information Technology Security to Combat Cyber Threats

***Summary of Challenge:** The OIG acknowledges that the Agency continues to initiate actions to further strengthen or improve its information security program. However, the Agency continues to face challenges in implementing a vigorous cybersecurity program that strengthens its network defenses and data security in a time of ever-increasing threats to federal government networks. Without enhanced information technology security, EPA remains vulnerable to existing and emerging cyber threats.*

Agency Response: The Agency is committed to protecting its information and technology assets. EPA understands the prevalence and complexity of the ever-growing cybersecurity attacks and is aware of the potential impact to the Agency’s mission if information assets are compromised. EPA has established and implemented processes and internal controls for monitoring and managing contractor support actions to address concerns associated with this management challenge. Specific actions taken to address the issue include:

- Developing and implementing processes within the Office Mission Support operations to improve management and oversight of audits and corrective actions.
- Working with the Office of General Counsel to develop standard security language to include in the Agency’s Environmental Protection Agency Acquisitions Guide (EPAAG) Section 39.1.2.
- Incorporating a verification component for the cybersecurity requirements identified in the EPAAG 39.1.2 into the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act process.
- Developing training for contract officers and contract officer representatives on their responsibilities for identifying contracts that require EPAAG Section 39.1.2 tasks.
- Establishing a tracking and reporting process that ensures all contractors with access to EPA information systems complete information security awareness training, and that contractors with significant security responsibilities also complete role-based training.
- Ensuring adequate cybersecurity is implemented on contractor operated systems by:
 - Assessing systems for proper implementation and operation of adequate cybersecurity controls.
 - Monitoring for timely completion of corrective actions for identified cybersecurity weaknesses.
 - Managing risks at the tactical, mission, and enterprise levels.

In addition, EPA has made significant strides addressing other recommendations highlighted in the OIG report. Specific actions the Agency has taken include:

- Worked with the Department of Homeland Security regarding the risk of the Electronic Manifest System. As a result, EPA maintained its original categorization but agreed to review the system's categorization annually and when significant changes to the system occur.
- Replaced the incident tracking system and implemented controls in the new system to protect the confidentiality and sensitivity of Personal Identifiable Information and enforce password management requirements according to federal and agency guidance.
- Documented the CIO's role in information security through policy and procedures.
- Documented and implemented controls to validate plans of action and milestones for vulnerability testing results.
- Established a process to periodically review security settings for the Agency's tracking system to validate whether they meet standards and implemented audit logging capabilities to capture data changes and a log review process.

The processes implemented to address the OIG recommendations were reviewed by the OIG for the FY 2019 Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) report and found to be adequate. Additionally, agencywide metrics related to IT security are tracked monthly and discussed in senior leader Monthly Business Reviews.

Responsible Agency Official: Tonya Manning, Director, Office of Information Security and Privacy

EPA Needs to Improve Risk Communication to Provide Individuals and Communities with Sufficient Information to Make Informed Decisions to Protect their Health and the Environment

***Summary of Challenge:** OIG acknowledges that the Agency has taken important steps to improve risk communication, however, challenges remain across many EPA programs. The Agency needs more effective risk communication strategies to guide, coordinate, and evaluate its communication efforts to convey potential hazards.*

Agency Response: Risk communication goes to the heart of EPA's mission of protecting human health and the environment. The Agency is committed to ensuring that it carries out effective risk communication by sharing meaningful, understandable, and actionable information on human health and environmental risks with the American public. To build a consistent and effective approach to risk communication, EPA hired a senior risk communication advisor in November 2019 who is responsible for coordinating risk communication across the Agency.

Over the past year and a half, EPA has made significant progress in the important work of improving the quality and consistency of our risk communication. This work will be continued with an additional focus on the Biden Administration's priorities of environmental justice and climate change. Recent progress in this area includes:

Completing a research-based risk communication framework (the SALT Framework) to be used by anyone who communicates risk on behalf of the Agency.

This framework, which is based on a process of **Strategy, Action, Learning and Tools**, provides a research-based approach and best practices for communicating our work to the American people. When followed consistently, it will strengthen the effectiveness of EPA's risk communication across our many programs and roles. It is a critical first step in addressing the current issues EPA faces in risk communication and has the potential to transform the way the Agency carries out its mission of protecting human health and the environment.

The SALT framework is now being used to integrate and improve risk communication planning, practice, and outcomes across all EPA offices, regions, and programs. For example, it is being used to develop strategies for communicating on COVID, ethylene oxide (EtO) emissions, and Superfund decisions at sites across the Nation. It also is being used to begin conversations with our external state and academic partners on how to improve all of our organizations' risk communication, including the Environmental Council of States, the Society for Risk Analysis, the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, and others.

Providing additional risk communication tools for staff and managers and updating the Agency's risk communication website.

Along with the SALT framework, the Agency has developed additional tools for risk communicators which are now housed on an updated and revamped agency website. This website includes an updated definition of risk communication, videos explaining key concepts in risk communication, and several case studies on how to use the SALT framework to achieve improved outcomes.

Establishing a premier, scientifically grounded risk communication training platform to conduct ongoing training for EPA staff and managers.

EPA developed a risk communication training platform in partnership with COMPASS Science Communication, a nationally recognized leader in science communication training, which was built on best practices from an EPA-specific risk communication research review. It is designed to use the best available technologies for virtual adult learning and uses a participatory learning model which is validated in education research to increase the consolidation of learning, the development of new skills, and network formation.

This 20-hour course is available to EPA staff and managers on an ongoing basis and has been used to train 170 people as of June 2021. It covers governing principles from the science of risk communication as well as topics such as: understanding your audience, building trust, effective messaging, the process for risk communication at EPA, and the SALT framework. The course also includes participatory exercises, role plays, and scenarios with outside experts.

Each class is structured around a specific hazard, audience, or Agency function with the goal of building knowledge, skills, and networks around best practice in risk communication. Classes completed as of June 2021 have included a focus on community engagement under EPA's in land

and emergency management programs, lead contamination, PFAS issues, environmental justice, tribal partnerships, and EPA's role in agriculture and addressing wildfires. Staff are chosen to participate based on their roles communicating risk on these issues and topics and have included staff from every office and region with a strong focus on staff who do direct community engagement as a part of their roles.

EPA plans to use this course to train an additional 250 staff and managers in FY 2022. Future plans also include cross-training partners from other agencies whether federal, state, local, or tribal.

Leveraging the science of risk communication through active engagement with the scientific community both inside EPA and in academia.

To both share the work we are doing and learn from the scientific and academic community, EPA's senior risk communications advisor serves on interagency and interorganizational groups focused on social, behavioral, and economic sciences. In addition, over the next year EPA will be working with the academic community to conduct research on the American public's knowledge of and feelings about today's environmental issues, so that we can better meet their needs in our risk communication.

Establishing a cross-agency work group with over 100 participants to increase coordination and build the Agency's risk communication tools.

The EPA Risk Communication Work Group, which is open to all interested Agency staff, serves as a forum for keeping up to date on what's going on across the Agency in risk communication. In addition, smaller Work Group Action Teams are working with program experts from across the Agency to build out EPA's risk communication tools portfolio to support the SALT Framework.

Responsible Agency Officials: Nancy Grantham, Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Public Affairs

EPA Needs to Improve on Fulfilling Mandated Reporting Requirements

***Summary of Challenge:** OIG believes that the Agency faces challenges in tracking and submitting reports mandated by law that contain key program information for Congress, the Administrator, and the public.*

***Agency Response:** In 2018, OIG identified an instance where the Agency had not fulfilled a mandatory, statutorily required report to Congress, and has identified other instances where reports were not issued to Congress. The two reports that OIG identified have since been issued. OIG believes the Agency should make a comprehensive effort to identify the causes for programs not issuing required reports, implement targeted plans to address the causes, and complete and issue any remaining missing reports. OIG also believes the Agency should continue to work with Congress to eliminate the requirements of duplicative or unnecessary reports from our authorizing statutes.*

EPA has taken the corrective actions identified in the 2018 OIG Report regarding the BEACH Act Report, which has since been issued to Congress. The Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations' Associate Administrator issued a memorandum in March 2018 to remind EPA's Assistant Administrators and Associate Administrators that the Agency's standard practice is to track reports to Congress by using the Office of Policy Action Development Process Tracker. OCIR, OP, and OCFO meet regularly to address tracking and preparing for the upcoming replacement of the ADP Tracker. Additionally, the Agency continues to provide a list of the unnecessary and duplicative reports that EPA suggests eliminating from its statutes to OMB as part of the budget process, in consultation with Congress. The Agency believes this effort will improve tracking of Reports to Congress so that statutory requirements are met in the future.

Additional activities to address this issue include the following:

- During FY 2021 OCIR and OCFO set up weekly meetings and leveraged the new Agency software via Teams on status of Agency inventory of reports to Congress.
- During FYs 2019, and 2020, and 2021, held internal meetings between OCIR, OP, and OCFO to coordinate the tracking of reports to Congress, to prepare for when the ADP Tracker is replaced, and to discuss the potential for a having a single means of tracking statutorily mandated reports to Congress and those required by appropriations law.
- Continue working with program offices to update the list of unnecessary or duplicative reports as part of the FY 2022 and 2023 budget proposals.

Responsible Agency Official: Robin Richardson, Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations

Integrating and Leading Environmental Justice Across the Agency and Government

Summary of Challenge: OIG believes that EPA needs to enhance its consideration of environmental justice across programs and regions and provide leadership in this area for the federal government.

Agency Response: The Agency continues to address issues and concerns raised by GAO and EPA's OIG regarding its leadership of integration of environmental justice within EPA. This includes leadership from OP and OEJ senior representatives on EPA initiatives to implement President Biden's Executive Order (EO) 13985 on Racial Equality and EO 14008 on Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad, and participation on inter-agency and intra-agency working groups. Additionally, on April 7, 2021, EPA Administrator Michael Regan issued an agencywide memo titled *Our Commitment to Environmental Justice* which clearly communicated his priority of centering EJ throughout all of EPA's activities. Administrator Regan's memo contained specific instructions on integration of EJ within programmatic activities, full enforcement of our environmental and civil rights laws, emphasis on meaningful engagement and consultation, and reinforcing our leadership in implementing President Biden's executive direction. Efforts to address EPA-specific recommendations made in the GAO report issued October 2019 entitled, *Federal Efforts Need Better Planning, Coordination, and Methods to Assess Programs* are now largely guided through implementation of EO 14008 and EO 13985. Many of the responsibilities for leadership on the inter-agency items relevant to those GAO recommendations now lie with the White House Council on Environmental Quality. EPA is supporting and engaging CEQ on

providing government-wide leadership on those recommendations. Additionally, the Agency is reviewing recommendations made by OIG.

Responsible Agency Official: Philip Fine, Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy; and Matthew Tejada, Office Director, Office of Environmental Justice

EPA USER FEE PROGRAMS

In FY 2022, EPA will have several user fee programs in operation. These user fee programs and proposals are referenced below. In FY 2022, the Agency also will conduct a review to determine whether fees should be assessed for programs that provide special benefits to recipients beyond those that accrue to the general public, in accordance with OMB Circular A-25.

Current Fees: Pesticides

Fee collection authority exists under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act of 1988, as amended by the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (P. L. 116-8) (“PRIA-4”), which was passed in March 2019. PRIA-4 reauthorizes these fee authorities through fiscal year 2023 and adjusts fee amounts for certain registration activities.

Pesticides Maintenance Fee (7 U.S.C. §136a-1(i))

The Maintenance Fee provides funding for the registration review programs, and a certain percentage supports the processing of applications involving inert ingredients and expedited processing of some applications, such as fast track amendments. PRIA-4 reauthorizes collection of this fee through FY 2023 and raises the collection target by \$3.2 million to an average collection of \$31 million over five years of PRIA-4 authorization.

Enhanced Registration Services (7 U.S.C. §136w-8(b))

Entities seeking to register pesticides for use in the United States pay a fee at the time the registration action request is submitted to EPA, setting specific timeframes for the registration decision service. This process has introduced new pesticides to the market more quickly. PRIA-4 reauthorizes collection of these fees through FY 2023 and adjusts fee amounts for certain types of registrations. In FY 2022, EPA expects to collect approximately \$20 million from this fee program.

Current Fees: Other

Clean Air Part 71 Operating Permits Program

Title 40 CFR Part 71 § 71.9 authorizes and establishes requirements for the Clean Air Part 71 program - a comprehensive Federal air quality operating permit program for air pollution control agencies that do not have a delegated Title V program on charging and collecting user fees, as required by Section 502(b)(3) of the Clean Air Act. All sources subject to the operating permit requirements of Title V shall have a permit to operate that assures compliance with all applicable requirements. The owners or operators shall pay annual fees that are sufficient to cover the permit program costs, in accordance with the procedures described in this section.

Service Fees for the Administration of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA Fees Rule)

On June 22, 2016, the “Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act” (P.L. 114-182) was signed into law, amending numerous sections of TSCA, including providing authority

for the establishment of a new, broader TSCA User Fee program that replaces and expands the former Section 5 Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fee. Section 26 of TSCA authorizes EPA to collect user fees to offset 25 percent of the Agency's full costs for implementing TSCA Sections 4, 5, 6, and 14⁶. Fees are charged for: issuance of Test Orders, Test Rules and Enforceable Consent Agreements under TSCA Section 4; submission of Pre-Manufacturing Notices, Significant New Use Notices and Microbial Commercial Activity Notices and certain submissions for exemptions under TSCA Section 5; and development of EPA-Initiated Risk Evaluations and Manufacturer-Requested Risk Evaluations (MRREs) under TSCA Section 6.

EPA promulgated the TSCA User Fee Rule in October 2019⁷ and collected \$2.7 million in fee revenue in FY 2019 from Section 5 submissions. In FY 2020, \$3 million in fee revenue was collected from Section 5 submissions as well as \$2.5 million from two Section 6 MRREs for chemicals on the TSCA Work Plan. In FY 2021, fee collections are expected to be \$30.0 million (\$3 million from Section 5, \$25.65 million from 19 of the 20 Section 6 EPA-Initiated Risk Evaluations, \$1.25 million from one Section 6 MRRE for a TSCA Work Plan chemical, and less than \$0.1 million from Section 4 Test Orders. However, nearly \$17 million of the collections for the 19 Section 6 Risk Evaluations is not due to be paid until September 2, 2021, rendering the funds un-usable by EPA until early FY 2022. In FY 2022, EPA anticipates collecting similar amounts for Sections 4 and 5 (\$3.1 million) and \$2.5 million for an assumed two Section 6 MRREs for TSCA Work Plan Chemicals, subject to potential fee level changes. EPA will apportion FY 2021 Section 6 collections over the risk evaluation lifecycle (3-3.5 years). TSCA requires EPA to update the Fees every three years⁸. Fees collected/projected to be collected in FY 2019 through FY 2021 equated to approximately 14 percent of associated expenditures for those three fiscal years, well below the 25 percent target. EPA proposed revisions to the fee rule in December 2020 but plans to re-propose in light of public comments; as such, EPA now expects to finalize an amended fee rule in FY 2022 (which may not go into effect until FY 2023).

Motor Vehicle and Engine Compliance Program Fee

This fee is authorized by the Clean Air Act of 1990 and is administered by the Office of Transportation and Air Quality. Fee collections for manufacturers of light-duty vehicles, light- and heavy-duty trucks, and motorcycles began in August 1992. In 2004, EPA promulgated a rule that updated existing fees and established fees for newly regulated vehicles and engines. The fees established for new compliance programs are paid by manufacturers of heavy-duty and nonroad vehicles and engines, including large diesel and gas equipment (earthmovers, tractors, forklifts, compressors, etc.), handheld and non-handheld utility engines (chainsaws, weed-whackers, leaf-blowers, lawnmowers, tillers, etc.), marine (boat motors, watercraft, jet-skis), locomotive, aircraft and recreational vehicles (off-road motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles) for in-use testing and certification. In 2009, EPA added fees for evaporative emissions requirements for nonroad engines. EPA intends to apply certification fees to additional industry sectors as new programs are developed. In FY 2022, EPA expects to collect approximately \$23.6 million from this fee program based upon a projection of the original rulemaking cost study adjusted for

⁶ TSCA, as amended by the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act, Section 26(b) (1) and (4)

⁷ <https://www.epa.gov/tsca-fees/fees-administration-toxic-substances-control-act>

⁸ <https://www.epa.gov/tsca-fees/fees-administration-toxic-substances-control-act>

inflation. EPA is not currently authorized to expend these collected funds but is proposing such authority.

Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest

The Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest Establishment Act (P. L. 112-195) provides EPA with the authority to establish a program to finance, develop, and operate a system for the electronic submission of hazardous waste manifests supported by user fees. In accordance with the Act, EPA established the e-Manifest Program. EPA finalized the user fee rule, *Hazardous Waste Management System: User Fees for the Electronic Hazardous Waste Manifest System and Amendments to Manifest Regulations*, in December 2017, and the e-Manifest system launched in June 2018.

In FY 2022, EPA will continue to operate the e-Manifest system and the Agency anticipates collecting and depositing approximately \$27 million in e-Manifest user fees into the Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund. Based upon authority to collect and spend e-Manifest fees provided by Congress in annual appropriations bills, the fees will fully support the e-Manifest program, including the operation of the system, necessary program expenses, and future development costs.

Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program Account (WIFIA) Program Fees

The FY 2022 Budget requests authorization for the Administrator to collect and obligate fees established in accordance with the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014. These funds shall be deposited in the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program Account (WIFIA) and remain available until expended. WIFIA fee regulations were first promulgated in FY 2017. Fee revenue will be used for the cost of contracting with expert services such as financial advisory, legal advisory, and engineering firms.

The requested WIFIA program fee expenditure authority would be in addition to the \$8 million request for administrative and operations expenses. Fee revenue does not take the place of the request for WIFIA administration. The appropriated administrative level and the anticipated fee revenue are both needed to successfully implement the WIFIA Program. In FY 2022, EPA estimates that \$13 million in WIFIA fees could be collected.

Fee Proposals: Other

FIFRA and PRIA Fee Spending Restrictions

Current statutory language in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) restricts what activities EPA can fund from collections deposited in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund and Pesticide Registration Fund. The FY 2022 request carries forward the proposed statutory language from the FY 2021 President's Budget to expand the range of activities that may be funded with these fees. Language for pesticide registration service fees is included in the proposed Administrative Provisions; since pesticide maintenance fees are mandatory, separate language has been prepared for those fees that will be transmitted at a later date.

Working Capital Fund

In FY 2022, the Agency will be in its 26th year of operation of the Working Capital Fund (WCF). The WCF is a revolving fund authorized by law to finance a cycle of operations in which the costs for goods or services provided are charged to the users. The WCF operates like a commercial business within EPA where customers pay for services received, thus generating revenue. Customers include EPA program and regional offices and other federal agencies. The WCF mechanism provides an efficient method for a full cost approach to agency programs. EPA's WCF was implemented under the authority of Section 403 of the Government Management Reform Act of 1994 and the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1997. EPA received permanent WCF authority in the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1998. The Modernizing Government Technology (MGT) Act⁹ provided additional authority for information technology development activities in agency working capital funds.¹⁰

EPA's Chief Financial Officer (CFO) initiated the WCF in FY 1997 as part of an effort to: 1) be accountable to agency offices, the Office of Management and Budget, and Congress; 2) increase the efficiency of the administrative services provided to program offices; and 3) increase customer service and responsiveness. The Agency has a WCF Board which provides policy and planning oversight and advises the CFO regarding the WCF financial position. The Board, chaired by a management representative within the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, is comprised of 22 voting members from program and regional offices.

In FY 2022, there will be 12 agency activities provided under the WCF. These are the Agency's information technology services, agency postage, Cincinnati voice services, background investigations, and enterprise human resources IT services managed by the Office of Mission Support; financial and administrative systems, employee relocations, and a budget formulation system managed by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer; the Agency's Continuity of Operations (COOP) site managed by the Land and Emergency Management program; regional information technology service and support managed by EPA Region 8; legal services managed by the Office of General Counsel; and multimedia and agency servicing contracts managed by the Office of the Administrator.

The Agency's FY 2022 budget request includes resources for these 12 activities in each National Program Manager's submission, totaling approximately \$300 million. These estimated resources may be adjusted during the year to incorporate any program office's additional service needs during the operating year. To the extent these increases are subject to Congressional reprogramming notifications, the Agency will comply with all applicable requirements. In FY 2022, the Agency will continue to perform relocation services for other federal agencies, delivering high quality services external to EPA.

The Agency anticipates that there may be minor increases and decreases in FY 2022 due to several IT improvements, including increased cloud computing, improved network infrastructure, cybersecurity requirements, continuous diagnostic and mitigation program implementation, and

⁹ The MGT Act was enacted as part of the Fiscal Year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act on December 12, 2017.

¹⁰ EPA determined that the Agency's existing WCF meets the requirements of the MGT Act. EPA's WCF provides a range of integral IT infrastructure, application, and hosting services. In addition, EPA's WCF possesses the structure and governance framework to satisfy the requirements for the Technology Modernization Fund (TMF) identified in the MGT Act.

discovery services. Other funding shifts have been included in the FY 2022 WCF plan that relate to the necessary telecommunications and computer support needed by every employee. As part of an overall review and rebalancing of these costs, funds have been shifted across programs to reflect FTE changes as well.

Environmental Protection Agency
ACRONYMS for STATUTORY AUTHORITY

The following is not an exhaustive list of [U.S.] statutory authorities but includes those commonly referred to by acronym in this document.

ACE: Air, Climate, and Energy

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

ADEA: Age Discrimination in Employment Act

AEA: Atomic Energy Act, as amended, and Reorganization Plan #3

AHERA: Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act

AHPA: Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act

AIM: American Innovation and Manufacturing Act of 2019

APA: Administrative Procedures Act

ARP: American Rescue Plan

ARRA: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

ASHAA: Asbestos in Schools Hazard Abatement Act

ASTCA: Antarctic Science, Tourism, and Conservation Act

AWIA: America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2018

BEACH Act of 2000: Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act

BRERA: Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act

BUILD Act: Brownfields Utilization, Investment, and Local Development Act

CAA: Clean Air Act

CAAA: Clean Air Act Amendments (1970 and 1990)

CARES: Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act

CCA: Clinger Cohen Act

CERCLA: Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (1980)

CFOA: Chief Financial Officers Act

CICA: Competition in Contracting Act

CRA: Civil Rights Act

CSA: Computer Security Act

CWA: Clean Water Act (1972)

CWPPR: Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act of 1990

CZARA: Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments

CZMA: Coastal Zone Management Act
DERA: Diesel Emissions Reduction Act
DPA: Deepwater Ports Act
DREAA: Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act
ECRA: Economic Cleanup Responsibility Act
EFOIA: Electronic Freedom of Information Act
EISA: Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007
EO: Executive Order
EPAct: Energy Policy Act of 2005
EPAA: Environmental Programs Assistance Act
EPCA: Energy Policy and Conservation Act
EPCRA: Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (1986)
ERD&DAA: Environmental Research, Development and Demonstration Authorization Act
ESA: Endangered Species Act
ESECA: Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act
FACA: Federal Advisory Committee Act
FAIR: Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act
FASA: Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (1994)
FCMA: Fishery Conservation and Management Act
FEPCA: Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1972, enacted as amendments to FIFRA
FFDCA: Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act
FFMIA: Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996
FGCAA: Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act
FIFRA: Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (1972)
FLPMA: Federal Land Policy and Management Act
FMFIA: Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (1982)
FOIA: Freedom of Information Act
FPA: Federal Pesticide Act
FPAS: Federal Property and Administration Services Act
FQPA: Food Quality Protection Act (1996)
FRA: Federal Register Act
FSA: Food Security Act
FSMA: Food Safety Modernization Act

FTTA: Federal Technology Transfer Act

FUA: Fuel Use Act

FWCA: Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

FWPCA: Federal Water Pollution and Control Act (also known as the Clean Water Act [CWA])

GISRA: Government Information Security Reform Act

GMRA: Government Management Reform Act

GPRA: Government Performance and Results Act (1993)

GPRAMA: Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010

HMTA: Hazardous Materials Transportation Act

HSWA: Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984, enacted as amendments to RCRA

IGA: Inspector General Act

IPA: Intergovernmental Personnel Act

IPIA: Improper Payments Information Act

ISTEA: Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act

IT: Information Technology

ITMRA: Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996-aka Clinger/Cohen Act

MPPRCA: Marine Plastic Pollution, Research and Control Act of 1987

MPRSA: Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act

NAWCA: North American Wetlands Conservation Act

NEPA: National Environmental Policy Act

NHPA: National Historic Preservation Act

NISA: National Invasive Species Act of 1996

ODA: Ocean Dumping Act

OPA: Oil Pollution Act of 1990

OWBPA: Older Workers Benefit Protection Act

PBA: Public Building Act

PFCRA: Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act

PHSA: Public Health Service Act

PLIRRA: Pollution Liability Insurance and Risk Retention Act

PPA: Pollution Prevention Act

PR: Privacy Act of 1974

PRA: Paperwork Reduction Act

PREA: Pesticide Registration Extension Act of 2012 (also known as PRIA 3)

PRIA: Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003
PRIA 4: Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018
PRIRA: Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act
QCA: Quiet Communities Act
RCRA: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, enacted as amendments to SWDA
RFA: Regulatory Flexibility Act
RICO: Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act
RLBPHRA: Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act
SARA: Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986
SBLRBREERA: Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act
SBREFA: Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996
SDWA: Safe Drinking Water Act
SICEA: Steel Industry Compliance Extension Act
SMCRA: Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act
SOS2.0: Save Our Seas Act 2.0
SPA: Shore Protection Act of 1988
SWDA: Solid Waste Disposal Act
TSCA: Toxic Substances Control Act
UMRA: Unfunded Mandates Reform Act
UMTRLWA: Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Land Withdrawal Act
USMCA: United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement
USTCA: Underground Storage Tank Compliance Act
VIDA: Vessel Incidental Discharge Act
WIFIA: Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act
WIIN: Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act
WQA: Water Quality Act of 1987
WRDA: Water Resources Development Act
WSRA: Wild and Scenic Rivers Act
WWWQA: Wet Weather Water Quality Act of 2000

FY 2022 STAG CATEGORICAL PROGRAM GRANTS
Statutory Authority and Eligible Uses
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2020 Actual Dollars (X1000)	FY 2021 Enacted Dollars (X1000)	FY 2022 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Section 103.	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA	S/L monitoring and data collection activities in support of the PM _{2.5} monitoring network and associated program costs.	\$35,974.8	\$41,904.8	\$58,660.0
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Section 103.	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA	S/L monitoring and data collection activities in support of air toxics monitoring.	\$7,589.8	\$7,488.2	\$20,000.0
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Section 103.	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA	S/L monitoring procurement activities in support of the NAAQS.	\$5,217.1	\$4,197.8	\$6,500.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2020 Actual Dollars (X1000)	FY 2021 Enacted Dollars (X1000)	FY 2022 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
State and Local Air Quality Management	CAA, Sections 103, 105, 106.	Air pollution control agencies as defined in section 302(b) of the CAA; Multi-jurisdictional organizations (non-profit organizations whose boards of directors or membership is made up of CAA section 302(b) agency officers and whose mission is to support the continuing environmental programs of the States); Interstate air quality control region designated pursuant to section 107 of the CAA or of implementing section 176A, or section 184 NOTE: only the Ozone Transport Commission is eligible.	Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program support costs, including all monitoring activities, including PM 2.5 monitoring and associated program costs (Section 103 and/or 105); Coordinating or facilitating a multi-jurisdictional approach to carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA (Sections 103 and 106); Supporting training for CAA Section 302(b) air pollution control agency staff (Sections 103 and 105); Supporting research, investigative, and demonstration projects (Section 103).	\$172,898.1	\$175,270.2	\$235,640.0
				Section 105 grants	Section 105 grants	Section 105 grants
				\$639.0	\$639.0	\$700.0
				Section 106 grants	Section 106 grants	Section 106 grants
				Total:	Total:	Total:
				\$222,318.8	\$229,500.0	\$321,500.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2020 Actual Dollars (X1000)	FY 2021 Enacted Dollars (X1000)	FY 2022 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Tribal Air Quality Management	CAA, Sections 103 and 105; Tribal Cooperative Agreements (TCA) in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribes; Intertribal Consortia; State/Tribal College or University	Conducting air quality assessment activities to determine a Tribe's need to develop a CAA program; Carrying out the traditional prevention and control programs required by the CAA and associated program costs; Supporting CAA training for Federally-recognized Tribes.	\$9,990.9	\$9,415.0	\$17,415.0
				Section 103 grants	Section 103 grants	Section 103 grants
				\$4,000.0	\$4,000.0	\$4,000.0
				Section 105 grants	Section 105 grants	Section 105 grants
				Total:	Total:	Total:
				\$13,990.9	\$13,415.0	\$21,415.0
Radon	TSCA, Sections 10 and 306.	State Agencies, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assist in the development and implementation of programs for the assessment and mitigation of radon.	\$7,646.0	\$7,795.0	\$8,951.0
Multipurpose Grants	Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, Pub. L. 116-260; and all other major environmental legislation including but not limited to CAA, CWA, SDWA and CERCLA	State Agencies, Tribes	Implementation of mandatory statutory duties delegated by EPA under pertinent environmental laws.	\$27,033.1	\$10,000.0	\$10,200.0
Water Pollution Control (Section 106)	FWPCA, as amended, Section 106; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Interstate Agencies	Develop and carry out surface and ground water pollution control programs, including NPDES permits, TMDLs, WQ standards, monitoring, and NPS control activities.	\$234,493.3	\$230,000.0	\$234,600.0
Nonpoint Source (NPS – Section 319)	FWPCA, as amended, Section 319(h); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement EPA-approved State and Tribal nonpoint source management programs and fund projects as selected by the state.	\$171,125.7	\$177,000.0	\$180,000.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2020 Actual Dollars (X1000)	FY 2021 Enacted Dollars (X1000)	FY 2022 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Wetlands Program Development	FWPCA, as amended, Section 104 (b)(3); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Local Governments, Tribes, Interstate Organizations, Intertribal Consortia, Non-Profit Organizations	To develop new wetland programs or enhance existing programs for the protection, management, and restoration of wetland resources.	\$12,922.7	\$14,192.0	\$14,476.0
Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	SDWA, Section 1443(a); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Assistance to implement and enforce National Primary Drinking Water Regulations to ensure the safety of the Nation's drinking water resources and to protect public health.	\$109,075.2	\$112,000.0	\$122,000.0
Underground Injection Control (UIC)	SDWA, Section 1443(b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement and enforce regulations that protect underground sources of drinking water by controlling Class I-V underground injection wells.	\$10,379.5	\$11,164.0	\$11,387.0
Beaches Protection	BEACH Act of 2000; TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, Local Governments	Develop and implement programs for monitoring and notification of conditions for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public.	\$8,388.7	\$9,619.0	\$9,811.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2020 Actual Dollars (X1000)	FY 2021 Enacted Dollars (X1000)	FY 2022 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act § 3011; Appropriation Act: FY 2018 (Public Law 115-141); Save our Seas 2.0, 2020, Pub. L. 116-224.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Development & Implementation of Hazardous Waste Programs. In FY 2022, propose to initiate a pilot for the construction, maintenance, and operation of post-consumer materials management or recycling facilities.	\$107,033.6	\$101,500.0	\$101,500.0 \$10,000.0 Pilot for post-consumer materials management or recycling facilities Total: \$111,500.0
Brownfields	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) § 128(a).	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Establish and enhance state and tribal response programs which will survey and inventory brownfields sites; develop oversight and enforcement authorities to ensure response actions are protective of human health and the environment; develop ways for communities to provide meaningful opportunities for public participation; and develop mechanisms for approval of a cleanup plan and verification and certification that cleanup is complete.	\$47,311.9	\$46,195.0	\$46,195.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2020 Actual Dollars (X1000)	FY 2021 Enacted Dollars (X1000)	FY 2022 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Underground Storage Tanks (UST)	Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1976, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, § 2007(f); Energy Policy Act, § 9011.	States	Provide funding for States' underground storage tanks and to support direct UST implementation programs.	\$1,468.5	\$1,475.0	\$1,505.0
Pesticides Program Implementation	FIFRA, Sections 23(a)(1); Federal Food, drug and Cosmetic Act (FDCA); Food quality Protection Act (FQPA); Endangered Species Act (ESA).	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Implement the following programs through grants to States, Tribes, partners, and supporters for implementation of pesticide programs, including: Certification and Training (C&T); Worker Protection; Endangered Species Protection Program (ESPP) Field Activities; Pesticides in Water; and tribal Programs.	\$11,364.3	\$11,051.0	\$11,272.0
				– States formula	– States formula	– States formula
				\$1,278.4	\$1,243.0	\$1,268.0
				HQ Programs: - Tribal - PREP - School IPM	HQ Programs: - Tribal - PREP - School IPM	HQ Programs: - Tribal - PREP - Pollinator Protection
				Total: \$12,642.7	Total: \$12,294.0	Total: \$12,540.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2020 Actual Dollars (X1000)	FY 2021 Enacted Dollars (X1000)	FY 2022 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Lead	TSCA, Sections 401-412.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Aid states, territories, the District of Columbia, and tribes to develop and implement authorized lead-based paint abatement programs and authorized Renovation, Repair, and Painting (RRP) programs. EPA directly implements these programs in all areas of the country that are not authorized to do so, and will continue to operate the Federal Lead-based Paint Program Database (FLPP) of trained and certified lead-based paint professionals.	\$12,403.2 404(g) State/Tribal Certification \$1,958.9 404(g) Direct Implementation Total: \$14,362.1	\$12,328.0 404(g) State/Tribal Certification \$1,947.0 404(g) Direct Implementation Total: \$14,275.0	\$12,575.0 404(g) State/Tribal Certification \$1,986.0 404(g) Direct Implementation Total: \$14,561.0
Toxic Substances Compliance	Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) § 28(a) and 404(g); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, federally recognized Indian Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, and Territories of the U.S.	Assist in developing, maintaining, and implementing compliance monitoring programs for PCBs, asbestos, and Lead Based Paint. In addition, enforcement actions by 1) the Lead Based Paint program and 2) States that obtained a "waiver" under the Asbestos program.	\$3,871.9	\$4,760.0	\$4,855.0
Pesticide Enforcement	FIFRA § 23(a)(1); Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, (P.L. 116-260); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Federally-recognized Indian Tribes, Intertribal Consortia, and Territories of the U.S.	Assist with implementation of cooperative pesticide enforcement programs.	\$23,799.4	\$24,000.0	\$24,480.0

Grant Title	Statutory Authorities	Eligible Recipients	Eligible Uses	FY 2020 Actual Dollars (X1000)	FY 2021 Enacted Dollars (X1000)	FY 2022 President's Budget Dollars (X1000)
Pollution Prevention	Pollution Prevention Act of 1990, Section 6605; TSCA Section 10; FY 2000 Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-74); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	States, Tribes, Intertribal Consortia	Provides assistance to States and State entities (<i>i.e.</i> , colleges and universities) and Federally-recognized Tribes and intertribal consortia to deliver pollution prevention technical assistance to small and medium-sized businesses. A goal of the program is to assist businesses and industries with identifying improved environmental strategies and solutions for reducing waste at the source.	\$4,294.8	\$4,630.0	\$4,723.0
Tribal General Assistance Program	Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act (42 U.S.C. § 4368b); TCA in annual Appropriations Acts.	Tribal Governments, Intertribal Consortia	Plan and develop Tribal environmental protection programs.	\$67,289.5	\$66,250.0	\$77,575.0
National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN, aka "the Exchange Network")	Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, 84 Stat. 2086, as amended by Pub. L. 98-80, 97 Stat. 485 (codified at Title 5, App.) (EPA's organic statute) Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260)	States, U.S. Territories, Federally Recognized Tribes and Native Villages, Interstate Agencies, Tribal Consortia, Other Agencies with Related Environmental Information Activities.	Helps States, U.S. Territories, Tribes, and intertribal consortia develop the information management and technology (IM/IT) capabilities they need to participate in the Exchange Network, to continue and expand data-sharing programs, and to improve access to environmental information.	\$8,557.1	\$9,336.0	\$9,523.0

**Environmental Protection Agency
FY 2022 Annual Performance Plan and Congressional Justification**

**PROGRAM PROJECTS BY PROGRAM AREA
(Dollars in Thousands)**

	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Enacted	FY 2022 Pres Budget	FY 2022 Pres Budget v. FY 2021 Enacted
Science & Technology				
Clean Air and Climate				
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	\$7,537.7	\$6,793.0	\$8,800.0	\$2,007.0
Climate Protection	\$7,326.8	\$7,895.0	\$9,997.0	\$2,102.0
Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$8,974.6	\$7,154.0	\$10,222.0	\$3,068.0
Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification	\$98,543.9	\$96,783.0	\$110,169.0	\$13,386.0
Subtotal, Clean Air and Climate	\$122,383.0	\$118,625.0	\$139,188.0	\$20,563.0
Indoor Air and Radiation				
Indoor Air: Radon Program	\$39.9	\$157.0	\$157.0	\$0.0
Radiation: Protection	\$1,795.6	\$1,735.0	\$2,340.0	\$605.0
Radiation: Response Preparedness	\$3,402.1	\$3,096.0	\$4,039.0	\$943.0
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	\$235.5	\$161.0	\$168.0	\$7.0
Subtotal, Indoor Air and Radiation	\$5,473.1	\$5,149.0	\$6,704.0	\$1,555.0
Enforcement				
Forensics Support	\$13,726.2	\$14,000.0	\$14,114.0	\$114.0
Homeland Security				
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	\$12,926.2	\$10,380.0	\$14,342.0	\$3,962.0
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	\$27,021.6	\$24,852.0	\$25,545.0	\$693.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$443.0	\$501.0	\$501.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security	\$40,390.8	\$35,733.0	\$40,388.0	\$4,655.0
IT / Data Management / Security				
IT / Data Management	\$3,473.7	\$3,072.0	\$3,121.0	\$49.0
Operations and Administration				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$68,812.7	\$67,500.0	\$68,533.0	\$1,033.0
Pesticides Licensing				
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	\$3,109.5	\$2,803.0	\$2,840.0	\$37.0
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	\$1,757.7	\$2,207.0	\$2,230.0	\$23.0
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	\$379.9	\$876.0	\$970.0	\$94.0
Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing	\$5,247.1	\$5,886.0	\$6,040.0	\$154.0

	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Enacted	FY 2022 Pres Budget	FY 2022 Pres Budget v. FY 2021 Enacted
Research: Air, Climate and Energy				
Research: Air, Climate and Energy	\$95,350.8	\$95,250.0	\$156,210.0	\$60,960.0
Research: Safe and Sustainable Water Resources				
Research: Safe and Sustainable Water Resources	\$108,506.9	\$112,250.0	\$116,588.0	\$4,338.0
Research: Sustainable Communities				
Research: Sustainable and Healthy Communities	\$143,191.3	\$133,000.0	\$137,412.0	\$4,412.0
Research: Chemical Safety for Sustainability				
Health and Environmental Risk Assessment	\$38,921.5	\$37,482.0	\$41,412.0	\$3,930.0
Research: Chemical Safety for Sustainability				
<i>Endocrine Disruptors</i>	\$19,833.8	\$16,253.0	\$16,851.0	\$598.0
<i>Computational Toxicology</i>	\$23,616.2	\$21,406.0	\$22,229.0	\$823.0
<i>Research: Chemical Safety for Sustainability (other activities)</i>	\$52,257.7	\$51,859.0	\$54,738.0	\$2,879.0
Subtotal, Research: Chemical Safety for Sustainability	\$95,707.7	\$89,518.0	\$93,818.0	\$4,300.0
Subtotal, Research: Chemical Safety for Sustainability	\$134,629.2	\$127,000.0	\$135,230.0	\$8,230.0
Water: Human Health Protection				
Drinking Water Programs	\$4,265.0	\$4,364.0	\$6,444.0	\$2,080.0
Congressional Priorities				
Water Quality Research and Support Grants	\$4,992.0	\$7,500.0	\$0.0	-\$7,500.0
Total, Science & Technology	\$750,441.8	\$729,329.0	\$829,972.0	\$100,643.0
Environmental Programs & Management				
Clean Air and Climate				
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	\$15,503.2	\$13,153.0	\$18,138.0	\$4,985.0
Climate Protection	\$103,054.5	\$97,000.0	\$103,689.0	\$6,689.0
Federal Stationary Source Regulations	\$21,244.6	\$20,733.0	\$26,618.0	\$5,885.0
Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$131,855.1	\$138,020.0	\$257,808.0	\$119,788.0
Stratospheric Ozone: Domestic Programs	\$4,872.4	\$4,633.0	\$10,901.0	\$6,268.0
Stratospheric Ozone: Multilateral Fund	\$8,347.0	\$8,711.0	\$18,000.0	\$9,289.0
Subtotal, Clean Air and Climate	\$284,876.8	\$282,250.0	\$435,154.0	\$152,904.0
Indoor Air and Radiation				
Indoor Air: Radon Program	\$2,680.4	\$3,136.0	\$3,167.0	\$31.0
Radiation: Protection	\$8,912.4	\$7,661.0	\$10,342.0	\$2,681.0
Radiation: Response Preparedness	\$2,616.2	\$2,404.0	\$2,908.0	\$504.0
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air	\$10,934.8	\$11,750.0	\$13,837.0	\$2,087.0

	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Enacted	FY 2022 Pres Budget	FY 2022 Pres Budget v. FY 2021 Enacted
Subtotal, Indoor Air and Radiation	\$25,143.8	\$24,951.0	\$30,254.0	\$5,303.0
Brownfields				
Brownfields	\$23,332.9	\$24,000.0	\$24,197.0	\$197.0
Compliance				
Compliance Monitoring	\$98,418.4	\$102,500.0	\$132,350.0	\$29,850.0
Enforcement				
Civil Enforcement	\$162,505.0	\$168,341.0	\$194,623.0	\$26,282.0
Criminal Enforcement	\$50,326.2	\$51,275.0	\$59,121.0	\$7,846.0
Environmental Justice	\$9,482.5	\$11,838.0	\$293,862.0	\$282,024.0
NEPA Implementation	\$15,337.8	\$16,943.0	\$18,966.0	\$2,023.0
Subtotal, Enforcement	\$237,651.5	\$248,397.0	\$566,572.0	\$318,175.0
Geographic Programs				
Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay	\$87,690.4	\$87,500.0	\$90,500.0	\$3,000.0
Geographic Program: Gulf of Mexico	\$13,833.9	\$20,000.0	\$22,447.0	\$2,447.0
Geographic Program: Lake Champlain	\$13,387.0	\$15,000.0	\$20,000.0	\$5,000.0
Geographic Program: Long Island Sound	\$20,642.6	\$30,400.0	\$40,000.0	\$9,600.0
Geographic Program: Other				
<i>Lake Pontchartrain</i>	\$947.0	\$1,900.0	\$1,932.0	\$32.0
<i>S.New England Estuary (SNEE)</i>	\$5,244.8	\$5,500.0	\$6,252.0	\$752.0
<i>Geographic Program: Other (other activities)</i>	\$3,672.1	\$3,000.0	\$3,050.0	\$50.0
Subtotal, Geographic Program: Other	\$9,863.9	\$10,400.0	\$11,234.0	\$834.0
Great Lakes Restoration	\$346,143.7	\$330,000.0	\$340,000.0	\$10,000.0
Geographic Program: South Florida	\$2,739.6	\$6,000.0	\$7,155.0	\$1,155.0
Geographic Program: San Francisco Bay	\$5,907.2	\$8,922.0	\$12,000.0	\$3,078.0
Geographic Program: Puget Sound	\$32,861.0	\$33,750.0	\$35,000.0	\$1,250.0
Subtotal, Geographic Programs	\$533,069.3	\$541,972.0	\$578,336.0	\$36,364.0
Homeland Security				
Homeland Security: Communication and Information	\$4,935.3	\$4,145.0	\$4,557.0	\$412.0
Homeland Security: Critical Infrastructure Protection	\$990.3	\$909.0	\$1,008.0	\$99.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$4,175.9	\$4,959.0	\$5,139.0	\$180.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security	\$10,101.5	\$10,013.0	\$10,704.0	\$691.0
Information Exchange / Outreach				
State and Local Prevention and Preparedness	\$13,660.5	\$13,736.0	\$14,003.0	\$267.0
TRI / Right to Know	\$12,225.3	\$13,206.0	\$13,450.0	\$244.0
Tribal - Capacity Building	\$13,639.3	\$12,902.0	\$15,971.0	\$3,069.0
Executive Management and Operations	\$50,346.8	\$46,836.0	\$54,792.0	\$7,956.0

	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Enacted	FY 2022 Pres Budget	FY 2022 Pres Budget v. FY 2021 Enacted
Environmental Education	\$6,388.7	\$8,580.0	\$8,615.0	\$35.0
Exchange Network	\$14,906.1	\$14,084.0	\$14,226.0	\$142.0
Small Minority Business Assistance	\$1,363.2	\$1,680.0	\$1,884.0	\$204.0
Small Business Ombudsman	\$2,145.2	\$1,778.0	\$1,929.0	\$151.0
Children and Other Sensitive Populations: Agency Coordination	\$6,209.9	\$6,173.0	\$6,247.0	\$74.0
Subtotal, Information Exchange / Outreach	\$120,885.0	\$118,975.0	\$131,117.0	\$12,142.0
International Programs				
US Mexico Border	\$2,955.4	\$2,837.0	\$3,192.0	\$355.0
International Sources of Pollution	\$6,240.6	\$6,746.0	\$8,006.0	\$1,260.0
Trade and Governance	\$5,608.4	\$5,292.0	\$6,080.0	\$788.0
Subtotal, International Programs	\$14,804.4	\$14,875.0	\$17,278.0	\$2,403.0
IT / Data Management / Security				
Information Security	\$6,190.4	\$8,285.0	\$14,116.0	\$5,831.0
IT / Data Management	\$86,699.8	\$82,715.0	\$86,744.0	\$4,029.0
Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security	\$92,890.2	\$91,000.0	\$100,860.0	\$9,860.0
Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review				
Integrated Environmental Strategies	\$11,398.1	\$9,475.0	\$17,719.0	\$8,244.0
Administrative Law	\$4,524.5	\$4,975.0	\$5,704.0	\$729.0
Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$800.2	\$864.0	\$1,141.0	\$277.0
Civil Rights Program	\$9,468.4	\$9,205.0	\$13,946.0	\$4,741.0
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	\$49,878.3	\$49,595.0	\$71,895.0	\$22,300.0
Legal Advice: Support Program	\$14,475.0	\$15,865.0	\$18,315.0	\$2,450.0
Regional Science and Technology	\$1,060.5	\$638.0	\$1,174.0	\$536.0
Science Advisory Board	\$3,903.2	\$3,205.0	\$3,475.0	\$270.0
Regulatory/Economic-Management and Analysis	\$12,643.4	\$12,421.0	\$13,463.0	\$1,042.0
Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review	\$108,151.6	\$106,243.0	\$146,832.0	\$40,589.0
Operations and Administration				
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$70,751.8	\$76,718.0	\$81,563.0	\$4,845.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$285,437.3	\$285,441.0	\$297,748.0	\$12,307.0
Acquisition Management	\$27,433.0	\$32,247.0	\$34,121.0	\$1,874.0
Human Resources Management	\$47,042.8	\$46,229.0	\$53,254.0	\$7,025.0
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	\$26,319.8	\$25,430.0	\$28,730.0	\$3,300.0
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	\$456,984.7	\$466,065.0	\$495,416.0	\$29,351.0
Pesticides Licensing				
Science Policy and Biotechnology	\$1,887.3	\$1,546.0	\$1,546.0	\$0.0
Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	\$60,580.8	\$60,181.0	\$60,929.0	\$748.0
Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	\$37,650.6	\$39,543.0	\$39,952.0	\$409.0

	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Enacted	FY 2022 Pres Budget	FY 2022 Pres Budget v. FY 2021 Enacted
Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	\$6,173.0	\$7,730.0	\$7,792.0	\$62.0
Subtotal, Pesticides Licensing	\$106,291.7	\$109,000.0	\$110,219.0	\$1,219.0
Research: Chemical Safety for Sustainability				
Research: Chemical Safety for Sustainability	\$143.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)				
RCRA: Corrective Action	\$35,671.5	\$38,453.0	\$38,836.0	\$383.0
RCRA: Waste Management	\$64,884.9	\$70,465.0	\$71,082.0	\$617.0
RCRA: Waste Minimization & Recycling	\$9,051.3	\$9,982.0	\$10,202.0	\$220.0
Subtotal, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)	\$109,607.7	\$118,900.0	\$120,120.0	\$1,220.0
Toxics Risk Review and Prevention				
Endocrine Disruptors	\$11,030.3	\$7,533.0	\$7,565.0	\$32.0
Pollution Prevention Program	\$11,475.6	\$12,558.0	\$12,588.0	\$30.0
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Management	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Toxic Substances: Chemical Risk Review and Reduction	\$67,369.7	\$60,280.0	\$75,519.0	\$15,239.0
Toxic Substances: Lead Risk Reduction Program	\$11,859.6	\$13,129.0	\$13,385.0	\$256.0
Subtotal, Toxics Risk Review and Prevention	\$101,735.2	\$93,500.0	\$109,057.0	\$15,557.0
Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)				
LUST / UST	\$10,841.7	\$11,250.0	\$11,443.0	\$193.0
Water: Ecosystems				
National Estuary Program / Coastal Waterways	\$30,863.9	\$31,822.0	\$31,963.0	\$141.0
Wetlands	\$20,212.0	\$19,300.0	\$24,899.0	\$5,599.0
Subtotal, Water: Ecosystems	\$51,075.9	\$51,122.0	\$56,862.0	\$5,740.0
Water: Human Health Protection				
Beach / Fish Programs	\$1,337.2	\$1,584.0	\$1,804.0	\$220.0
Drinking Water Programs	\$101,007.3	\$106,903.0	\$118,265.0	\$11,362.0
Subtotal, Water: Human Health Protection	\$102,344.5	\$108,487.0	\$120,069.0	\$11,582.0
Water Quality Protection				
Marine Pollution	\$9,153.2	\$9,468.0	\$12,072.0	\$2,604.0
Surface Water Protection	\$201,289.7	\$206,882.0	\$218,582.0	\$11,700.0
Subtotal, Water Quality Protection	\$210,442.9	\$216,350.0	\$230,654.0	\$14,304.0
Congressional Priorities				
Water Quality Research and Support Grants	\$15,000.0	\$21,700.0	\$0.0	-\$21,700.0
Total, Environmental Programs & Management	\$2,713,792.7	\$2,761,550.0	\$3,427,494.0	\$665,944.0

	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Enacted	FY 2022 Pres Budget	FY 2022 Pres Budget v. FY 2021 Enacted
Inspector General				
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations				
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	\$43,076.0	\$43,500.0	\$54,347.0	\$10,847.0
Total, Inspector General	\$43,076.0	\$43,500.0	\$54,347.0	\$10,847.0
Building and Facilities				
Homeland Security				
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$14,325.7	\$6,676.0	\$6,676.0	\$0.0
Operations and Administration				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$32,216.3	\$27,076.0	\$56,076.0	\$29,000.0
Total, Building and Facilities	\$46,542.0	\$33,752.0	\$62,752.0	\$29,000.0
Hazardous Substance Superfund				
Indoor Air and Radiation				
Radiation: Protection	\$2,323.3	\$1,985.0	\$2,612.0	\$627.0
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations				
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	\$10,498.1	\$11,586.0	\$11,800.0	\$214.0
Compliance				
Compliance Monitoring	\$1,054.3	\$1,000.0	\$1,006.0	\$6.0
Enforcement				
Criminal Enforcement	\$7,292.3	\$7,647.0	\$7,786.0	\$139.0
Environmental Justice	\$566.3	\$826.0	\$5,841.0	\$5,015.0
Forensics Support	\$1,257.6	\$1,145.0	\$1,164.0	\$19.0
Superfund: Enforcement	\$179,284.5	\$156,773.0	\$159,542.0	\$2,769.0
Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement	\$7,155.8	\$7,424.0	\$7,574.0	\$150.0
Subtotal, Enforcement	\$195,556.5	\$173,815.0	\$181,907.0	\$8,092.0
Homeland Security				
Homeland Security: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery	\$32,992.9	\$33,020.0	\$33,264.0	\$244.0
Homeland Security: Protection of EPA Personnel and Infrastructure	\$994.6	\$1,030.0	\$1,030.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, Homeland Security	\$33,987.5	\$34,050.0	\$34,294.0	\$244.0
Information Exchange / Outreach				
Exchange Network	\$1,341.2	\$1,328.0	\$1,328.0	\$0.0

	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Enacted	FY 2022 Pres Budget	FY 2022 Pres Budget v. FY 2021 Enacted
IT / Data Management / Security				
Information Security	\$927.6	\$659.0	\$5,659.0	\$5,000.0
IT / Data Management	\$15,168.6	\$13,826.0	\$15,202.0	\$1,376.0
Subtotal, IT / Data Management / Security	\$16,096.2	\$14,485.0	\$20,861.0	\$6,376.0
Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review				
Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$1,014.2	\$832.0	\$857.0	\$25.0
Legal Advice: Environmental Program	\$628.3	\$443.0	\$450.0	\$7.0
Subtotal, Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review	\$1,642.5	\$1,275.0	\$1,307.0	\$32.0
Operations and Administration				
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$24,772.5	\$26,561.0	\$27,720.0	\$1,159.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$82,734.0	\$68,727.0	\$72,801.0	\$4,074.0
Acquisition Management	\$24,356.1	\$23,800.0	\$30,519.0	\$6,719.0
Human Resources Management	\$6,094.4	\$6,202.0	\$6,842.0	\$640.0
Financial Assistance Grants / IAG Management	\$3,561.3	\$3,210.0	\$3,390.0	\$180.0
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	\$141,518.3	\$128,500.0	\$141,272.0	\$12,772.0
Research: Sustainable Communities				
Research: Sustainable and Healthy Communities	\$15,501.1	\$16,463.0	\$16,634.0	\$171.0
Research: Chemical Safety for Sustainability				
Health and Environmental Risk Assessment	\$3,882.1	\$12,824.0	\$12,876.0	\$52.0
Research: Chemical Safety for Sustainability	\$4,115.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, Research: Chemical Safety for Sustainability	\$7,997.7	\$12,824.0	\$12,876.0	\$52.0
Superfund Cleanup				
Superfund: Emergency Response and Removal	\$203,758.9	\$190,000.0	\$195,489.0	\$5,489.0
Superfund: EPA Emergency Preparedness	\$8,824.2	\$7,700.0	\$7,839.0	\$139.0
Superfund: Federal Facilities	\$23,280.8	\$21,800.0	\$22,189.0	\$389.0
Superfund: Remedial	\$617,575.2	\$589,000.0	\$882,400.0	\$293,400.0
Subtotal, Superfund Cleanup	\$853,439.1	\$808,500.0	\$1,107,917.0	\$299,417.0
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund	\$1,280,955.8	\$1,205,811.0	\$1,533,814.0	\$328,003.0
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks				
Enforcement				
Civil Enforcement	\$657.3	\$620.0	\$634.0	\$14.0
Operations and Administration				
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$354.8	\$416.0	\$434.0	\$18.0
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$1,066.0	\$836.0	\$837.0	\$1.0

	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Enacted	FY 2022 Pres Budget	FY 2022 Pres Budget v. FY 2021 Enacted
Acquisition Management	\$155.9	\$132.0	\$132.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, Operations and Administration	\$1,576.7	\$1,384.0	\$1,403.0	\$19.0
Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)				
LUST / UST	\$9,942.8	\$9,470.0	\$9,603.0	\$133.0
LUST Cooperative Agreements	\$57,441.7	\$55,040.0	\$55,040.0	\$0.0
LUST Prevention	\$25,666.5	\$25,369.0	\$25,369.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)	\$93,051.0	\$89,879.0	\$90,012.0	\$133.0
Research: Sustainable Communities				
Research: Sustainable and Healthy Communities	\$520.6	\$320.0	\$327.0	\$7.0
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	\$95,805.6	\$92,203.0	\$92,376.0	\$173.0
Inland Oil Spill Programs				
Compliance				
Compliance Monitoring	\$181.4	\$139.0	\$2,142.0	\$2,003.0
Enforcement				
Civil Enforcement	\$2,237.2	\$2,413.0	\$2,462.0	\$49.0
Oil				
Oil Spill: Prevention, Preparedness and Response	\$15,571.8	\$16,200.0	\$16,454.0	\$254.0
Operations and Administration				
Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$640.2	\$682.0	\$683.0	\$1.0
Research: Sustainable Communities				
Research: Sustainable and Healthy Communities	\$428.2	\$664.0	\$668.0	\$4.0
Total, Inland Oil Spill Programs	\$19,058.8	\$20,098.0	\$22,409.0	\$2,311.0
State and Tribal Assistance Grants				
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)				
Infrastructure Assistance: Alaska Native Villages	\$29,186.0	\$36,186.0	\$36,186.0	\$0.0
Brownfields Projects	\$94,203.0	\$90,982.0	\$130,982.0	\$40,000.0
Infrastructure Assistance: Clean Water SRF	\$1,632,518.2	\$1,638,826.0	\$1,870,680.0	\$231,854.0
Infrastructure Assistance: Drinking Water SRF	\$1,320,783.1	\$1,126,088.0	\$1,357,934.0	\$231,846.0
Infrastructure Assistance: Mexico Border	\$26,854.8	\$30,000.0	\$30,000.0	\$0.0
Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program	\$99,130.1	\$90,000.0	\$150,000.0	\$60,000.0
Targeted Airshed Grants	\$61,066.4	\$59,000.0	\$59,000.0	\$0.0
Gold King Mine Water Monitoring	\$3,280.3	\$4,000.0	\$4,000.0	\$0.0
Safe Water for Small & Disadvantaged Communities	\$14,182.4	\$26,408.0	\$41,413.0	\$15,005.0

	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Enacted	FY 2022 Pres Budget	FY 2022 Pres Budget v. FY 2021 Enacted
Reducing Lead in Drinking Water	\$3,342.0	\$21,511.0	\$81,515.0	\$60,004.0
Lead Testing in Schools	\$52,196.5	\$26,500.0	\$36,500.0	\$10,000.0
Drinking Water Infrastructure Resilience and Sustainability	\$0.0	\$4,000.0	\$9,000.0	\$5,000.0
Technical Assistance for Treatment Works	\$0.0	\$18,000.0	\$18,000.0	\$0.0
Sewer Overflow Control Grants	\$59.2	\$40,000.0	\$60,000.0	\$20,000.0
Water Infrastructure and Workforce Investment	\$0.0	\$3,000.0	\$3,000.0	\$0.0
Subtotal, State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)	\$3,336,802.0	\$3,214,501.0	\$3,888,210.0	\$673,709.0
Categorical Grants				
Categorical Grant: Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)	\$171,125.7	\$177,000.0	\$180,000.0	\$3,000.0
Categorical Grant: Public Water System Supervision (PWSS)	\$109,075.2	\$112,000.0	\$122,000.0	\$10,000.0
Categorical Grant: State and Local Air Quality Management	\$222,318.8	\$229,500.0	\$321,500.0	\$92,000.0
Categorical Grant: Radon	\$7,646.0	\$7,795.0	\$8,951.0	\$1,156.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)				
<i>Monitoring Grants</i>	\$18,586.9	\$17,267.0	\$17,267.0	\$0.0
<i>Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106) (other activities)</i>	\$215,906.4	\$212,733.0	\$217,333.0	\$4,600.0
Subtotal, Categorical Grant: Pollution Control (Sec. 106)	\$234,493.3	\$230,000.0	\$234,600.0	\$4,600.0
Categorical Grant: Wetlands Program Development	\$12,922.7	\$14,192.0	\$14,476.0	\$284.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Injection Control (UIC)	\$10,379.5	\$11,164.0	\$11,387.0	\$223.0
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Program Implementation	\$12,642.7	\$12,294.0	\$12,540.0	\$246.0
Categorical Grant: Lead	\$14,362.1	\$14,275.0	\$14,561.0	\$286.0
Categorical Grant: Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	\$107,033.6	\$101,500.0	\$111,500.0	\$10,000.0
Categorical Grant: Pesticides Enforcement	\$23,799.4	\$24,000.0	\$24,480.0	\$480.0
Categorical Grant: Pollution Prevention	\$4,294.8	\$4,630.0	\$4,723.0	\$93.0
Categorical Grant: Toxics Substances Compliance	\$3,871.9	\$4,760.0	\$4,855.0	\$95.0
Categorical Grant: Tribal General Assistance Program	\$67,289.5	\$66,250.0	\$77,575.0	\$11,325.0
Categorical Grant: Underground Storage Tanks	\$1,468.5	\$1,475.0	\$1,505.0	\$30.0
Categorical Grant: Tribal Air Quality Management	\$13,990.9	\$13,415.0	\$21,415.0	\$8,000.0
Categorical Grant: Environmental Information	\$8,557.1	\$9,336.0	\$9,523.0	\$187.0
Categorical Grant: Beaches Protection	\$8,388.7	\$9,619.0	\$9,811.0	\$192.0
Categorical Grant: Brownfields	\$47,311.9	\$46,195.0	\$46,195.0	\$0.0
Categorical Grant: Multipurpose Grants	\$27,033.1	\$10,000.0	\$10,200.0	\$200.0
Subtotal, Categorical Grants	\$1,108,005.4	\$1,099,400.0	\$1,241,797.0	\$142,397.0
Congressional Priorities				
Congressionally Mandated Projects	\$1,345.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0

	FY 2020 Actuals	FY 2021 Enacted	FY 2022 Pres Budget	FY 2022 Pres Budget v. FY 2021 Enacted
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants	\$4,446,153.1	\$4,313,901.0	\$5,130,007.0	\$816,106.0
Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund				
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)				
RCRA: Waste Management	\$20,317.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Operations and Administration				
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	\$114.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Total, Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund	\$20,432.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Fund				
Water Quality Protection				
Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation	\$40,760.6	\$65,000.0	\$80,108.0	\$15,108.0
Total, Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Fund	\$40,760.6	\$65,000.0	\$80,108.0	\$15,108.0
Subtotal, EPA	\$9,457,018.4	\$9,265,144.0	\$11,233,279.0	\$1,968,135.0
Cancellation of Funds	\$0.0	-\$27,991.0	\$0.0	\$27,991.0
TOTAL, EPA	\$9,457,018.4	\$9,237,153.0	\$11,233,279.0	\$1,996,126.0

Notes:

Superfund transfer resources for the audit and research functions are shown in the Superfund account.

FY 2020 Actuals include resources for Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria; USMCA; Disaster Relief Act; and CARES Act.

FY 2021 excludes the American Rescue Plan Act.

Two programs have been renamed: Atmospheric Protection is now Climate Protection; Research: Air and Energy is now Research: Air, Climate and Energy. One program area has been renamed from the Clean Air Program Area to the Clean Air and Climate Program Area.

Eliminated Programs

Eliminated Program Projects

Water Quality Research and Support Grants (FY 2022 President's Budget: \$0.0, 0.0 FTE)

This program is proposed for elimination in the FY 2022 President's Budget. Work to advance water quality protection can be accomplished within core statutory programs funded in the budget request.

The Program focuses on water quality and water availability research; the development and application of water quality criteria, the implementation of watershed management approaches, and the application of technological options to restore and protect water bodies. For training and technical assistance aspects of the Program, States have the ability to develop technical assistance plans for their water systems using Public Water System Supervision funds and set-asides from the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF). For research and development components of the Program, EPA was instructed to award grants on a competitive basis, independent of the Science to Achieve Results (STAR) Program, and give priority to not-for-profit organizations that: conduct activities that are national in scope; can provide a twenty-five percent match, including in-kind contributions; and often partner with the Agency.

Expected Benefits of E-Government Initiatives

eRulemaking

The eRulemaking Line of Business is designed to: enhance public access and participation in the regulatory process through electronic systems; reduce the burden on citizens and businesses in finding relevant regulations and commenting on proposed rulemaking actions; consolidate redundant docket systems; and improve agency regulatory processes and the timeliness of regulatory decisions. EPA has served as the managing partner for this Line of Business; however, in FY 2020, EPA transferred management services to the General Services Administration (GSA). EPA continues to be involved as a partner agency.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2020	020-99-99-99-99-0060-24	\$1,000.0
2021	020-99-99-99-99-0060-24	\$1,063.0
2022	020-99-99-99-99-0060-24	\$1,330.0

Geospatial Line of Business

The Geospatial Line of Business is an intergovernmental project to improve the ability of the public and government to use geospatial information to support the business of government and facilitate decision-making. This initiative reduces costs and improves agency operations in several areas.

With the implementation of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure Strategic Plan, the geospatial data sets known as National Geospatial Data Assets (NDGA) and associated analytical services have become available on the National Geospatial Platform. These additional datasets and services are easily accessible by federal agencies, their partners, and stakeholders. EPA uses the National Geospatial Platform to obtain data and services for internal analytical purposes as well as to publish outward-facing geospatial capabilities to the public.

While the Department of the Interior is the managing partner, EPA is a leader in developing the vision and operational plans for the implementation of the Geospatial Data Act as well as OMB guidance on Coordination of Geographic Information and Related Spatial Data Activities and the National Geospatial Platform which incorporates many national geospatial data and analytical services for federal agencies, their partners, and stakeholders. EPA is expected to contribute to the operation of the National Geospatial Platform in FY 2022. The intent is to reduce base costs by providing an opportunity for EPA and other agencies to share approaches on procurement consolidation and include shared services for hosting geospatial data, services, and applications.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2020	020-99-99-99-99-3100-24	\$225.0
2021	020-99-99-99-99-3100-24	\$225.0
2022	020-99-99-99-99-3100-24	\$225.0

USA Jobs

U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) USA Jobs simplifies the process of locating and applying for federal jobs. USA Jobs is a standard job announcement and resume builder website. It is the one-stop for federal job seekers to search for and apply to positions online. This integrated process benefits citizens by providing a more efficient process to locate and apply for jobs and assists federal agencies in hiring top talent in a competitive marketplace. The OPM USA Jobs initiative has increased job seeker satisfaction with the federal job application process and is helping the Agency to locate highly qualified candidates and improve response times to applicants.

The Agency is required to integrate with USA Jobs, to eliminate the need for applicants to maintain multiple user IDs to apply for federal jobs across agencies. The vacancy announcement format is improved for easier readability. The system can maintain up to five resumes per applicant, which allows them to create and store resumes tailored to specific skills. In addition, USA Jobs has a notification feature that keeps applicants updated on the status of the application and provides a link to the Agency's website for detailed information. This self-help USA Jobs feature allows applicants to obtain up-to-date information on the status of their application upon request.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2020	020-00-01-16-04-1218-24	\$130.0
2021 ¹¹	020-00-01-16-04-1218-24	\$0.0
2022	020-00-01-16-04-1218-24	\$0.0

Financial Management Line of Business

The Financial Management Line of Business (FM LoB) is a multi-agency effort whose goals include achieving process improvements and cost savings in the acquisition, development, implementation, and operation of financial management systems. By incorporating the same FM LoB-standard processes as those used by central agency systems, interfaces among financial systems are streamlined, and the quality of information available for decision-making is improved.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2020	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	\$96.0
2021	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	\$88.0
2022	020-00-01-01-04-1100-24	\$96.0

Grants.gov

The Grants.gov initiative benefits EPA and its grant programs by providing a single location to publish grant opportunities and application packages, and by providing a single site for the grants

¹¹ As of FY 2021, OMB does not require an EPA contribution for USA Jobs.

community to apply for grants using common forms, processes, and systems. EPA believes that the central site raises the visibility of its grant opportunities to a wider diversity of applicants.

The grants community benefits from savings in postal costs, paper, and envelopes. Applicants save time in searching for agency grant opportunities and in learning the application systems of various agencies. In order to streamline the application process, EPA offers Grants.gov application packages for mandatory state grants (i.e., Continuing Environmental Program Grants).

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2020	020-00-04-00-04-0160-24	\$331.0
2021	020-00-04-00-04-0160-24	\$335.0
2022	020-00-04-00-04-0160-24	\$347.0

Budget Formulation and Execution Line of Business

The Budget Formulation and Execution Line of Business (BFELoB) allows EPA and other agencies to access budget-related benefits and services. The Agency has the option to implement LoB-sponsored tools, training, and services.

EPA has benefited from the BFELoB by sharing valuable information on how systems and software being developed by the LoB have enhanced work processes. This effort has created a government-only capability for electronic collaboration (Wiki) in which the Budget Community website allows EPA to share budget information internally, with OMB, and with other federal agencies. The Agency also made contributions to the Human Capital Workgroup, participating in development of online training modules for budget activities – a valuable resource to all agency budget staff. The LoB has developed the capability to have secure, virtual online meetings where participants can view budget-related presentations from their workspace and participate in the discussion through a conference line. The LoB provides regularly scheduled symposia as an additional forum for EPA budget employees.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2020	020-99-99-99-99-3200-24	\$110.0
2021	020-99-99-99-99-3200-24	\$120.0
2022	020-99-99-99-99-3200-24	\$120.0

Federal Human Resources Line of Business

OPM’s Human Resources Line of Business (HR LoB) provides the federal government the infrastructure to support pay-for-performance systems, modernized HR systems, and the core functionality necessary for the strategic management of human capital.

The OPM HR LoB offers common solutions that enable federal departments and agencies to work more effectively, and to provide managers and executives across the federal government an improved means to meet strategic objectives. EPA will benefit by supporting an effective program

management activity which evaluates provider performance, customer satisfaction, and compliance with program goals, on an ongoing basis.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2020	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$69.0
2021	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$68.0
2022	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$69.0

Hiring Assessment Line of Business

The Hiring Assessment Line of Business (Hiring LoB) supports developing, promoting, testing, and scaling additional processes and technology in support of assessment processes and related hiring improvements, including government-wide hiring actions and shared certificates. In FY 2022, EPA will create a talent team to help implement data-driven assessment strategies to improve selection outcomes, to share new approaches and best practices, and to identify government-wide implementation challenges. Together, talent teams and the Hiring LoB will create a multi-level effort focused on improving hiring outcomes, both within agencies and across government.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2020	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$0.0
2021	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$0.0
2022	020-00-01-16-04-1200-24	\$66.0

Integrated Acquisition Environment

The Integrated Acquisition Environment (IAE) is comprised of a number of government-wide automated applications and/or databases that streamline the acquisition business process across the government and support EPA’s contracting and grants programs. In FY 2012, GSA began the process of consolidating the systems into one central repository called the System for Award Management (SAM). Until the consolidation is complete, EPA leverages some IAE systems via electronic linkages to EPA’s Acquisition System (EAS); other IAE systems are not linked directly to EAS but benefit the Agency’s contracting staff and vendor community as stand-alone resources.

EAS uses SAM vendor data: contracting officers can download vendor-provided representation and certification information electronically via SAM, which allows vendors to submit this information once rather than separately for every contract proposal. Additionally, contracting officers access the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System, which contains records on contractor performance, including past performance evaluations, and suspensions and debarments.

Through the IAE, contracting officers also can review Wage Determinations to obtain information required under the Service Contract Act and the Davis-Bacon Act. EAS links to the Contract Awards system, expected to be deployed in FY 2021, for submission of contract actions at the time of award. FPDS provides public access to government-wide contract information. The Electronic

Subcontracting Reporting System supports vendor subcontracting data submission for contracts identified as requiring this information. EPA publishes notices of proposed contract actions expected to exceed \$25 thousand to the Contact Opportunities listing. Vendors use this publicly available information to identify business opportunities in federal contracting.

The IAE houses Assistance Listings (formerly called Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA), which provides a comprehensive description of all federal assistance including information on eligibility, how to apply, and matching requirements for public consumption.

Further, EPA’s IAE fee supports use of services for standardized obligations and award-related information reporting for all Federal financial assistance and procurement awards as required by the Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA) and the DATA Act of 2014.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Service Fee (in thousands)
2020	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	\$720.0
2021	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	\$720.0
2022	020-00-01-16-04-0230-24	\$720.0

Federal PKI Bridge

Federal Public Key Infrastructure (FPKI) provides the government with a common infrastructure to administer digital certificates and public-private key pairs, including the ability to issue, maintain, and revoke public key certificates. FPKI leverages a security technique called Public Key Cryptography to authenticate users and data, protect the integrity of transmitted data, and ensure non-repudiation and confidentiality.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2020	020-99-99-99-99-0090-24	\$41.0
2021	020-99-99-99-99-0090-24	\$44.0
2022	020-99-99-99-99-0090-24	\$46.0

Freedom of Information Act Portal

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Improvement Act of 2016 directed the OMB and the Department of Justice (DOJ) to build a consolidated online request portal that allows a member of the public to submit a request for records to any agency from a single website. DOJ is managing the development and maintenance of this National FOIA Portal. EPA and other federal agencies were asked to contribute to this effort.

Fiscal Year	Account Code	EPA Contribution (in thousands)
2020	020-99-99-99-99-0090-24	\$43.0
2021	020-99-99-99-99-0090-24	\$43.0
2022	020-99-99-99-99-0090-24	\$37.0

Proposed FY 2022 Administrative Provisions

To further clarify proposed Administrative Provisions that involve more than a simple annual extension or propose a modification to an existing provision, the following information is provided.

Pesticide Licensing Fee Spending Restrictions

Statutory language in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (PRIA 4), signed into law by the President on March 8, 2019, restricts what activities EPA can fund from collections deposited in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Revolving Fund and Pesticide Registration Fund. The FY 2022 Budget carries forward the proposed statutory language from the FY 2021 President's Budget to allow registration service fees to be spent on additional activities related to registration of pesticides, such as processing and review of submitted data, laboratory support and audits, and rulemaking support.

The following proposed statutory language would ease spending restrictions related to PRIA registration service fees.

PRIA registration service fees:

The addition of language specifying that PRIA fees collected in FY 2022 will remain available until expended would simplify aspects of budget execution. The proposal to allow EPA to collect and spend PRIA fees in FY 2022 and to authorize expanded use of PRIA fee collections is below.

Proposed Language to Add to the FY 2022 Budget

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w-8): Provided, That such fees collected shall remain available until expended.

Notwithstanding section 33(d)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(d)(2)), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may assess fees under section 33 of FIFRA (7 U.S.C. 136w-8) for fiscal year 2022.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in addition to the activities specified in section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136w-8), fees collected in this and prior fiscal years under such section shall be available for the following activities as they relate to pesticide licensing: processing and review of data submitted in association with a registration, information submitted pursuant to section 6(a)(2) of FIFRA (7 U.S.C. 136d(a)(2)), supplemental distributor labels, transfers of registrations and data compensation rights, additional uses registered by states under section 24(c) of FIFRA (7 U.S.C. 136v(c)), data compensation petitions, reviews of minor amendments, and notifications; review of applications for emergency exemptions under section 18 of FIFRA (7 U.S.C. 136p) and ensuring data collection activities, laboratory support and audits; administrative support; risk communication activities;

development of policy and guidance; rulemaking support; information collection activities; and the portions of salaries related to work in these areas.

Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest

The Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest Establishment Act (Public Law 112-195) provides EPA with the authority to establish a program to finance, develop, and operate a system for the electronic submission of hazardous waste manifests supported by user fees. In FY 2022, EPA will operate the e-Manifest system and the Agency anticipates collecting and depositing approximately \$26 million in e-Manifest user fees into the Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund. Based upon authority to collect and spend e-Manifest fees provided by Congress in annual appropriations bills, the fees will be utilized for the operation of the system and necessary program expenses. Fees will fully support the e-Manifest Program, including future development costs. In recent appropriations acts, Congress has provided an advance on the appropriation for the e-Manifest Program, to be reduced by the amount of fees collected so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation of \$0. Because the Program is now fully operational and fee-supported, this language is no longer necessary. The language to authorize collection and spending of the fees is below. Language specifying that e-Manifest fees collected in FY 2022 will remain available until expended would simplify aspects of budget execution.

Propose a modification to an existing provision:

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate fees in accordance with section 3024 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6939g) for fiscal year 2022, to remain available until expended.

Service Fees for the Administration of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA Fees Rule)

On June 22, 2016, the “Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act” (P.L. 114-182) was signed into law, amending numerous sections of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). The amendments provide authority to the Agency to establish fees for certain activities under Sections 4, 5, and 6 of TSCA, as amended, to defray 25 percent of the costs of administering these sections and requirements under Section 14. The amendments removed the previous cap that the Agency may charge for pre-manufacturing notification reviews. Fees collected under the TSCA Fees Rule¹² will be deposited in the TSCA Service Fee Fund for use by EPA. Fees under this structure began to be incurred through EPA rulemaking on October 1, 2018 and replace the former Pre-Manufacturing Notification Fees. In recent appropriations acts, Congress has provided an advance on the appropriation for the TSCA Program, to be reduced by the amount of fees collected, so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation of \$0. Because the Program began collecting fees in FY 2019, this language is no longer necessary and was not included in the FY 2021 President’s Budget. Language specifying that TSCA fees collected in FY 2022 will remain available until expended would simplify aspects of budget execution.

¹² For additional information, please refer to: <https://www.epa.gov/tscfa-fees/fees-administration-toxic-substances-control-act>.

Propose a modification to an existing provision:

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate fees in accordance with section 26(b) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2625(b)) for fiscal year 2022, to remain available until expended.

Student Services Contracting Authority

In the FY 2022 Budget, the Agency requests authorization for the Office of Research and Development (ORD), the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP), and the Office of Water (OW) to hire pre-baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate students in science and engineering fields. This authority would provide ORD, OCSPP, and OW with the flexibility to hire qualified students that work on projects that support current priorities, programmatic functions, and the Agency's environmental goals.

Proposed Language to add to FY 2022 Budget:

For fiscal years 2022 through 2026, the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention and the Office of Water may, using funds appropriated under the headings "Environmental Programs and Management" and "Science and Technology", contract directly with individuals or indirectly with institutions or nonprofit organizations, without regard to 41 U.S.C. 5, for the temporary or intermittent personal services of students or recent graduates, who shall be considered employees for the purposes of chapters 57 and 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for travel and work injuries, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, relating to tort claims, but shall not be considered to be Federal employees for any other purpose: Provided, That amounts used for this purpose by the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention and the Office of Water collectively may not exceed \$2,000,000 per year.

Special Accounts and Aircraft for Superfund Response Actions

31 U.S.C. 1343(d) generally states that appropriated funds are not available for aircraft unless "the appropriation specifically authorizes" its use for such purpose. The FY 2020 Further Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 116-94) made EPA's annually appropriated Superfund Trust Fund money available to hire, maintain, and operate aircraft for the purposes of carrying out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). However, the FY 2020 Further Consolidated Appropriations Act did not include specific authority for EPA to also use funds recovered from Potentially Responsible Parties – which are deposited into Superfund "special accounts" and made available to EPA in a separate, permanent indefinite appropriation – for aircraft. Accordingly, in the FY 2022 Budget, the Agency requests parity in authority to use Superfund special account funds for aircraft, so that EPA may carry out CERCLA response actions funded with special account money in the same manner as the Agency would with annually appropriated Superfund money.

The appropriation provided by 42 U.S.C. 9622(b)(3) is available for the hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft.

Changes to EPA's use of the Title 42 Hiring Authority

EPA is requesting changes to its Title 42 Authority to increase the cap from 50 to 75 hires for the Office of Research and Development (ORD) and to extend the authority to include the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP). This would include a cap of 25 hires. ORD currently uses this authority to fill highly competitive, PhD-level positions where recruiting through the GS system is not appropriate. ORD has a robust process for managing the Program, including an Operations Manual that provides requirements on recruiting, compensation, ethics, and term renewals. OCSPP faces similar challenges in hiring specialized talent.

Proposed Language to add to FY 2022 Budget:

The Administrator may, after consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, employ up to seventy-five persons at any one time in the Office of Research and Development and twenty-five persons at any one time in the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention under the authority provided in 42 U.S.C. 209, through fiscal year 2025.

Working Capital Fund Authority

On December 12, 2017, the Modernizing Government Technology (MGT Act)¹³ was signed into law, authorizing CFO-Act agencies to set up information technology (IT) specific WCFs, which allows them to fund IT modernization projects and reinvest savings for additional modernization projects in the future. In the FY 2022 Budget, the Agency requests language be added to clarify and ensure that EPA has the ability to utilize funds deposited into EPA's WCF to modernize and develop the Agency's IT systems. The Agency has a well-established WCF where nearly 80 percent of the current service offerings are IT related. Establishing a separate IT WCF would be duplicative and more costly than to utilize the Agency's existing WCF. By seeking the proposed authorizing language change, EPA will clarify its existing authority and harmonize it with the intent of what Congress envisioned in the passage of the MGT Act.

Proposed Language to add to FY 2022 Budget:

The Environmental Protection Agency Working Capital Fund, 42 U.S.C. 4370e, is available for expenses and equipment necessary for modernization and development of information technology of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency.

¹³ For more information on the MGT Act, please refer to Section G of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91): <https://www.congress.gov/115/plaws/publ91/PLAW-115publ91.pdf>.

MAKING LITIGATION COSTS TRANSPARENT- EQUAL ACCESS FOR JUSTICE ACT (EAJA)

FY 2020*

Date of Final fee agreement or court disposition	Case Name	Court	Case Number	Judge	Amount of Fees and/or Costs Paid	Source of Funds	Was amount negotiated or court ordered?	Recipients	Nature of Case and Findings Basis	Hourly Rate of Attorney	Hourly Rate of Expert Witness
2/3/2020	<i>Anacostia Riverkeeper, et. al. v. Wheeler</i>	<i>District of Columbia Circuit Court</i>	16-cv-01651-CRC	Judge Christopher R. Cooper	\$39,500	EPA Appropriations	Negotiated	Anacostia Riverkeeper, Inc., Kingman Park Civic Association, and Potomac Riverkeeper Network	Plaintiffs alleged that EPA's approval of the District of Columbia's Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for bacteria violated the Clean Water Act and the Administrative Procedures Act. The district court vacated EPA's approval of the TMDLs and stayed the vacatur for one year. A settlement agreement was made for EAJA fees.	Various Petitioners requested rates from \$300/hr to \$500/hr.	None
9/1/2020	<i>Friends of Animals v. U.S. EPA</i>	<i>District of Oregon, Pendleton Division</i>	2:17-cv-01410-SU	Judge Michael Simon (Magistrate Judge Patricia Sullivan)	\$87,000	EPA Appropriations	Negotiated	Friends of Animals, Inc.	Plaintiff challenged EPA's denial of Plaintiff's petition under Section 6(b) of FIFRA that EPA initiate a Special Review of the pesticide ZonaStat-H to determine whether its registration should be cancelled or revised. The district court entered an order adopting the Findings and Recommendations of the Magistrate Judge that EPA's denial of Plaintiff's petition was arbitrary and capricious and remanded the matter to EPA for reconsideration. A settlement agreement was made for EAJA fees.	Various Petitioners requested rates from \$300/hr to \$500/hr.	None

*In the FY 2019 Explanatory Statement accompanying the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116-6), the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations requested Department of Interior, EPA, and the Forest Service make publicly available the EAJA fee information as specified in the explanatory statement accompanying Division G of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (P.L. 115-31). **EPA proposes that this document concludes its reporting obligations** for Equal Access to Justice Act fee information and will not be providing a report in its FY 2023 Congressional Justification unless alerted by Congress to continue.

Physicians' Comparability Allowance (PCA) Plan

Department and component:

Environmental Protection Agency

Purpose: The purpose of this document is to describe the agency's plan for implementing the Physicians' Comparability Allowance (PCA) Program. Per 5 CFR 595.107, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) must approve this plan prior to the agency entering into any PCA service agreement. Changes to this plan must be reviewed and approved by OMB in accordance with 5 CFR 595.107.

Reporting: In addition to the plan, each year, components utilizing PCA will include their PCA worksheet in the OMB Justification (OMBJ), typically in September. OMB and OPM will use this data for Budget development and congressional reporting.

Plan for Implementing the PCA Program:

1a) Identify the categories of physician positions the agency has established are covered by PCA under § 595.103. Please include the basis for each category. If applicable, list and explain the necessity of any additional physician categories designated by your agency (for categories other than I through IV-B). List Any Additional Physician Categories Designated by Your Agency: Pursuant to 5 CFR 595.107, any additional category of physician receiving a PCA, not covered by categories I through IV-B, should be listed and accompanied by an explanation as to why these categories are necessary.

Number of Physicians Receiving PCAs by Category (non-add)	Category of Physician Position	Covered by Agency (mark "x" if covered)	Basis for Category
2	Category I Clinical Position	X	The small population of EPA Research Physicians experiences modest turnover. The value of the physicians' comparability allowance to EPA is used as a retention tool. The Agency is told regularly that, absent the allowance, some EPA physicians would seek employment at federal agencies that provide the allowance.
	Category II Research Position		
	Category III Occupational Health		
	Category IV-A Disability Evaluation		
1	Category IV-B Health and Medical Admin.	X	The small population of EPA Research Physicians experiences modest turnover. The value of the physicians' comparability allowance to EPA is used as a retention tool. The Agency is told regularly that, absent the allowance, some EPA physicians would seek employment at

			federal agencies that provide the allowance.
--	--	--	--

Physicians' Comparability Allowance (PCA) Plan (continued)

Explain the recruitment and retention problem(s) for each category of physician in your agency (this should demonstrate that a current need continues to persist). § 595 of 5CFR Ch. 1 requires that an agency may determine that a significant recruitment and retention problem exists only if all of the following conditions apply:

- Evidence indicates that the agency is unable to recruit and retain physicians for the category;
- The qualification requirements being sought do not exceed the qualifications necessary for successful performance of the work;
- The agency has made efforts to recruit and retain candidates in the category; and
- There are not a sufficient number of qualified candidates available if no comparability allowance is paid.

Number of Physicians Receiving PCAs by Category (non-add)	Category of Physician Position	Recruitment and retention problem
2	Category I Clinical Position	The small population of EPA Research Physicians experiences modest turnover. The value of the physicians' comparability allowance to EPA is used as a retention tool. The Agency is told regularly that, absent the allowance, EPA physicians would seek employment at federal agencies that provide the allowance.
	Category II Research Position	
	Category III Occupational Health	
	Category IV-A Disability Evaluation	
1	Category IV-B Health and Medical Admin.	The small population of EPA Research Physicians experiences modest turnover. The value of the physicians' comparability allowance to EPA is used as a retention tool. The Agency is told regularly that absent the allowance, EPA physicians would seek employment at federal agencies that provide the allowance.

Explain how the agency determines the amounts to be used for each category of physicians.

Number of Physicians Receiving PCAs by Category (non-add)	Category of Physician Position	Basis of comparability allowance amount
2	Category I Clinical Position	EPA reviews the experience and technical expertise of the candidates. Combined with other salary ranges in the private sector and in review of other federal agencies, the Agency tries to be within a range that allows the Agency to retain the employees.
	Category II Research Position	
	Category III Occupational Health	
	Category IV-A Disability Evaluation	
1	Category IV-B Health and Medical Admin.	EPA reviews the experience and technical expertise of the candidates. Combined with other salary ranges in the private sector and in review of other federal agencies, the Agency tries to be within a range that allows the Agency to retain the employees.

Does the agency affirm that the PCA plan is consistent with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 5948 and the requirements of § 595 of 5 CFR Ch. 1?

Yes

Physicians' Comparability Allowance (PCA) Worksheet

Department and component:

Environmental Protection Agency

Explain the recruitment and retention problem(s) justifying the need for the PCA pay authority.

(Please include any staffing data to support your explanation, such as number and duration of unfilled positions and number of accessions and separations per fiscal year.)
 Historically, the number of EPA Research Physicians is between three and seven positions. This small population experiences modest turnover. The value of the physicians' comparability allowance to EPA is used as a retention tool.
 In FY 2020, EPA used the PCA to recruit and retain a qualified candidate to fill a vacancy left by a FY 2019 retirement. In FY 2021 and FY 2022, EPA will use the allowance to retain these employees.

3-4) Please complete the table below with details of the PCA agreement for the following years:

	PY 2020 (Actual)	CY 2021 (Estimates)	BY* 2022 (Estimates)
3a) Number of Physicians Receiving PCAs	3	3	3
3b) Number of Physicians with One-Year PCA Agreements	0	0	0
3c) Number of Physicians with Multi-Year PCA Agreements	3	3	3
4a) Average Annual PCA Physician Pay (without PCA payment)	\$182,600	\$188,100	\$193,700
4b) Average Annual PCA Payment	\$24,000	\$19,300	\$19,300

*BY data will be approved during the BY Budget cycle. Please ensure each column is completed.

5) Explain the degree to which recruitment and retention problems were alleviated in your agency through the use of PCAs in the prior fiscal year.

(Please include any staffing data to support your explanation, such as number and duration of unfilled positions and number of accessions and separations per fiscal year.)
 The Agency is told regularly that, absent the allowance, some EPA research physicians would seek employment at federal agencies that provide the allowance.

6) Provide any additional information that may be useful in planning PCA staffing levels and amounts in your agency.

An agency with a very small number of physician positions and a low turn-over rate among them still needs the allowance authority to maintain the stability of the small population. Those who opt for federal employment in opposition to private sector employment still want the maximum pay available in the federal sector. Were it not for the PCA, EPA would regularly lose some of its physicians to other federal agencies that offer the allowance, both requiring EPA to refill vacant positions and making it more difficult for EPA to fill those positions. Turn-over statistics should be viewed in this light.

FY 2022: Consolidations, Realignment, or Other Transfer of Resources

Environmental Justice as a National Program Manager

The FY 2022 President's Budget signals EPA's and the Administration's intent to establish a new National Program Manager (NPM) for Environmental Justice. Currently the Office of Environmental Justice is located within the Office of Policy within the Office of the Administrator. The proposed reorganization would elevate environmental justice to ensure it is considered across regional offices, National Program Managers, and statutory authorities. The head of the new NPM would be an Assistant Administrator to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Further information and details on the proposed reorganization are under development. EPA will work closely with the Office of Management and Budget and the Congress on the proposal.

Office of the Chief Financial Officer

In FY 2022, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) is considering a reorganization to realign functions and staff within OCFO to better position OCFO to meet critical mission requirements from new statutory requirements of the Evidence Act and increased reporting requirements as effectively as possible without a corresponding increase in resources. The reorganization also would realign functions to balance workload across OCFO, eliminate organizational layers, and consolidate similar or duplicative functions to better leverage personnel and resources. At this time, OCFO does not foresee any changes to its budget structure. The proposed reorganization would not affect any other EPA program office or regional office.

Center for Environmental Social Sciences

In FY 2022, the Office of Research and Development (ORD) is considering a reorganization that would create a Center for Environmental Social Sciences (CESS). This Center will house talent and innovation uniquely able to address the complex interactions between pollution sources, exposures, non-chemical stressors, and communities. The Center will employ social science experts in sociology, economics, anthropology, geography, demography, political science, decision science, behavioral science, risk and science communication, translational science, community engagement, and urban planning. Integrated with EPA's capabilities to analyze and address natural and technological systems, the Center would conduct solutions-focused research, support meaningful collaborations with communities with environmental justice concerns, improve risk communication, and tailor science-based tools and solutions for communities.

Office of Mission Support

In FY 2022, the Office of Mission Support (OMS) is considering a reorganization to realign functions and staff within OMS to better position the office to meet critical mission needs from

new requirements associated with President Biden’s Executive Orders on climate,¹⁴ supporting underserved communities and acquisition.¹⁵ The reorganization also would realign functions to balance workload across OMS, eliminate organizational layers, and consolidate similar or duplicative functions to better leverage personnel and resources. This proposed reorganization would not affect any other EPA program office or regional office.

¹⁴ For additional information, please see: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/27/executive-order-on-tackling-the-climate-crisis-at-home-and-abroad/>.

¹⁵ For additional information, please see: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/20/executive-order-advancing-racial-equity-and-support-for-underserved-communities-through-the-federal-government/>.

EPA Budget by National Program Manager and Major Office

Dollars in Thousands

NPM	Major Office	FY 2021 Enacted Budget				FY 2022 President's Budget			
		Pay(\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE	Pay(\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE
OA	Immediate Office	\$4,019	\$448	\$4,467	27.0	\$6,246	\$657	\$6,903	39.5
	Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations	\$7,351	\$416	\$7,767	43.2	\$7,587	\$414	\$8,001	43.2
	Office of Public Affairs	\$5,428	\$325	\$5,754	30.5	\$5,605	\$330	\$5,935	30.5
	Office of Public Engagement	\$1,123	\$85	\$1,208	8.0	\$1,159	\$85	\$1,244	8.0
	Office of Policy	\$26,998	\$10,676	\$37,674	158.7	\$46,859	\$271,329	\$318,188	278.9
	Children's Health Protection	\$2,548	\$2,402	\$4,950	13.1	\$2,587	\$2,452	\$5,038	13.1
	Environmental Education	\$927	\$7,053	\$7,980	5.2	\$939	\$7,040	\$7,980	5.2
	Office of Civil Rights	\$3,066	\$168	\$3,235	20.9	\$3,315	\$478	\$3,793	20.9
	Executive Secretariat	\$3,674	\$155	\$3,829	20.1	\$3,787	\$154	\$3,942	20.1
	Executive Services	\$2,844	\$268	\$3,112	14.9	\$2,936	\$2,425	\$5,362	14.9
	Homeland Security	\$2,230	\$316	\$2,545	11.3	\$2,459	\$510	\$2,969	12.3
	Science Advisory Board	\$3,132	\$334	\$3,465	18.7	\$3,180	\$476	\$3,657	18.7
	Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	\$1,797	\$739	\$2,536	9.7	\$1,959	\$904	\$2,863	9.7
	Regional Resources	\$42,318	\$12,163	\$54,481	251.2	\$55,426	\$13,679	\$69,105	327.0
	OA TOTAL	\$107,454	\$35,548	\$143,002	632.5	\$144,044	\$307,487	\$451,531	842.0
OAR	Immediate Office	\$10,041	\$10,282	\$20,323	56.7	\$10,342	\$10,075	\$20,417	56.7
	Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards	\$56,630	\$20,991	\$77,621	341.0	\$66,028	\$125,922	\$191,950	383.6
	Office of Atmospheric Programs	\$38,052	\$58,548	\$96,600	216.5	\$44,735	\$53,839	\$98,574	253.4
	Office of Transportation and Air Quality	\$59,030	\$42,647	\$101,677	336.0	\$63,229	\$81,607	\$144,836	343.3
	Office of Radiation and Indoor Air	\$24,461	\$13,324	\$37,785	142.0	\$31,683	\$15,303	\$46,985	180.4
	Regional Resources	\$98,158	\$403,841	\$501,999	598.5	\$110,188	\$564,950	\$675,138	652.1
	OAR TOTAL	\$286,372	\$549,633	\$836,005	1,690.7	\$326,205	\$851,695	\$1,177,900	1,869.5
OCFO	Immediate Office	\$1,795	\$4,743	\$6,538	11.0	\$1,947	\$5,051	\$6,999	11.0
	Office of Budget	\$6,936	\$2,934	\$9,869	42.5	\$7,524	\$2,733	\$10,257	42.5
	Office of Planning, Analysis and Accountability	\$4,080	\$295	\$4,375	25.0	\$4,426	\$295	\$4,721	25.0
	Office of Technology Solutions	\$8,225	\$23,525	\$31,749	49.4	\$8,923	\$23,883	\$32,806	49.4
	Office of Resource and Information Management	\$2,366	\$1,684	\$4,051	14.5	\$2,567	\$1,249	\$3,816	14.5
	Office of the Controller	\$22,406	\$2,108	\$24,514	133.0	\$24,308	\$2,103	\$26,412	133.0
	OCFO eEnterprise	\$1,093	\$568	\$1,660	4.8	\$1,156	\$549	\$1,706	4.8
	Office of Continuous Improvement	\$2,057	\$427	\$2,484	10.0	\$2,139	\$451	\$2,590	10.0
	Regional Resources	\$31,392	\$2,094	\$33,486	203.3	\$33,694	\$1,965	\$35,659	206.3
	OCFO TOTAL	\$80,349	\$38,378	\$118,727	493.5	\$86,686	\$38,280	\$124,966	496.5

NPM	Major Office	FY 2021 Enacted Budget				FY 2022 President's Budget			
		Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE	Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE
OCSPP	Immediate Office	\$2,275	\$1,296	\$3,571	12.0	\$2,326	\$1,230	\$3,556	12.0
	Office of Pesticide Programs	\$58,895	\$23,347	\$82,242	339.0	\$59,744	\$23,529	\$83,273	339.0
	Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics	\$45,967	\$24,646	\$70,613	295.9	\$61,210	\$24,790	\$86,000	383.5
	Office of Program Support	\$33,586	\$3,383	\$36,968	183.0	\$34,445	\$3,281	\$37,725	183.0
	Regional Resources	\$22,179	\$31,145	\$53,324	141.8	\$22,595	\$31,581	\$54,176	141.8
	OCSPP TOTAL	\$162,902	\$83,816	\$246,718	971.7	\$180,319	\$84,411	\$264,730	1,059.3
OECA	Immediate Office	\$6,694	\$2,978	\$9,672	42.7	\$6,839	\$2,958	\$9,796	42.9
	Office of Civil Enforcement	\$22,127	\$6,342	\$28,469	108.2	\$24,035	\$15,732	\$39,767	117.4
	Office of Criminal Enforcement, Forensics, and Training	\$60,941	\$9,532	\$70,473	305.5	\$67,960	\$9,531	\$77,490	333.4
	Office of Compliance	\$20,703	\$20,131	\$40,834	113.2	\$21,837	\$51,272	\$73,109	118.2
	Federal Facilities Enforcement Office	\$2,594	\$553	\$3,147	14.0	\$2,634	\$558	\$3,192	14.0
	Office of Site Remediation Enforcement	\$13,047	\$20,088	\$33,135	67.0	\$13,243	\$21,125	\$34,369	67.0
	Regional Resources	\$294,224	\$49,149	\$343,373	1,773.1	\$305,267	\$55,668	\$360,935	1,817.8
	OECA TOTAL	\$420,331	\$108,773	\$529,104	2,423.7	\$441,815	\$156,844	\$598,659	2,510.7
OGC	Immediate Office	\$2,489	\$55	\$2,544	14.5	\$2,212	\$55	\$2,267	11.0
	Air and Radiation Law Office	\$7,249	\$35	\$7,284	44.0	\$9,048	\$40	\$9,088	45.0
	Pesticides and Toxic Substances Law Office	\$3,460	\$36	\$3,496	21.0	\$4,021	\$35	\$4,056	26.0
	Solid Waste and Emergency Response Law Office	\$2,132	\$63	\$2,195	13.2	\$3,418	\$82	\$3,500	17.0
	Water Law Office	\$1,644	\$10	\$1,654	9.3	\$4,825	\$25	\$4,850	24.0
	Civil Rights - Title VI	\$1,859	\$200	\$2,059	10.2	\$3,358	\$553	\$3,911	16.7
	Other Legal Support	\$22,593	\$5,354	\$27,947	92.6	\$25,424	\$10,966	\$36,390	98.4
	Regional Resources	\$23,307	\$33	\$23,340	139.9	\$34,589	\$832	\$35,421	162.7
	OGC TOTAL	\$64,733	\$5,786	\$70,519	344.7	\$86,894	\$12,588	\$99,482	400.8
OIG	Immediate Office	\$632	\$61	\$694	3.6	\$714	\$316	\$1,030	4.0
	Office of Chief of Staff	\$1,739	\$356	\$2,095	10.0	\$1,964	\$183	\$2,147	11.1
	Office of Counsel	\$4,268	\$407	\$4,675	24.5	\$4,821	\$449	\$5,270	27.3
	Office of Management	\$6,007	\$4,519	\$10,527	34.4	\$6,785	\$7,896	\$14,681	38.4
	Office of Audit	\$13,912	\$808	\$14,720	79.7	\$15,715	\$1,039	\$16,754	88.9
	Office of Evaluations	\$11,224	\$643	\$11,867	64.3	\$12,678	\$840	\$13,518	71.7
	Office of Investigations	\$9,327	\$1,181	\$10,509	53.5	\$10,535	\$2,213	\$12,748	59.6
	OIG TOTAL	\$47,110	\$7,976	\$55,086	270.0	\$53,212	\$12,935	\$66,147	301.0

NPM	Major Office	FY 2021 Enacted Budget				FY 2022 President's Budget			
		Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE	Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE
OITA	Immediate Office	\$844	\$46	\$890	4.5	\$953	\$81	\$1,034	5.0
	Office of International Affairs	\$6,781	\$2,570	\$9,350	36.0	\$8,383	\$2,770	\$11,153	44.0
	Office of Management and International Services	\$2,064	\$448	\$2,512	11.0	\$2,439	\$710	\$3,149	12.8
	American Indian Environmental Office	\$3,090	\$468	\$3,558	16.6	\$3,677	\$400	\$4,077	19.3
	Regional Resources	\$10,807	\$66,902	\$77,709	67.6	\$13,052	\$78,351	\$91,403	78.6
	OITA TOTAL	\$23,586	\$70,433	\$94,019	135.7	\$28,504	\$82,312	\$110,816	159.7
OLEM	Immediate Office	\$8,315	\$5,260	\$13,574	40.8	\$8,383	\$5,181	\$13,564	40.8
	Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office	\$2,528	\$672	\$3,200	13.2	\$2,558	\$707	\$3,265	13.2
	Office of Communication, Partnership, and Analysis	\$2,417	\$1,570	\$3,987	13.8	\$2,437	\$1,555	\$3,992	13.8
	Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation	\$25,860	\$69,871	\$95,731	144.3	\$25,907	\$116,289	\$142,196	144.3
	Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery	\$24,837	\$20,192	\$45,029	140.7	\$25,131	\$30,709	\$55,840	140.7
	Office of Underground Storage Tanks	\$3,708	\$2,921	\$6,630	21.6	\$3,755	\$3,098	\$6,853	21.6
	Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization	\$2,811	\$9,526	\$12,337	16.6	\$2,844	\$13,217	\$16,061	16.6
	Office of Emergency Management	\$12,314	\$28,748	\$41,062	64.2	\$12,458	\$29,410	\$41,868	64.2
	Office of Mountains, Deserts, and Plains	\$840	\$0	\$840	4.0	\$846	\$0	\$846	4.0
	Regional Resources	\$268,269	\$832,301	\$1,100,570	1,610.9	\$270,068	\$1,120,410	\$1,390,478	1,610.9
	OLEM TOTAL	\$351,899	\$971,061	\$1,322,960	2,070.1	\$354,387	\$1,320,575	\$1,674,962	2,070.1
OMS	Immediate Office	\$10,698	\$32,604	\$43,302	22.6	\$4,970	\$37,125	\$42,095	26.6
	Environmental Appeals Board	\$3,046	\$14	\$3,060	14.0	\$3,269	\$163	\$3,432	15.0
	Administrative Law Judges	\$1,950	\$12	\$1,962	10.0	\$2,167	\$161	\$2,329	11.0
	Office of Resources and Business Operations	\$9,974	\$2,720	\$12,694	62.0	\$10,323	\$7,484	\$17,807	63.0
	Office of Human Resources	\$18,923	\$7,321	\$26,244	80.7	\$20,948	\$5,903	\$26,851	89.7
	OARM - Research Triangle Park	\$14,047	\$30,962	\$45,008	95.0	\$15,245	\$29,472	\$44,717	100.0
	Office of Grants and Debarment	\$11,949	\$4,257	\$16,205	67.0	\$13,633	\$4,219	\$17,852	76.0
	OARM - Cincinnati	\$9,702	\$8,527	\$18,229	66.0	\$10,614	\$10,619	\$21,233	70.0
	Office of Administration	\$16,831	\$310,785	\$327,615	87.5	\$19,599	\$353,186	\$372,785	87.5
	Office of Acquisition Solutions	\$32,211	\$6,601	\$38,812	193.0	\$40,014	\$6,512	\$46,525	233.0
	Office of Enterprise Information Programs	\$7,612	\$7,856	\$15,468	40.1	\$7,718	\$7,818	\$15,536	40.1
	Office of Information Management	\$11,040	\$27,767	\$38,807	58.7	\$11,197	\$27,988	\$39,185	58.7
	Office of Digital Services & Technical Architecture	\$4,243	\$1,671	\$5,915	23.0	\$4,297	\$1,655	\$5,952	23.0
	Office of Customer Advocacy, Policy & Portfolio Management	\$5,567	\$2,093	\$7,659	31.0	\$5,638	\$2,076	\$7,714	31.0
	Office of Information Security & Privacy	\$2,660	\$6,162	\$8,821	14.1	\$2,694	\$16,980	\$19,675	14.1
	Office of Information Technology Operations	\$1,947	\$4,489	\$6,436	9.7	\$1,972	\$4,474	\$6,446	9.7
Regional Resources	\$76,143	\$50,473	\$126,616	464.9	\$84,035	\$52,215	\$136,250	479.4	
OMS TOTAL	\$238,540	\$504,313	\$742,853	1,339.3	\$258,333	\$568,051	\$826,384	1,427.8	

NPM Major Office		FY 2021 Enacted Budget				FY 2022 President's Budget			
		Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE	Pay (\$K)	Non-Pay (\$K)	Total (\$K)	FTE
ORD	ORD Headquarters	\$43,869	\$77,554	\$121,423	256.2	\$44,440	\$105,808	\$150,248	256.2
	Center for Computational Toxicology & Exposure	\$41,139	\$28,445	\$69,584	239.9	\$45,358	\$34,814	\$80,172	261.5
	Center for Environmental Measurements & Modeling	\$60,773	\$36,883	\$97,656	354.4	\$66,795	\$44,786	\$111,581	385.1
	Center for Public Health & Environmental Assessment	\$60,807	\$36,662	\$97,470	352.6	\$66,828	\$44,150	\$110,978	383.3
	Center for Environmental Solutions & Emergency	\$42,030	\$28,013	\$70,044	245.1	\$46,260	\$34,346	\$80,606	266.7
	Office of Science Advisor, Policy and Engagement	\$11,266	\$58,695	\$69,961	65.7	\$12,973	\$51,161	\$64,134	74.8
	Regional Resources	\$31,632	\$16,321	\$47,953	199.5	\$31,866	\$16,715	\$48,581	199.5
	ORD TOTAL	\$291,518	\$282,573	\$574,091	1,713.4	\$314,520	\$331,780	\$646,300	1,827.1
OW	Immediate Office	\$11,554	\$5,790	\$17,343	59.4	\$12,391	\$6,102	\$18,493	63.5
	Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water	\$29,818	\$69,242	\$99,060	167.6	\$34,229	\$61,500	\$95,729	191.3
	Office of Science and Technology	\$20,507	\$15,388	\$35,895	106.8	\$21,925	\$16,592	\$38,517	113.6
	Office of Wastewater Management	\$24,087	\$134,593	\$158,680	131.7	\$27,326	\$169,195	\$196,521	148.6
	Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds	\$19,427	\$23,895	\$43,322	103.8	\$21,420	\$26,859	\$48,279	114.3
	Regional Resources	\$190,031	\$3,987,728	\$4,177,759	1,177.2	\$206,243	\$4,587,620	\$4,793,863	1,262.8
	OW TOTAL	\$295,424	\$4,236,636	\$4,532,060	1,746.5	\$323,534	\$4,867,868	\$5,191,402	1,894.1
	Subtotal Agency Resources	\$2,370,218	\$6,894,926	\$9,265,144	13,831.8	\$2,598,453	\$8,634,826	\$11,233,279	14,858.6
Less Rescission of Prior Year Funds			(\$27,991)				\$0		
Reimbursable FTE				465.5				465.5	
Total Agency Resources	\$2,370,218	\$6,894,926	\$9,237,153	14,297.3	\$2,598,453	\$8,634,826	\$11,233,279	15,324.1	

S. 2276 – Good Accounting Obligation in Government Act

Public Law No: 115-414, January 3, 2019

In accordance with the reporting requirements of the Good Accounting Obligation in Government Act, Agencies are to submit reports on outstanding recommendations in the annual budget submitted to Congress.

For the FY 2022 budget justification, EPA developed a report listing each open public recommendation for corrective action from the Office of the Inspector General, along with the implementation status of each recommendation.

EPA also developed a report listing the status of each open or closed as unimplemented public recommendation from the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

The Agency's GAO-IG Act Report will be available at the following link:
<https://www.epa.gov/cj>.

EPA OIG Open Recommendations and Corrective Actions

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
18-P00240-1	<p>Recommendation: Establish a strategic vision and objectives for managing the use of citizen science that identifies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Linkage to the Agency’s strategic goals, b. Roles and responsibilities for implementation, and c. Resources to maintain and build upon existing agency expertise 	9/5/18
	<p>Corrective Action: The Agency concurs with this recommendation and will establish an agencywide work group to establish a more formal strategic vision and objectives for managing the use of citizen science, including policies, procedures and clear objectives for how to collect, manage and use citizen science to support the Agency's mission. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	
	<p>Recommendation: Through appropriate EPA offices, direct completion of an assessment to identify the data management requirements for using citizen science data and an action plan for addressing those requirements, including those on sharing and using data, data format/standards, and data testing/validation.</p>	
	<p>Corrective Action: The Agency concurs with this recommendation and will complete an assessment and action plan to identify and address data management requirements for citizen science. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	
20-P00062-1	<p>Recommendation: Revise EPA's Crisis Communication Plan to include a communication process to inform affected communities about the resolution of community concerns raised during an emergency.</p>	12/16/19
	<p>Corrective Action: Revise EPA's Crisis Communication process to inform affected communities about the resolution of community concerns raised during an emergency. <i>Planned: 12/30/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	
20-N00128-1	<p>Recommendation: Improve and continue to implement ongoing risk communication efforts by promptly providing residents in all communities near the 25 ethylene oxide-emitting facilities identified as high-priority by EPA with a forum for an interactive exchange of information with EPA or the states regarding health concerns related to exposure to ethylene oxide.</p>	3/31/20
	<p>Corrective Action: EPA will post quarterly status reports of outreach activities to the Agency's/Region’s Ethylene Oxide website beginning September 30, 2020. <i>Planned: 09/30/20, Status: Dispute Resolution</i></p>	
20-P00083-4	<p>Recommendation: Develop performance measures to track progress toward the Border 2020 Program goals and objectives.</p>	2/18/20

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>Corrective Action: OITA will work with NPM's and Regional Border Offices to identify performance measures for Border 2025 goals and objectives, in line with the Agency LEAN effort and Bowling Charts. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	
	<p>Recommendation: Establish and implement management controls to determine how and when Policy Forum action plans will be developed.</p>	
	<p>Corrective Action: Border 2020 Policy Fora did not require action plans. Policy Fora Action/Activities are being considered in the Accountability of the Border 2025 framework and will be reflected or include in the regional action plans, if required. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	
	<p>Recommendation: Establish and implement management controls to increase reliability of the Border 2020 Program action plans by standardizing the action plan format to include key data such as the relevant goal, objective, sub-objective, requests for proposal, grant amount and project status.</p>	
	<p>Corrective Action: OITA does recognize the advantage toward Action Plans Format standardization. OITA will work with NPM's and Regional Border Offices to standardize the Border 2025 Action Plans to the extent that it allows flexibility within RWG' s and Task Forces in the spirit of fomenting bottom up work as each region may have differences. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	
	<p>Recommendation: Establish and implement management controls to increase transparency of the Border 2020 Program by providing stakeholder and public access, as appropriate, to the program's funded products such as studies, reports, and videos on EPA's Border 2020 Program website.</p>	
	<p>Corrective Action: OITA is a NADB Board Member and will work with the NADB to ensure that project information/products are made available to the public, in line with grants polices and regulations. Once this is achieved, EPA can link from the Border 2025 website to those materials on NADB ' s website. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	
	<p>Recommendation: Establish and implement management controls to increase transparency of the Border 2020 Program by sharing NADB sub-grantee fact sheets on EPA's Border 2020 Program website.</p>	
	<p>Corrective Action: OITA will work with the NAD B to ensure that Border 2025 project information/products are made available to the public, in line grants polices and regulations. Once this is achieved, EPA can link the Border 2025 website to those</p>	

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	materials on NADB' s website. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i>	
17-F00046-130	<p>Recommendation: Work with the Compass Financials service provider to establish controls for creating and locking administrative accounts.</p> <p>Corrective Action: The Agency will work with the service provider to analyze alternatives for controls and establish an action plan. <i>Planned: 9/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p> <p>Recommendation: Work with the Compass Financials service provider to develop and implement a methodology to monitor accounts with administrative capabilities.</p> <p>Corrective Action: The Agency will work with the service provider to analyze alternative methodologies and establish an action plan. <i>Planned: 9/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	11/15/16
20-F00033-130	<p>Recommendation: We recommend that the Chief Financial Officer evaluate and improve EPA's process for preparing financial statements, including the resources assigned.</p> <p>Corrective Action: 1.0 - The Agency makes every effort to continually review and improve its processes for financial statement reporting, including the implementation of new financial statements preparation software in FY 2019. The Agency will continue to review its processes for preparing financial statements and identify process improvements to further strengthen the preparation process.</p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that the Chief Financial Officer establish accounting models to properly classify and record interest, fines, penalties and fees.</p> <p>Corrective Action: 3.0 - OCFO will work with the Office of Land and Emergency Management to review the business process for e-Manifest financial activities and develop a plan for recording the related activities at the transactional level. <i>Planned: 9/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that the Chief Financial Officer establish accounting models to properly record e-Manifest account receivables and recognize earned revenue at the transaction level.</p> <p>Corrective Action: 4.0 - OCFO will work with the Office of Land and Emergency Management to review the business process for e-Manifest financial activities and develop a plan for recording the related activities at the transactional level. <i>Planned: 9/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that the Chief Financial Officer establish accounting models to properly record</p>	11/19/19

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>receivables, collections and earned revenue from federal versus nonfederal vendors.</p> <p>Corrective Action: 5.0 - OCFO will work with the Office of Land and Emergency Management to review the business process for e-Manifest financial activities and develop a plan for recording the related activities at the transactional level. <i>Planned: 9/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that the Chief Financial Officer update the accounting models to properly record collections and not reduce an account receivable account.</p> <p>Corrective Action: 6.0 - OCFO will work with the Office of Land and Emergency Management to review the business process for e-Manifest financial activities and develop a plan for recording the related activities at the transactional level. <i>Planned: 9/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
16-P00275-140	<p>Recommendation: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation: Determine whether additional action is needed to mitigate any adverse air quality impacts of the Renewable Fuel Standard as required by the Energy Independence and Security Act.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OAR agrees with this recommendation, and we acknowledge the statute’s requirement to determine whether additional action is needed to mitigate any adverse air quality impacts in light of the anti-backsliding study. That study, discussed in Corrective Action 2, would need to be completed prior to any such determination taking place. <i>Planned: 9/30/24, Status: Adhering</i></p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that the Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation: Complete the anti-backsliding study on the air quality impacts of the Renewable Fuel Standard as required by the Energy Independence and Security Act.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OAR agrees with this recommendation, and we acknowledge the statutory obligation for an anti-backsliding study under Clean Air Act section 211(v) (as amended by EISA section 209). EPA has already taken a number of time-consuming and resource-intensive steps that are important prerequisites for the anti-backsliding study. For example, OAR conducted a vehicle emissions test program designed to evaluate the impacts of gasoline properties (including aromatics and ethanol concentration) on vehicle exhaust emissions, https://www3.epa.gov/otaq/models/moves/epact.htm. This study is the largest, most comprehensive, and most carefully designed and implemented study to date on the impacts of fuel changes on</p>	8/18/16

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>emissions from recent model year gasoline vehicles. Using the data from this study, OAR then updated the fuel effects model in its tool for estimating motor vehicle emissions, the Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (MOVES). This update was released in 2014. However, as the OIG report correctly notes, there are multiple intermediate research steps that still need to be completed before OAR can plan, fund, and conduct a comprehensive anti-backsliding study. These steps include development of baseline, current, and projected scenarios for how renewable fuels have and might be produced, distributed, and used to fulfill the RFS requirements, generation of emissions inventories, and air quality modeling, all of which are time-consuming and resource-intensive. Furthermore, this work must be conducted on top of other statutorily required actions under the RFS Program, many of which are carried out by the same group of staff and managers.</p> <p><i>Planned: 9/30/24, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
18-P00181-140	<p>Recommendation: Define performance measures to assess the performance of EPA’s light-duty vehicle compliance program.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OAR agrees with this recommendation. OAR currently uses in-use vehicle emissions testing data to track light-duty emissions compliance over time. OAR will develop additional performance measures to better monitor emissions compliance and program success. OAR will implement this recommendation in four phases: 1) develop the performance measures; 2) implement, gather data, and evaluate; 3) revise measures as informed by evaluation, then fully implement measures; and 4) use those measures to inform program management moving forward. We project that this will be a three-year process. Step one will be completed by the end of Q2, FY2019. Step two will be completed at the end of Q2, FY2020, and step three will be completed at the end of Q2, FY2021. Step 4 is ongoing.</p> <p><i>Planned: 3/31/21, Status: Delayed</i></p>	5/15/18
19-P00168-140	<p>Recommendation: Define performance measures to assess the performance of EPA’s on-road heavy-duty vehicle and engine compliance program.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OAR agrees with this recommendation. OAR currently uses in-use vehicle emissions testing data to track heavy-duty emissions compliance over time. OAR will develop additional performance measures to better monitor emissions compliance and program success. <i>Planned: 9/30/22, Status: Adhering</i></p>	6/3/19

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>Recommendation: Conduct and document a risk assessment for the on-road heavy-duty vehicle and engine compliance program that prioritizes risk and links specific control activities to specific risks. Update the risk assessment on a scheduled and periodic basis.</p>	
	<p>Corrective Action: OAR agrees with this recommendation. OAR currently conducts an informal risk assessment of its heavy-duty vehicle compliance program and started implementing and documenting a formal process for both light-and heavy-duty sectors in 2018 in response to OIG’s recommendation for the light-duty program. OAR will continue to expand and formalize this process and will develop protocols for its implementation and documentation. <i>Planned: 6/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
	<p>Recommendation: Address the following risks as part of the on-road heavy-duty vehicle and engine compliance program risk assessment, in addition to other risks that EPA identifies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Non-criteria pollutants not being measured. b. Level of heavy-duty sector testing throughout the compliance life cycle. c. Marketplace ambiguity over regulatory treatment of rebuilt versus remanufactured engines. d. Different compliance challenges for heavy-duty compression-ignition and spark-ignition engines. e. Lack of laboratory test cell and in-house testing capacity for heavy-duty spark-ignition engines. 	
	<p>Corrective Action: OAR agrees with this recommendation and will address each of these areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-criteria pollutants not being measured Response: Under the Clean Air Act, manufacturers are responsible for measuring and reporting emissions of nonregulated pollutants. OTAQ does not routinely measure noncriteria pollutants, but we will work to enhance manufacturer reporting by establishing a new document type in our Engine and Vehicle Compliance Information System (EV-CIS) to collect the manufacturer reports; updating our guidance to announce the new EV-CIS capacity and to remind manufacturers of their reporting obligation; and then reviewing and considering the reported information as part of our ongoing risk assessment process. Planned Completion Date: End of Q4 2021. • Level of heavy-duty sector testing throughout the compliance life cycle Response: OTAQ will continue to prioritize testing for all vehicle and engine sectors, including the HD highway sector, as 	

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>resources allow. We will formally document and periodically reassess the level of testing as part of our periodic risk assessment. Planned Completion Date: End of Q3 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marketplace ambiguity over regulatory treatment of rebuilt versus remanufactured engines <p>Response: OTAQ believes the regulations are clear on this issue so we will engage stakeholders to improve understanding of nomenclature and expectations, and we will work to educate manufacturers about ambiguity resulting from their inappropriate use of terminology. Planned Completion Date: End of Q1 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different compliance challenges for heavy-duty compression-ignition and spark-ignition engines <p>Response: This recommendation concerns the technical differences between SI and CI engines, and the resulting different challenges and tradeoffs in controlling emissions for the two types of technology. We will formally document and periodically reassess concerns about different compliance incentives as part of our periodic risk assessment.</p> <p>Planned Completion Date: End of Q3 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of laboratory test cell and in-house testing capacity for heavy-duty spark-ignition engines <p>Response: Heavy-duty spark-ignition (HDSI) engines represent less than 4% of heavy-duty highway production. NVFEL is able to test all the other sectors and can use contract laboratories or portable emissions measurement systems to test HDSI engines if necessary. Therefore, investment in HDSI testing capacity has not been a priority to date.</p> <p>Going forward, we will formally document and periodically reassess decisions about investments in laboratory capacity as part of a periodic risk assessment. Planned Completion Date: End of Q3 2021.</p> <p><i>Planned: 9/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p> <hr/> <p>Recommendation: Evaluate the following issues, which may require regulatory or programmatic action, as part of (1) the on-road heavy-duty vehicle and engine emission control program risk assessment and (2) EPA’s annual regulatory agenda development process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Regulatory definition of on-road heavy-duty engine useful life may not reflect actual useful life. Not-to-Exceed standard may not reflect real-world operating conditions, especially for certain applications. In-use testing requirements for heavy-duty spark-ignition engines may be needed. 	

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>d. A particle number standard may more accurately control particulate matter emissions that impact human health.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OAR agrees with this recommendation. We will consider the first three issues as part of the CTI rulemaking process. We also will commit to considering approaches to best control particulate matter emissions that affect public health and will continue to work toward improving ultrafine particulate matter measurement techniques. <i>Planned: 9/30/22, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
19-P00207-140	<p>Recommendation: Develop and implement electronic checks in EPA’s Emissions Collection and Monitoring Plan System or through an alternative mechanism to retroactively evaluate emissions and quality assurance data in instances where monitoring plan changes are submitted after the emissions and quality assurance data have already been accepted by EPA.</p> <p>Corrective Action: The Office of Air and Radiation agrees with this recommendation. As OIG acknowledged in its report, CAMD has already addressed this issue by implementing a post-submission data check that is run at the end of each reporting period. The new check identifies any monitoring plan submissions containing changes to monitoring span records that occur prior to the current emissions reporting period. If any changes were made, the check recalculates quality assurance tests that were submitted prior to the span change and verifies the pass/fail status of each test. If the status of any test changes, CAMD analysts will contact the affected facility and request the correction and resubmission of the impacted data. As of February 2019, CAMD had insured that the discrepancies in the data used in OIG’s review were resolved and resubmitted.</p> <p>In the long term, CAMD will implement an additional check in the ECMPS forcing retroactive span record changes to require the reevaluation and resubmission of any affected quality assurance tests and hourly emissions records. CAMD has initiated the process of re-engineering ECMPS. In order to minimize additional expenditures on the current version of ECMPS, CAMD will focus on adding the check to the new version of ECMPS. <i>Planned: 9/30/22, Status: Adhering</i></p>	6/27/19
19-P00251-140	<p>Recommendation: Assess the training needs of the EPA regions and state, local and tribal agencies concerning stack test plans and report reviews and EPA test methods, and develop and publish a plan to address any training shortfalls.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OAR will implement the following corrective action. OAR’s Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards</p>	7/30/19

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>(OAQPS) will work with the EPA regions and state, local and tribal air agencies to review currently available materials and assess training needs with respect to approval of stack test plans, review of stack test reports, and conduct of EPA test methods, with respect to particulate matter compliance testing. OAQPS will work with EPA regional, state, local and tribal agencies to identify current training shortfalls and develop a plan to address these shortfalls. We anticipate two and one-half years to assess the training needs, prepare a training plan, and begin enacting the plan. <i>Planned: 3/31/22, Status: Adhering</i></p> <p>Recommendation: Develop stack test report checklists for EPA Method 5 and other frequently used EPA methods to assist state, local and tribal agencies in their reviews of stack test plans and reports.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OAR will implement the following corrective action. OAQPS will work with the EPA regions, state, local and tribal air agencies to develop checklists useful for review of stack test plans, and stack test reports for EPA Method 1, Method 2, Method 3, Method 4, Method 5, Method 7E, and Method 10. OAQPS will provide this content as informational and not to be used as official Regulatory Guidance. We anticipate that it will take approximately 18 months for these checklists to be finalized. <i>Planned: 6/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
17-P00053-164	<p>Recommendation: Conduct an assessment of clearance devices to validate their effectiveness in detecting required clearance levels, as part of the Office of Pesticide Programs' ongoing re-evaluation of structural fumigants.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Within two years of the final report, by November 30, 2018, OCSPP will validate and implement new device clearance guidance. <i>Planned: 11/30/18, Status: Delayed</i></p>	12/12/16
17-P00395-164	<p>Recommendation: Develop and implement a plan to reduce excess Pesticides Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund and Pesticide Registration Fund balances within the established target range.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Assess progress in achieving 2020 spend down projections, as described in 11/13/17 memo from OCSPP to OIG entitled "Response to Final Report: EPA Needs to Manage Pesticide Funds More Efficiently," Report No. 17-P-0395. <i>Planned: 12/31/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	9/18/17
18-P00080-164	<p>Recommendation 1: The Assistant Administrator for Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention, in coordination with the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance: 1. Develop and implement a methodology to evaluate the impact of the revised</p>	2/15/18

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>Agricultural Worker Protection Standard on pesticide exposure incidents among target populations.</p> <p>Corrective Action 1-1: CA 1 -- OCSPP will: (1) collect and review data related to the extent to which agricultural workers obtain knowledge through trainings; (2) collect and review incident data; and (3) after reviewing training and incident data, analyze the need to collect additional information to help evaluate the impact of the revised Worker Protection Standard. These efforts, as well as a detailed timeline for completion of specific milestones, are described in the Agency's 2/25/19 Response to the OIG's Final Report. After reviewing training and incident data, OCSPP will consider the need to collect additional information to help evaluate the impact of the revised Worker Protection Standard. EPA will examine the potential for additional sources of information that might contribute to a better understanding of the rule's impact by December 2022. Target Completion Date: OCSPP will complete a Final Report on the three efforts described below by December 31, 2022. <i>Planned: 12/31/22, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
19-P00195-164	<p>Recommendation: Complete the actions and milestones identified in the Office of Pesticide Programs' PRIA Maintenance Fee Risk Assessment document and associated plan regarding the fee payment and refund posting processes.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OCSPP/OPP will complete the actions and milestones identified in the Office of Pesticide Programs' PRIA Maintenance Fee Risk Assessment document and associated plan regarding the fee payment and refund posting processes by 12/31/2020. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	6/21/19
19-P00275-164	<p>Recommendation: Determine how EPA can use the Managed Pollinator Protection Plan survey results to advance its National Program Manager Guidance goals and its regulatory mission.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OCSPP accepts the recommendation to utilize the AAPCO/SFIREG survey results to advance the Program's National Program Management Goals (NPMG1). OCSPP will use the information provided from the AAPCO/SFIREG survey to revise applicable NPMGs at the next available opportunity in the cycle of NPMG planning. OCSPP projects this task will be completed in June 2021. <i>Planned: 6/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	8/15/19
18-P00240-166	<p>Recommendation: Build capacity for managing the use of citizen science, and expand awareness of citizen science resources, by:</p> <p>a. Finalizing the checklist on administrative and legal factors for agency staff to consider when developing citizen science projects, as well as identifying and developing any procedures needed to ensure compliance with steps in the checklist;</p>	9/5/18

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>b. Conducting training and/or marketing on EPA’s citizen science intranet site for program and regional staff in developing projects; and</p> <p>c. Finalizing and distributing materials highlighting project successes and how EPA has used results of its investment in citizen science.</p> <p>Corrective Action: ORD will consult with OGC and other relevant EPA programs and regions to finalize the checklist on administrative and legal factors for agency staff to consider when developing citizen science projects. ORD will conduct training and marketing for program and regional staff. Finally, ORD will have an active communication and outreach strategy that will include communications materials highlighting project successes and how EPA has used results of its investment in citizen science. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	
13-P00178-167	<p>Recommendation: Develop and implement an inspection monitoring and oversight program to better manage and assess the quality of program inspections, reports, supervisory oversight, and compliance with inspection guidance.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OSWER and OECA are working with the Regions to identify key components of a repository of inspection reports in order to better ensure and assess the quality of RMP inspections. This repository system will be developed by the end of FY2014.</p> <p>May 2018 Update: The OLEM Acting AA approved the revision of this milestone date from February 28, 2020 to June 30, 2023. The new date is based on the completion date of RMP Reconsideration rule. OLEM will need at least 3 years after its completion to start the development of an on-line system for the Regions to file/submit each of their inspection reports. This system must allow for quality control and the ability to not only assess the quality of the inspection reports but identify trends and issues at RMP facilities in order to better target our inspection efforts. Following completion of the final regulation, EPA will be required to revise the RMP on-line reporting system and over a dozen guidance documents to incorporate the regulatory changes. This action will take approximately one year to complete following the completion of the guidance in corrective action 1-1 above. Therefore, this action item should be delayed until after the completion of that work. (The OLEM Acting AA notified the OIG via email dated May 15, 2018.)</p> <p>For recommendation #2: July 2017 Update: The OLEM Acting AA approved the revision of this milestone date from September</p>	3/21/13

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>30, 2019 to February 2020. This action requires the development of an on-line system for the Regions to file/submit each of their inspection reports. This system must allow for quality control and the ability to not only assess the quality of the inspection reports but identify trends and issues at RMP facilities in order to better target our inspection efforts. Recently, EPA published a final rule extending the effective date on the January 2017 revised RMP rule to February 2019. For the next 20 months, EPA will be engaged in drafting and publishing a proposed and final rule. Following completion of the final regulation, EPA will be required to revise the RMP on-line reporting system and over a dozen guidance documents to incorporate the regulatory changes. This action will take approximately one year to complete following the completion of the guidance in corrective action 1-1 above. Therefore, this action item should be delayed until after the completion of that work. (The OLEM Acting AA notified the OIG AIG, Carolyn Copper, via email on 07/07/2017.)</p> <p>March 2016 Update: The OLEM AA approved to revise the corrective action milestone date from March 30, 2017, to September 30, 2019. This action requires the development on an on-line system for the Regions to file/submit each of their inspection reports. This system must allow for quality control and the ability to not only assess the quality of the inspection reports but identify trends and issues at RMP facilities in order to better target our inspection efforts. Currently the Administration's priority is to complete a final RMP regulation by late 2016/early 2017. Following completion of the final regulation, EPA will be required to revise the RMP on-line reporting system and over a dozen guidance documents to incorporate the regulatory changes. This effort will take 2-3 years and must be completed in that timeframe to give facilities time to review the guidance and comply with the new requirements under the RMP Program. Therefore, this OIG action item must be delayed until after the completion of that work. This action will take approximately one year to complete following the completion of the guidance in corrective action 1-1 above. (The OIG was notified via an email from the OLEM AA to Art Elkins on 03/11/2016.)</p> <p>July 2014 Update: The OSWER AA approved to revise the corrective action date from 09/30/14 to 03/31/17. This corrective action has been overtaken by actions and deadlines associated with implementation of Executive Order 13650, Improving Chemical Facility Safety and Security, which lays out a</p>	

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	comprehensive set of actions to advance chemical facility safety and security, including federal coordination on inspections. We anticipate the repository will take 18 months to 2 years to complete once we start. (The OIG was notified of this delay via an email from the OSWER AA to the Inspector General dated 07/30/14). <i>Planned: 9/30/14, Status: Delayed</i>	
18-P00059-167	<p>Recommendation: Develop and include procedures for checking with other regions for facilities/sites with multiple self-insured liabilities in the standard operating procedures created for Recommendation 5.</p> <p>Corrective Action: 6. In the RCRA Program, EPA will inventory and assess existing guidance and/or SOPs, outline OLEM and OECA roles and responsibilities for overseeing the validity of RCRA financial assurance instruments, communicate existing guidance and/or SOPs to financial assurance community, and develop or update SOPs and provide to financial assurance community. The RCRA Program will develop and include procedures for checking with other regions or states when facilities/sites with multiple self-insured liabilities exist.</p> <p>May 2019 Update: The OLEM Acting AA approved the revision of this milestone date from June 20, 2020 to September 30, 2021 as a result of the delay in launching the RCRAInfo Financial Assurance module upgrade to version 6. New expected date delivery is 09/30/21. Acting OLEM AA, Barry Breen, notified Acting IG Charles Sheehan on Tuesday, May 7, 2019. <i>Planned: 6/30/20, Status: Delayed</i></p> <p>Recommendation: Develop standard operating procedures that outline the Office of Land and Emergency Management and Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance roles and responsibilities for overseeing the validity of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and Superfund financial assurance instruments.</p> <p>Corrective Action: 5. EPA will, for the RCRA Program, inventory and assess existing guidance and/or SOPs, outline OLEM and OECA roles and responsibilities for overseeing the validity of RCRA financial assurance instruments, communicate existing guidance and/or SOPs to financial assurance community, and develop or update SOPs and provide to financial assurance community.</p> <p>May 2019 Update: The OLEM Acting AA approved the revision of this milestone date from June 20, 2020 to September 30, 2021 as a result of the delay in launching the RCRAInfo Financial</p>	12/22/17

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>Assurance module upgrade to version 6. New expected date delivery is 09/30/21. Acting OLEM AA, Barry Breen, notified Acting IG Charles Sheehan on Tuesday, May 7, 2019. <i>Planned: 6/30/20, Status: Delayed</i></p> <p>Recommendation: Develop and include instructions on the steps to take when an invalid financial assurance instrument (expired, insufficient in dollar amount, or not provided) is identified in the standard operating procedures created for Recommendation 5 and collect information on the causes of invalid financial assurance.</p> <p>Corrective Action: 7. In the RCRA Program, EPA will inventory and assess existing guidance and/or SOPs, outline OLEM and OECA roles and responsibilities for overseeing the validity of RCRA financial assurance instruments, communicate existing guidance and/or SOPs to financial assurance community, and develop or update SOPs and provide to financial assurance community.</p> <p>The RCRA Program will develop and include in the guidance and/or SOPs: (1) instructions on the steps to take when an invalid financial assurance instrument (expired, insufficient in dollar amount, or not provided) is identified and (2) where and when to collect and document causes of invalid financial assurance.</p> <p>May 2019 Update: For corrective actions 5, 6 and 7, the OLEM Acting AA approved the revision of this milestone date from June 20, 2020 to September 30, 2021 as a result of the delay in launching the RCRAInfo Financial Assurance module upgrade to version 6. New expected date delivery is 09/30/21. Acting OLEM AA, Barry Breen, notified Acting IG Charles Sheehan on Tuesday, May 7, 2019. <i>Planned: 6/30/20, Status: Delayed</i></p> <p>Recommendation: Train staff on the procedures and instructions developed for Recommendations 5 through 7.</p> <p>Corrective Action: 8. In the RCRA Program, EPA will hold webinar for the EPA regions and states, add SOPs to existing training materials, and evaluate financial assurance training needs and develop training plan for recommendations 5 through 7.</p> <p>May 2019 Update: the OLEM Acting AA approved the revision of this milestone date from September 30, 2020 to December 31, 2021 as a result of the delay in launching the RCRAInfo Financial Assurance module upgrade to version 6. New expected date delivery is 12/31/21. Acting OLEM AA, Barry Breen,</p>	

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	notified Acting IG Charles Sheehan on Tuesday, May 7, 2019. <i>Planned: 9/30/20, Status: Delayed</i>	
20-P00066-167	<p>Recommendation: Maintain one official agencywide management and tracking system for homeland security and emergency response equipment that provides for the status, availability and acquisition costs of all equipment.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Establish AAMS as the agencywide system for tracking personal property. <i>Planned: 6/30/22, Status: Adhering</i></p>	1/30/20
10-P00224-168	<p>Recommendation: Develop a systematic approach to identify which States have outdated or inconsistent MOAs, renegotiate and update those MOAs using the MOA template, and secure the active involvement and final, documented concurrence of Headquarters to ensure national consistency.</p> <p>Corrective Action: EPA has completed the review of all EPA-State MOAs. Ten authorized NPDES states were identified as being problematic. The EPA Regions and States have completed actions to update MOAs to satisfy concerns identified in the corrective action plan for three states: Iowa, Missouri, and Virginia. At this time, seven MOAs are still in the process of being corrected.</p> <p>OECA is requesting a six month extension to continue to work with the Office of Water and States on their MOAs to fulfill this corrective action. <i>Planned: 3/28/18, Status: Delayed</i></p>	9/14/10
19-P00002-168	<p>Recommendation: Issue updated and consistent guidance on biosolids fecal coliform sampling practices.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OW completed its work to address the corrective action on 12-16.20. The corrective actions will be published in an ORD document that is currently under review. The document will not meet the deadline for posting to the website by 12/30/2020. OST anticipates the updates will be publicly available by 5/31/2021. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p> <p>Recommendation: Publish guidance on the methods for the biosolids pathogen alternatives 3 and 4.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OW completed its work to address the corrective action on 12-16.20. The corrective actions will be published in an ORD document that is currently under review. The document will not meet the deadline for posting to the website by 12/30/2020. OST anticipates the updates will be publicly available by 5/31/2021. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	11/15/18

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>Recommendation: Develop and implement a plan to obtain the additional data needed to complete risk assessments and finalize safety determinations on the 352 identified pollutants in biosolids and promulgate regulations as needed.</p> <p>Corrective Action: For Recommendation 4, EPA agreed with this recommendation. The initial corrective action did not fully address the intent of the recommendation. After our meeting on September 17, 2018, EPA provided acceptable corrective actions and a planned completion date. In addition to EPA’s work on improving the biennial review process, the Office of Water established a performance measure for biennial reviews. This recommendation is resolved with corrective actions pending. <i>Planned: 12/31/22, Status: Adhering</i></p> <p>Recommendation: Complete development of the probabilistic risk assessment tool and screening tool for biosolids land application scenarios.</p> <p>Corrective Action: For Recommendation 3, the Agency agreed with the recommendation and offered an acceptable corrective action but did not provide a specific completion date. After our meeting on September 17, 2018, the Office of Water provided an acceptable completion date. This recommendation is resolved with corrective actions pending. <i>Planned: 12/31/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
19-P00318-168	<p>Recommendation: Update and revise the 2010 Public Notification Handbooks to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Public notice delivery methods that are consistent with regulations. b. Information on modern methods for delivery of public notice. c. Public notice requirements for the latest drinking water regulations. d. Procedures for public water systems to achieve compliance after violating a public notice regulation. e. Up-to-date references to compliance assistance tools. f. Additional resources for providing public notice in languages other than English. <p>Corrective Action: EPA will revise the Public Notification Handbook per OJG’s. <i>Planned: 9/30/20, Status: Delayed</i></p> <p>Recommendation: Update and revise the 2010 Revised State Implementation Guidance for the Public Notification Rule to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Public notice delivery methods that are consistent with regulations. b. Information on modern methods for delivery of public notice. 	9/25/19

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>Corrective Action: EPA will revise the State Implementation Guidance per OIG's recommendation. <i>Planned: 9/30/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	
18-P00059-180	<p>Recommendation: Update standard operating procedures and data systems to accommodate the changes implemented for Recommendation 2.</p>	12/22/17
	<p>Corrective Action: OLEM, w/support from OECA, will update SOPs and data systems to accommodate the implemented risk management actions. <i>Planned: 9/30/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
	<p>Recommendation: Train staff on the changes implemented for Recommendation 2.</p>	
	<p>Corrective Action: OLEM, w/support from OECA, will train staff on the implemented risk management actions. <i>Planned: 12/31/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
19-P00251-180	<p>Recommendation: Develop and implement a plan for improving the consistency of stack test reviews across the EPA regions and delegated agencies.</p>	7/30/19
	<p>Corrective Action: OECA will implement a plan, in coordination with OAR and consistent with the activities undertaken by OAR in addressing recommendations 2-3, for improving the consistency of stack test reviews across the EPA regions and delegated agencies. Such enhanced compliance monitoring will help ensure the tool of stack testing is being sufficiently and properly utilized. <i>Planned: 3/31/22, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
19-P-00302-180	<p>Recommendation: Establish the Lead-Based Paint Renovation, Repair and Painting Rule Program's objectives, goals and measurable outcomes, such as measures to demonstrate the effectiveness of program contributions toward decreasing elevated blood lead levels.</p>	9/9/19
	<p>Corrective Action: OECA, in collaboration with the EPA Regions, will evaluate the Lead-Based Paint Renovation, Repair and Painting Rule compliance monitoring and enforcement program to determine appropriate refinements to existing program objectives to help OECA set enforcement goals and measurable outcomes for FY21, consistent with the OECA National Program Guidance. <i>Planned: 7/1/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
	<p>Recommendation: Identify the regulated universe of Lead-Based Paint Renovation, Repair and Painting Rule firms in support of regional targeting strategies, in coordination with the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention.</p>	
	<p>Corrective Action: OECA, in coordination with OCSPP, will develop a targeting strategy that will include a geospatial-based</p>	

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>model to assist the Regions in identifying areas of concern for lead exposure in general along with any guidance on how to identify firms within this area.</p> <p><i>Planned: 12/31/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
19-P00318-180	<p>Recommendation: Conduct a national review of the adequacy of primacy agency implementation, compliance monitoring, reporting and enforcement of the Safe Drinking Water Act’s public notice requirements.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Over the past two years, OECA has been working with the Regions and the Office of Water to refine the scope, the mechanism and the roll out for a drinking water enforcement review (DW ER). Such a review examines whether a primacy agency is taking appropriate and timely actions to address violations; is properly escalating enforcement and is ensuring a facility's return to compliance. OECA is working closely with our Regional offices to ensure that this review complements existing oversight efforts and, in particular, does not duplicate OW programmatic reviews.</p> <p>OECA is building this nationally consistent framework from activities and reviews that select Regions are already implementing. In particular, OECA has been working with Regions 4, 5 and 7, who are currently doing these types of reviews with their states and sharing their experience and lessons learned to help us build this national framework. Additional time in 2021 will allow these Regions the chance to perform additional enforcement reviews and allow OECA to coordinate and parallel its construction of a national framework as these reviews are undertaken.</p> <p>Once the pilot is completed, OECA will work across all its Regions and in partnership with the states to institutionalize this element of enforcement program oversight.</p> <p>OECA will pilot test a new framework for regional review of primacy agency response to violations, including whether public notice requirements are met. Upon completion of the pilot, OECA will review the results and, if the approach is effective, will finalize the framework and implement a national program for periodic regional reviews for primacy agencies. OECA will pilot test a new framework for regional review of primacy agency response to violations, including whether public notice requirements are met. Upon completion of the pilot, OECA will</p>	9/25/19

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>review the results and, if the approach is effective, will finalize the framework and implement a national program for periodic regional reviews for primacy agencies. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p>	
20-P00012-180	<p>Recommendation: Require circuit riders to include the pesticide needs and risks of each tribe on their circuit in the development of their priority-setting plans, which are a required component of tribal pesticide enforcement cooperative agreements.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OECA agrees to develop guidance which will require circuit riders to include the needs and risks of each tribe on their circuit in the development of priority-setting plans, which are required component of tribal pesticide enforcement cooperative agreements. (FINAL GUIDANCE). <i>Planned: 12/31/22, Status: Adhering</i></p> <p>Recommendation: Develop and implement tribal circuit rider guidance for pesticide inspectors that includes expectation-setting and communication with tribes that are being served under a tribal pesticide enforcement cooperative agreement.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OECA agrees to develop guidance which will require circuit riders to include the needs and risks of each tribe on their circuit in the development of priority-setting plans, which are required component of tribal pesticide enforcement cooperative agreements. (FINAL GUIDANCE). <i>Planned: 12/31/22, Status: Adhering</i></p> <p>Recommendation: Develop and implement regional processes to receive feedback directly from tribes using pesticide circuit riders.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OECA agrees to develop guidance which will require circuit riders to include the needs and risks of each tribe on their circuit in the development of priority-setting plans, which are required component of tribal pesticide enforcement cooperative agreements. (FINAL GUIDANCE). <i>Planned: 12/31/22, Status: Adhering</i></p>	10/29/19
14-P00109-360	<p>Recommendation: Direct COs to require that the contractor adjust all its billings to reflect the application of the correct rate to team subcontract ODCs.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Region 6 concurs with Recommendation No. 3 and agrees to require the contractor to adjust all of its past billings to reflect the application of the composite rate to team-subcontractor ODCs that were arranged for and paid for by the team-subcontractor. We intend to implement the corrective action when final indirect cost rates (OCR) are established. Therefore,</p>	2/4/14

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	the CO will be directed to defer past billing adjustments until the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) audits the indirect cost rates and the EPA Financial Administrative Contracting Officer (FACO) negotiates, approves and issues a Final Indirect Cost (ICR) Agreement for the past billing periods (i.e. Years 2007 to 2013). <i>Planned: 9/30/24, Status: Adhering</i>	
18-P00233-360	<p>Recommendation: We recommend that the EPA Regional Administrators, Regions 6 and 9: Fully develop and implement prioritization and resource allocation methodologies for the Tronox abandoned uranium mine sites on or near Navajo Nation lands.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Complete development and implementation of resource allocation methodology following the cost analysis of the preferred remedies. Complete prioritization list for funding by December 31, 2021. Establish a funding allocation strategy for the prioritized NAUM sites by December 31, 2021. Complete final resource allocations by May 31, 2022. <i>Planned: 12/31/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	8/22/18
12-100560-380	<p>Recommendation: Ensure the grantee addresses the recommendations and recover questioned and unsupported costs.</p> <p>Corrective Action: 3/20/15: OGD and the Region are discussing contents of proposed Final Determination Letter and need for a waiver request. Projected completion date is June 30, 2015.</p> <p>12/30/13: The Region is continuing to work with HQ and regional counsel on options for this recipient with a revised expected completion date of June 30,2014. The Region also will be looking to the new OMB Circular on cooperative audit resolution for some guidance.</p> <p>10/21/13: OGD and the Region are discussing contents of proposed Final Determination Letter. Projected completion date is December 30, 2013. <i>Status: Delayed</i></p>	9/24/07
18-P00233-390	<p>Recommendation: We recommend that the EPA Regional Administrators, Regions 6 and 9: Complete the necessary removal site evaluations and engineering evaluations/cost analyses.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Complete engineering evaluations/cost analyses. Region 6: COMPLETED 4 Draft Final EECAs for 18 Tronox NAUMs. Region 9: Draft 4 EE/CAs by September 30, 2021 at mines that are closest to residents, where exposure is higher, and human health risk is therefore potentially higher. Draft remaining</p>	8/22/18

FY Audit Number	Recommendations and Corrective Actions	Report Date
	<p>EE/CAs by December 31, 2021. <i>Planned: 12/31/20, Status: Delayed</i></p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that the EPA Regional Administrators, Regions 6 and 9: Fully develop and implement prioritization and resource allocation methodologies for the Tronox abandoned uranium mine sites on or near Navajo Nation lands.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Complete development and implementation of resource allocation methodology following the cost analysis of the preferred remedies. Complete prioritization list for funding by December 31, 2021. Establish a funding allocation strategy for the prioritized NAUM sites by December 31, 2021. Complete final resource allocations by May 31, 2022. <i>Planned: 12/31/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	
20-P-00063-451	<p>Recommendation: Evaluate and determine whether the improperly credited Travel Compensatory Time Off should have been forfeited as required by EPA's Pay Administration Manual and, if so, whether the time off or value of any time off used should be recovered.</p> <p>Corrective Action: OMS will review the travel compensatory time off cases and issue a determination on the findings. If recovery is warranted, OMS will notify the Office of Air and Radiation and the Office of the Chief Financial Officer so the process may be initiated. <i>Planned: 1/31/21, Status: Delayed</i></p>	12/19/19
20-P-00120-451	<p>Recommendation: Develop and maintain an up-to-date inventory of the software and associated licenses used within the organization.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Establishing License Entitlement Inventory. The Agency is developing and deploying an enterprise Software Asset and Configuration Management (SACM) capability that will align license entitlement data with software inventories to fully realize the goal of this recommendation. <i>Planned: 10/15/21, Status: Adhering</i></p>	3/25/20

EPA GAO Open Recommendations and Recommendations Closed as Unimplemented

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-06-148	2006-01-04	The Administrator, EPA, should take a number of steps to further protect the American public from elevated lead levels in drinking water. Specifically, to improve EPA's ability to oversee implementation of the lead rule and assess compliance and enforcement activities, EPA should ensure that data on water systems' test results, corrective action milestones, and violations are current, accurate, and complete. (1)	In recent years, EPA has taken the significant steps to protect the American public from elevated lead levels in drinking water. Examples of the Agency's actions include: Proposed regulations, updates to the Lead and Copper Rule, MOU's with federal partners to reduce lead in schools and childcare facilities, funding for states to test drinking water in schools, reviews and quality control evaluations of state data and files to improve accuracy of reporting, and modernization of EPA's Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS) database.
GAO-08-440	2008-03-07	To develop timely chemical risk information that EPA needs to effectively conduct its mission, the Administrator, EPA, should require the Office of Research and Development to re-evaluate its draft proposed changes to the IRIS assessment process in light of the issues raised in this report and ensure that any revised process periodically assesses the level of resources that should be dedicated to this significant program to meet user needs and maintain a viable IRIS database. (5)	EPA leadership is working to initiate the new cycle of strategic planning. With respect to proposed changes to the IRIS assessment process, the IRIS Program is revising the nomination process for FY22 to address issues identified by GAO. To date, the previous September 2020 request for FY21 nominations was re-administered in March 2021 using a modified process that better engages the Regions and other offices in EPA that do not oversee statutory decision making, i.e., Office of Children's Health Protection. Using the nomination process to understand the Agency's assessment needs is the starting point for making informed decisions on resources.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-11-381	2011-06-17	To improve EPA's ability to oversee the states' implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act and provide Congress and the public with more complete and accurate information on compliance, the Administrator of EPA should resume data verification audits to routinely evaluate the quality of selected drinking water data on health-based and monitoring violations that the states provide to EPA. These audits also should evaluate the quality of data on the enforcement actions that states and other primacy agencies have taken to correct violations. (1)	On September 30, 2020, OW submitted additional supporting documentation to promote closure of the open recommendations and hosted a follow up technical meeting on November 16, 2020.
GAO-11-381	2011-06-17	To improve EPA's ability to oversee the states' implementation of the Safe Drinking Water Act and provide Congress and the public with more complete and accurate information on compliance, the Administrator of EPA should work with the states to establish a goal, or goals, for the completeness and accuracy of data on monitoring violations. In setting these goals, EPA may want to consider whether certain types of monitoring violations merit specific targets. For example, the Agency may decide that a goal for the states to completely and accurately report when required monitoring was not done should differ from a goal for reporting when monitoring was done but not reported on time. (2)	On September 30, 2020, OW submitted additional supporting documentation to promote closure of the open recommendations and hosted a follow up technical meeting on November 16, 2020.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-12-42	2011-12-09	To better ensure the credibility of IRIS assessments by enhancing their timeliness and certainty, the EPA Administrator should require the Office of Research and Development, should different time frames be necessary, to establish a written policy that clearly describes the applicability of the time frames for each type of IRIS assessment and ensures that the time frames are realistic and provide greater predictability to stakeholders. (2)	As part of adjustments to the nomination process, the IRIS Program is soliciting information on context for the assessment and timelines under which the assessment is needed. These inputs will be considered as part of ORD's analysis of which nominations the IRIS Program can realistically commit to. Other key inputs are the anticipated complexity of the assessment and resourcing (i.e., contract support and/or availability of staff with the appropriate expertise). Nominations that are formally accepted by ORD are then communicated publicly in the IRIS Program Outlook, with time frame estimates for public engagement. EPA is evaluating how complexities in IRIS assessments are communicated.
GAO-12-42	2011-12-09	To ensure that current and accurate information on chemicals that EPA plans to assess through IRIS is available to IRIS users--including stakeholders such as EPA program and regional offices, other federal agencies, and the public--the EPA Administrator should direct the Office of Research and Development to annually publish the IRIS agenda in the Federal Register each fiscal year. (4)	IRIS Integrated Assessment Plans (IAPs) and Systematic Review Protocols (Protocols) document chemical-specific considerations which inform the timelines presented in the IRIS Program Outlook.
GAO-12-791	2012-09-26	To enhance federal agencies' ability to realize enterprise architecture benefits, the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, the Air Force, the Army, Commerce, Defense, Education, Energy, Homeland Security, the Interior, Labor, the Navy, State, Transportation, the Treasury, and Veterans Affairs; the Attorney General; the Administrators of the	EPA has been rebuilding its Enterprise Architecture program. In FY20, the architecture program brought on senior expertise in network and security architecture, and has addressed needed stand-alone architecture tasks (e.g., initiating a baseline security architecture). The Architecture Program also has started building recurring programmatic elements (e.g., supporting deployment of DevSecOps capabilities) against which programmatic metrics can be

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
		<p>Environmental Protection Agency, General Services Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Small Business Administration; the Commissioners of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Social Security Administration; and the Directors of the National Science Foundation and the Office of Personnel Management should fully establish an approach for measuring enterprise architecture outcomes, including a documented method (i.e., steps to be followed) and metrics that are measurable, meaningful, repeatable, consistent, actionable, and aligned with the Agency's enterprise architecture's strategic goals and intended purpose. (18)</p>	<p>applied. During FY21, as those programmatic elements mature, EPA will revisit the Gartner guidance referenced earlier and identify at least one metric for the architecture program.</p>
GAO-12-791	2012-09-26	<p>To enhance federal agencies' ability to realize enterprise architecture benefits, the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, the Air Force, the Army, Commerce, Defense, Education, Energy, Homeland Security, the Interior, Labor, the Navy, State, Transportation, the Treasury, and Veterans Affairs; the Attorney General; the Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency, General Services Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Small Business Administration; the Commissioners of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Social Security Administration; and the Directors of the National Science Foundation and the Office</p>	<p>EPA has been rebuilding its Enterprise Architecture program. In FY20, the architecture program brought on senior expertise in network and security architecture, and has addressed needed stand-alone architecture tasks (e.g., initiating a baseline security architecture). The Architecture Program also has started building recurring programmatic elements (e.g., supporting deployment of DevSecOps capabilities) against which programmatic metrics can be applied. During FY21, as those programmatic elements mature, we will revisit the Gartner guidance referenced earlier and identify at least one metric for the architecture program.</p>

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
		of Personnel Management should periodically measure and report enterprise architecture outcomes and benefits to top agency officials (i.e., executives with authority to commit resources or make changes to the Program) and to OMB. (42)	
GAO-13-145	2013-08-08	To improve EPA's management of the conditional registration process, the Administrator of EPA should direct the Director of the Office of Pesticide Programs to complete plans to automate data related to conditional registrations to more readily track the status of these registrations and related registrant and agency actions and identify potential problems requiring management attention. (1)	EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs is providing status information on conditional registrations issued from 2000 through 2020 on the web at https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/conditional-pesticide-registration . IT modernization efforts enabling the Office of Pesticide Programs to track conditionally registered products electronically are targeted for completion in 2021.
GAO-13-249	2013-03-22	To better position EPA to collect chemical toxicity and exposure-related data and ensure chemical safety under existing TSCA authority, while balancing its workload, and to better position EPA to ensure chemical safety under existing TSCA authority, the Administrator of EPA should direct the appropriate offices to develop strategies for addressing challenges that impede the Agency's ability to meet its goal of ensuring chemical safety. At a minimum, the strategies should address challenges associated with: (1) obtaining toxicity and exposure data needed to conduct ongoing and future TSCA Work Plan risk assessments, (2) gaining access to toxicity and exposure data provided to the European Chemicals Agency, (3) working	OPPT completed its workforce analysis in December 2020. Over the past several years EPA has significantly increased its human capital resources to address the increased workload imposed by the amended TSCA. EPA requested that GAO close this pre-Lautenberg Act Report and declare all recommendations closed as implemented.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
		<p>with processors and processor associations to obtain exposure-related data, (4) banning or limiting the use of chemicals under section 6 of TSCA and planned actions for overcoming these challenges--including a description of other actions the Agency plans to pursue in lieu of banning or limiting the use of chemicals, and (5) identifying the resources needed to conduct risk assessments and implement risk management decisions in order to meet its goal of ensuring chemical safety. (3)</p>	
GAO-13-369	2013-05-10	<p>To ensure that EPA maximizes its limited resources and addresses the statutory, regulatory, and programmatic needs of EPA program offices and regions when IRIS toxicity assessments are not available, and once demand for the IRIS Program is determined, the EPA Administrator should direct the Deputy Administrator, in coordination with EPA's Science Advisor, to develop an agencywide strategy to address the unmet needs of EPA program offices and regions that includes, at a minimum: (1) coordination across EPA offices and with other federal research agencies to help identify and fill data gaps that preclude the Agency from conducting IRIS toxicity assessments, and (2) guidance that describes alternative sources of toxicity information and when it would be appropriate to use them when IRIS values are not</p>	<p>IRIS program officials are building capacity for applying systematic review in chemical assessments. They are communicating more frequently with EPA program and regional offices about program and regional office needs and the IRIS program's ability to meet those needs. IRIS officials will convene coordination meetings twice a year with relevant EPA program offices to discuss chemical assessments to meet agency needs.</p>

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
		available, applicable, or current. (3)	
GAO-14-274	2014-05-19	To strengthen federal oversight of facilities with ammonium nitrate, the Secretary of Labor and the Administrator of EPA should direct OSHA and EPA, respectively, to consider revising their related regulations to cover ammonium nitrate and jointly develop a plan to require high risk facilities with ammonium nitrate to assess the risks and implement safeguards to prevent accidents involving this chemical. (6)	In January 2017, EPA issued a final rule to modify its Risk Management Program (RMP) regulations. The Agency did not to propose any revisions to the list of regulated substances and does not plan to add ammonium nitrate to the RPM regulated program.
GAO-14-413	2014-05-22	To ensure the effective management of software licenses, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should develop an agency-wide comprehensive policy for the management of software licenses that addresses the weaknesses we identified. (87)	GAO informed EPA that they are in the process of closing this recommendation.
GAO-14-413	2014-05-22	To ensure the effective management of software licenses, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should employ a centralized software license management approach that is coordinated and integrated with key personnel for the majority of agency software license spending and/or enterprise-wide licenses. (88)	In 2020, EPA developed an automated process to track software license deployment that is monitored through a centralized dashboard. The Agency is working towards central tracking and maintenance for Agency software records. Once established, the policy for procurement and management of that software will soon follow.
GAO-14-65	2013-11-06	To improve the Agency's implementation of PortfolioStat, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should direct the CIO to develop a complete commodity IT baseline. (19)	In December 2020, EPA provided the latest 2020 READ business function inventory. EPA believes the recommendation is implemented and requested closure.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-14-65	2013-11-06	To improve the Agency's implementation of PortfolioStat, in future reporting to OMB, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should direct the CIO to fully describe the following PortfolioStat action plan elements: (1) consolidate commodity IT spending under the Agency CIO; (2) establish targets for commodity IT spending reductions and deadlines for meeting those targets; and (3) establish criteria for identifying wasteful, low-value, or duplicative investments. (20)	In December 2020, EPA provided documentary evidence supporting full implementation and requested closure.
GAO-14-65	2013-11-06	To improve the Agency's implementation of PortfolioStat, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should direct the CIO to report on the Agency's progress in consolidating the managed print services and strategic sourcing of end user computing to shared services as part of the OMB integrated data collection quarterly reporting until completed. (21)	Documentation of the print contract supporting this effort was provided in December 2020 with a request for closure.
GAO-15-617	2015-09-15	To improve the Agency's IT savings reinvestment plans, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should direct the CIO to ensure that the Agency's integrated data collection submission to OMB includes, for all reported initiatives, complete plans to reinvest any resulting cost savings and avoidances from OMB-directed IT reform-related efforts. (19)	This is a long-standing project requiring substantial coordination as EPA reviews and defines "reinvest" which could have significant implications on IT budget reporting requirements.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-15-618	2015-08-17	The EPA Administrator should direct OGD to develop a timetable with milestones and identify and allocate resources for adopting electronic records management for all 10 regional offices. (2)	Based on an April 2021 meeting with EPA and GAO, auditors are in the process of closing this recommendation.
GAO-15-618	2015-08-17	The EPA Administrator should direct OGD to implement plans for adopting an up-to-date and comprehensive IT system by 2017 that will provide accurate and timely data on agencywide compliance with grants management directives. (3)	Based on an April 2021 meeting with EPA and GAO, auditors are reviewing EPA's request for closure.
GAO-16-220	2016-02-10	To better ensure that EPA is reducing the risk of unreasonable harm to important pollinators, the Administrator of EPA should direct the Office of Pesticide Programs to develop a plan for obtaining data from pesticide registrants on the effects of pesticides on nonhoney bee species, including other managed or wild, native bees. (4)	<p>Closed – Not Implemented</p> <p>EPA's plan for obtaining data on the effects of pesticides on nonhoney bees is to adhere to the existing process that the Agency follows for other taxonomic groups. More specifically, EPA routinely uses surrogate species to evaluate risks from pesticides and has used honey bees as a surrogate for nonhoney bee species. Ideally, risk evaluations would be made using as many species as would likely be exposed. However, doing so would be impractical on a routine basis. EPA maintains that existing data indicate that honey bees continue to represent a reasonable surrogate for nonhoney bee species.</p>
GAO-16-220	2016-02-10	To help comply with the directive in the White House Pollinator Health Task Force's strategy, the Administrator of EPA should direct the Office of Pesticide Programs to identify the pesticide tank mixtures that farmers and pesticide applicators most commonly use on agricultural crops to help determine whether those mixtures pose greater risks	<p>Closed – Not implemented</p> <p>EPA conducted a pilot study to evaluate pesticide tank mixes used on almonds in California during bloom. Although the Agency was able to identify pesticide tank mixes applied during almond bloom, the number and variability in those combinations EPA concluded that is it not feasible to do so at a national level given the number of factors that influence such</p>

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
		than the sum of the risks posed by the individual pesticides. (5)	combinations even within a relatively localized area.
GAO-16-323	2016-03-03	The Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Education, Energy, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, Housing and Urban Development, the Interior, Labor, State, Transportation, the Treasury, and Veterans Affairs; the Attorney General of the United States; the Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency, General Services Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and U.S. Agency for International Development; the Director of the Office of Personnel Management; the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; and the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration should take action to improve progress in the data center optimization areas that we reported as not meeting OMB's established targets, including addressing any identified challenges. (27)	Closed – Not Implemented EPA initially agreed with this recommendation. However, in August 2016, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) announced changes to the optimization metrics that analyzed in GAO's report. In June 2019, OMB issued new data center optimization guidance that removed the remaining two optimization metrics for agencies. As a result of OMB's changes, EPA decided not to implement this recommendation.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-16-530	2016-07-14	The EPA Administrator should direct the Office of Grants and Debarment (OGD) and program and regional offices, as appropriate, as part of EPA's ongoing streamlining initiatives and the development of a grantee portal, to incorporate expanded search capability features, such as keyword searches, into its proposed web-based portal for collecting and accessing performance reports to improve their accessibility. (1)	Implementation of this recommendation is ongoing. In December 2020, EPA completed its migration to a new, comprehensive web-based IT application Next Generation Grants System (NGGS), which replaced the legacy grants management system. In addition, EPA launched an electronic grants file management system in March 2021, which will improve grants managers' access to performance information.
GAO-16-530	2016-07-14	The EPA Administrator should direct OGD and program and regional offices, as appropriate, as part of EPA's ongoing streamlining initiatives and the development of a grantee portal, once EPA's new performance system is in place, to ensure that the Office of Water adopts software tools, as appropriate, to electronically transfer relevant data on program results from program-specific databases to EPA's national performance system. (3)	Implementation of this recommendation is ongoing. Following its adoption of a new IT system for budget performance data in December 2017, EPA began developing the capability for program offices to import data from their program-specific databases electronically, via a machine-readable template.
GAO-16-530	2016-07-14	The EPA Administrator should direct OGD and program and regional offices, as appropriate, as part of EPA's ongoing streamlining initiatives and the development of a grantee portal, to clarify the factors project officers should consider when determining whether performance reports are consistent with EPA's environmental results directive. (4)	Implementation of this recommendation is ongoing. Specifically, EPA is in the process of revising guidance to clarify the factors project officers should consider when determining whether performance reports are consistent with EPA's environmental results directive.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-16-530	2016-07-14	The EPA Administrator should direct OGD and program and regional offices, as appropriate, as part of EPA's ongoing streamlining initiatives and the development of a grantee portal, to expand aspects of EPA's policy for certain categorical grants, specifically, the call for an explicit reference to the planned results in grantees' work plans and their projected time frames for completion, to all grants. (5)	Implementation of this recommendation is ongoing. In December 2020, EPA completed migration to a new, comprehensive web-based IT application Next Generation Grants System (NGGS), which replaced the legacy grants management system. EPA plans to assess and evaluate a web-based portal for collecting performance information from grantees as a post-deployment enhancement to the system, by the end of December 2021, and any solution developed will cover all grantees.
GAO-16-530	2016-07-14	The EPA Administrator should direct OGD and program and regional offices, as appropriate, as part of EPA's ongoing streamlining initiatives and the development of a grantee portal, to incorporate built-in data quality controls for performance reports into the planned web-based portal based on EPA's environmental results directive. (6)	Implementation of this recommendation is ongoing. In December 2020, EPA completed its migration to a new, comprehensive web-based IT application Next Generation Grants System (NGGS), which replaced the legacy grants management system. EPA will assess and evaluate a web-based portal for collecting performance information from grantees as a post-deployment enhancement to the system, by December 31, 2021. Data quality standards—including those for submitting performance reports—will be established as part of the assessment of enhancements to NGGS.
GAO-16-79	2015-11-19	To better monitor and provide a basis for improving the effectiveness of cybersecurity risk mitigation activities, informed by the sectors' updated plans and in collaboration with sector stakeholders, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should direct responsible officials to develop performance metrics to provide data and determine how to overcome challenges to monitoring the water and wastewater systems sector's cybersecurity progress. (7)	EPA continues to carry out its sector-specific agency role and consult with the Water Sector Coordinating Council (WSCC), Department of Homeland Security, and National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), as appropriate, to promote cybersecurity and understand the use of the cybersecurity framework across the water sector consistent with statutory requirements. In December 2020 EPA provided final documentation and requested closure.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-17-424	2017-09-01	The Assistant Administrator for Water of EPA's Office of Water should require states to report available information about lead pipes to EPA's Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS)/Fed (or a future redesign such as SDWIS Prime) database, in its upcoming revision of the LCR. (1)	EPA has initiated work to develop guidance for States and Water systems that will share best practices for preparing and updating Lead Service Line inventories. EPA promulgated requirements for states to report lead service line information to EPA under 40 CFR 142.15(c)(4)(iii)(D) in the LCRR published on January 15,2021.
GAO-17-424	2017-09-01	The Assistant Administrator for Water of EPA's Office of Water should require states to report all 90th percentile sample results for small water systems to EPA's SDWIS/Fed (or a future redesign such as SDWIS Prime) database, in its upcoming revision of the LCR. (2)	EPA promulgated a requirement for states to report the 90th percentile sample results for each water system regardless of size to EPA under 40 CFR 142.15(c)(4)(iii)(A) as part of the LCRR published on January 15, 2021. Reporting to EPA will be done through the SDWIS database. EPA is currently developing a SDWIS-State module for state to use to oversee LCRR implementation.
GAO-17-424	2017-09-01	The Assistant Administrator for Water of EPA's Office of Water and the Assistant Administrator of EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance should develop a statistical analysis that incorporates multiple factors--including those currently in SDWIS/Fed and others such as the presence of lead pipes and the use of corrosion control--to identify water systems that might pose a higher likelihood for violating the LCR once complete violations data are obtained, such as through SDWIS Prime. (3)	EPA is currently working with state representatives to develop the modernized SDWIS. EPA works closely with state primacy agencies to gather reliable violations data. EPA also tracks Action Level Exceedances. Both violation and ALE data are provided to EPA's regional program and enforcement staff on a quarterly basis for review and discussion with states, and for decisions on needed technical assistance or enforcement actions. The use of the internal tool has benefited EPA's priority efforts to assist systems with lead contamination.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-17-448	2017-08-15	The Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Homeland Security, Energy, HHS, Interior, Labor, State, Transportation, Treasury, and VA; the Attorney General of the United States; the Administrators of EPA, GSA, and SBA; the Director of OPM; and the Chairman of NRC should take action to, within existing OMB reporting mechanisms, complete plans describing how the Agency will achieve OMB's requirement to implement automated monitoring tools at all agency-owned data centers by the end of fiscal year 2018. (15)	EPA uses ScienceLogic's EM7 monitoring tool for measuring server utilization. EPA expects to expand use of the tool to DCOI-DC-45634 (NEIC) once the facility is completed (expected Q4 2021). Work is underway to close the data center footprint in DCOI-DC-45621 (PYD) which is expected to complete by Q4 2021.
GAO-18-102	2018-01-26	The Assistant Administrator for Water should direct EPA's Office of Water to amend its Safe Drinking Water Act and Clean Water Act inspection guidance documents to add questions on strategic workforce planning topics--such as the number of positions needed in the future, skills needed in the future, and any potential gaps in water operator positions. (1)	In December 2020, EPA requested closure of this recommendation. EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) developed the Clean Water Act inspection guidance documents highlighted in the recommendation.
GAO-18-148	2017-11-07	The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) should ensure that the CIO of EPA establishes an agency-wide policy and process for the CIO's certification of major IT investments' adequate use of incremental development, in accordance with OMB's guidance on the implementation of FITARA, and confirm that it includes: a description of the CIO's role in the certification process; a description of how CIO	EPA's Office of Mission Support, Environmental Information, Office of Customer Advocacy, Policy and Portfolio Management (PMD) acknowledges GAOs recommendations and commits to continuing to establish and execute the necessary steps to complete as well as implement agency-wide policy, procedures and processes for the CIO certification of major IT investments; and will ensure its major IT investments always demonstrate adequate use of incremental development and conform to OMB FITARA guidance.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
		certification will be documented; and a definition of incremental development and time frames for delivering functionality, consistent with OMB guidance. (11)	
GAO-18-211	2018-02-15	The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should take steps to consult with respective sector partner(s), such as the SCC, DHS and NIST, as appropriate, to develop methods for determining the level and type of framework adoption by entities across their respective sector. (4)	EPA conducted training, webcasts, and outreach related to cybersecurity, including using the framework and tailoring its efforts to sector needs. EPA used the NIST framework to inform development of its cyber resources. EPA has been consulting with Federal partners to develop potential options for promoting and assessing adoption of the framework.
GAO-18-309	2018-05-15	The Administrator of EPA, in cooperation with other members of the tribal infrastructure task force, should review the 2011 task force report and identify and implement additional actions to help increase the task force's collaboration at the national level. (8)	EPA's Office of Water submitted responses to GAO questions and documentation supporting implementation in November and December 2020 with a request for closure.
GAO-18-410	2018-07-12	The Director, working with the Study, should ensure that as the Study finalizes its reporting format, it fully incorporates leading practices of performance reporting. (1)	The Study is still on track to complete an online reporting and tracking system by mid-year 2021. Once the online tracking system is in place, EPA will consider this recommendation to be fully implemented.
GAO-18-410	2018-07-12	The Director, working with the Study, should estimate the range of potential costs for all implementation actions and include the estimates in future supplements to the 2015 plan. (3)	The Study finalized the 2020-2024 implementation action update in October 2020 and is currently finalizing the technical supporting documents that accompany each of the implementation actions.
GAO-18-453	2018-07-19	The EPA Region 10 Administrator should work with the management conference on future updates to the CCMP to help prioritize among the indicators that currently lack measurable targets and ensure that such targets are developed for the highest priority indicators where possible. (1)	EPA continues to work with the leader of the management conference, the Puget Sound Partnership, on the effort to review and revise the Puget Sound recovery vital signs, including updating associated indicators and targets. Progress on this effort was presented at the May 2020 Ecosystem Coordination Board meeting. The effort is on schedule to be completed

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
			for the 2022 Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) update.
GAO-18-561	2018-08-24	The Administrator of the EPA should develop a program management plan that includes a schedule of the actions EPA will take and the resources and funding it needs to establish and implement the Columbia River Basin Restoration Program, including formation of the associated Columbia River Basin Restoration Working Group, and submit this plan to the appropriate congressional authorizing committees as part of the fiscal year 2020 budget process. (1)	Closed – Not Implemented EPA developed a program management plan for the implementation of the new CWA 320 authority and provided GAO with an updated program plan for FY21 and FY22 with program objectives, actions, and timelines for both the Working Group and grant program. In addition, the CRBRP successfully launched the first grant competition awarding \$2M in 14 grants (13 in R10 and 1 in R8) in September 2020 and held two formal Working Group meetings (virtually due to COVID) with over 100 attendees. Although it was not included in the FY20 budget process, EPA considers the intent of this recommendation to be met.
GAO-18-93	2018-08-02	The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should ensure that the Agency's IT management policies address the role of the CIO for key responsibilities in the six areas we identified. (19)	EPA's OCAPPM is working on the Agency's IT management policies to address to role of the CIO for key responsibilities in the six areas that GAO identified. OCAPPM will provide an update on this initiative in mid- FY 21.
GAO-19-22	2019-03-20	The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should develop a documented policy or clarify existing policy to implement the statutory requirement to consult with ANCs on the same basis as Indian tribes under Executive Order 13175. (2)	This recommendation is in progress and has not been fully implemented. Due to the COVID pandemic, tribal consultation was extended an additional three months to allow for more input. It is estimated that the project will be completed in 2021.
GAO-19-280	2019-07-08	The EPA Administrator should direct EPA officials responsible for appointing advisory committee members to follow a key step in its appointment process—developing and including draft membership grids in appointment packets with staff rationales for proposed	EPA continues to disagree with this recommendation. It is up to the EPA Administrator to develop policy for the Agency and as such, it is within the Administrator's authority to develop and/or alter policies to fit particular circumstances. In the cases cited by the GAO, the Administrator substituted the

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
		membership— for all committees. (1)	creation of a membership grid with a series of briefings that enabled an in-depth discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of each potential candidate. EPA requested closure of this recommendation.
GAO-19-280	2019-07-08	EPA’s Designated Agency Ethics Official should direct EPA’s Ethics Office, as part of its periodic review of EPA’s ethics program, to evaluate—for example, through audits or spot-checks—the quality of financial disclosure reviews for special government employees appointed to EPA advisory committees. (2)	At the time of the GAO audit, EPA’s Ethics Office was understaffed. These staffing issues have been resolved and, as a result, EPA is now engaged in a full and thorough review of all employees’ (including special government employees engaged to work on EPA federal advisory committees) ethics forms to ensure that they meet all ethics requirements. EPA is on track to launch an electronic financial disclosure reporting system for special government employees in 2021.
GAO-19-384	2019-07-25	The Administrator of EPA should update the Agency's policies to require an organization-wide cybersecurity risk assessment. (39)	EPA updated policies and provided them to GAO in 2020. The Agency awaits closure of the recommendation.
GAO-19-384	2019-07-25	The Administrator of EPA should establish a process for conducting an organization-wide cybersecurity risk assessment. (40)	EPA is collaborating internally with the Office of Customer Advocacy, Policy & Portfolio Management OCAPPM to have all relevant policies and procedures reviewed on a timely basis. OCAPPM has established an agency-wide process for reviewing, modifying, and re-issuing (after signatories) all policies and procedures. NIST published the latest revision of Special Publication 800-53, Revision 5 in September 2020. EPA is in the process of reviewing, modifying, and re-issuing all security policies/procedures per the OCAPPM review process.
GAO-19-384	2019-07-25	The Administrator of EPA should fully establish and document a process for coordination between cybersecurity risk management and enterprise risk management functions. (41)	EPA updated policies and provided them to GAO in 2020. The Agency awaits closure of the recommendation.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-19-391	2019-06-21	The Administrator of EPA should work with the Commissioner of FDA and Secretary of Agriculture to incorporate leading collaboration practices as they implement their interagency FLW reduction strategic plan, to include (1) agreeing on roles and responsibilities; (2) developing mechanisms to monitor, evaluate, and report on results; (3) clearly defining short- and long-term outcomes; (4) identifying how leadership commitment will be sustained; and (5) ensuring that the relevant stakeholders have been included in the collaborative effort.(1)	EPA considers the recommendation parts 1, 2, 4 and 5 fully implemented. Parts 3 will continue with interagency coordination and engagement through 2021.
GAO-19-543	2019-09-16	The Administrator of EPA, as chair of the working group, should develop guidance for agencies on what they should include in their environmental justice strategic plans. (21)	EPA, as lead for the Environmental Justice Interagency Working Group (EJ IWG) continues to lead the coordination, along with the member agencies, the implementation of GAO's recommendations. EPA agreed with this recommendation and will work through the EJ IWG to review the Agency's actions and update this information.
GAO-19-543	2019-09-16	The Administrator of EPA, as chair of the working group, should develop guidance or create a committee of the working group to develop guidance on methods the agencies could use to assess progress toward their environmental justice goals. (22)	EPA, as lead for the Environmental Justice Interagency Working Group (EJ IWG) continues to lead the coordination, along with the member agencies, the implementation of GAO's recommendations. EPA agreed with this recommendation and will work through the EJ IWG to review the Agency's actions and update this information.
GAO-19-543	2019-09-16	The Administrator of EPA, as chair of the working group, and in consultation with the working group, should clearly establish, in its organizational documents, strategic goals for the federal	EPA, as lead for the Environmental Justice Interagency Working Group (EJ IWG) continues to lead the coordination, along with the member agencies, the implementation of GAO's recommendations. EPA agreed with this recommendation and will work through the

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
		government's efforts to carry out the 1994 Executive Order. (23)	EJ IWG to review the Agency's actions and update this information.
GAO-19-543	2019-09-16	The Administrator of EPA, as chair of the working group, and in consultation with the other working group members, should update the 2011 Memorandum of Understanding and renew the agencies' commitments to participate in the interagency collaborative effort and the working group. (24)	EPA, as lead for the Environmental Justice Interagency Working Group (EJ IWG) continues to lead the coordination, along with the member agencies, the implementation of GAO's recommendations. EPA agreed with this recommendation and will work through the EJ IWG to review the Agency's actions and update this information.
GAO-20-126	2019-12-12	The Administrator of EPA should update security plan for the selected operational system to identify a description of security controls, and the individual reviewing and approving the plan and date of approval. (19)	EPA's Chief Information Security Officer will coordinate with agency Information Security Officers to ensure system security plans include all required information. The CISO will monitor all systems for compliance through the established Chief Information Officer Authorization to Operate process.
GAO-20-126	2019-12-12	The Administrator of EPA should update the security assessment report for the selected operational system to identify the summarized results of control effectiveness tests. (20)	EPA does not concur with this recommendation.
GAO-20-126	2019-12-12	The Administrator of EPA should update the list of corrective actions for the selected operational system to identify the specific weakness, estimated funding and anticipated source of funding, key remediation milestones with completion dates, changes to milestones and completion dates, and source of the weaknesses. (21)	EPA does not concur with this recommendation.
GAO-20-126	2019-12-12	The Administrator of EPA should prepare the letter authorizing the use of cloud service for the selected operational system and submit the letter to the FedRAMP program management office. (22)	EPA's Chief Information Security Officer will coordinate with agency Information Security Officers to ensure corrective actions have plans of actions and milestones as appropriate that include all required information. The CISO will monitor all systems for compliance through

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
			the established Chief Information Officer Authorization to Operate process.
GAO-20-126	2019-12-12	The Administrator of EPA should develop guidance requiring that cloud service authorization letter be provided to the FedRAMP program management office. (23)	EPA disagrees with this recommendation. The Agency submits authorization documents to the FedRAMP Program management office (PMO). EPA will continue to follow, as appropriate, FedRAMP PMO guidance promulgated through the General Services Administration FedRAMP Website. EPA initiated outreach to the FedRAMP PMO to obtain additional information on reporting requirements. No additional guidance stipulating the need to report specific services authorized or updated templates to illustrate reporting specific services authorized has been provided.
GAO-20-129	2019-10-30	The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should ensure that the Agency fully implements each of the eight key IT workforce planning activities it did not fully implement. (11)	EPA is working on key IT workforce planning activities as outlined in EPA's response to GAO's Final Report. EPA provided additional information and supporting documentation to GAO in December 2020 with a request for closure.
GAO-20-24	2020-01-16	The Director of Water Security of EPA, as Chair of the Water Sector Government Coordinating Council, should work with the council to identify existing technical assistance providers and engage these providers in a network to help drinking water and wastewater utilities incorporate climate resilience into their projects and planning on an ongoing basis. (1)	EPA continues to work across the water sector and with its established network to provide technical assistance, knowledge, financing, and other tools to ensure investments made in water infrastructure are sustainable and resilient in the long term. EPA works within an existing network of technical assistance providers and coordinates with its stakeholders to identify opportunities to provide technical assistance to wastewater and drinking water utilities, as resources are available.
GAO-20-299	2020-02-25	The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should take steps to consult with respective sector partner(s), such as the SCC, DHS, and NIST, as appropriate, to collect and report sector-wide improvements from	In October and December 2020, EPA's Office of Water provided additional supporting documentation to request closure of this recommendation.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
		use of the framework across its critical infrastructure sector using existing initiatives. (5)	
GAO-20-597	2020-09-28	The Assistant Administrator of the Office of Water should develop an agreement with HHS's Offices of Child Care and Head Start on their roles and responsibilities in implementing the Memorandum of Understanding on Reducing Lead Levels in Drinking Water in Schools and Child Care Facilities. For example, these agreements may include the ways in which guidance and information will be shared with states and Head Start grantees, such as through webinars or email, and how frequently. (3)	EPA disagrees with the need for this recommendation because the action requested is already being implemented in coordination with HHS and 13 other federal and non-federal partners committed to the reduction of lead levels in drinking water in schools
GAO-20-597	2020-09-28	The Assistant Administrator of the Office of Water should direct the Office of Water to specify how it will track progress toward the outcomes of the Memorandum of Understanding on Reducing Lead Levels in Drinking Water in Schools and Child Care Facilities and determine how it will regularly monitor and update the MOU. For example, the Office of Water could develop performance measures for each of the MOU's outcomes. In addition, the Office of Water could submit annual reports on progress toward achieving the MOU's outcomes or it could plan to update the agreement at specific intervals. (4)	EPA disagrees with the need for this recommendation because the action requested is already being implemented under the 2019 MOU and the WIIN Act grant programs.
GAO-20-73	2019-10-18	The Director of the Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation should establish a schedule for standardizing and improving	EPA convened a working group comprising Superfund and regional officials to collect and disseminate geospatial information for all NPL sites to help the Agency analyze, communicate,

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
		information on the boundaries of nonfederal NPL sites. (1)	and respond to the impacts of natural disasters and weather.
GAO-20-73	2019-10-18	The Administrator of EPA should clarify how EPA's actions to manage risks to human health and the environment from the potential impacts of climate change effects at nonfederal NPL sites align with the Agency's current goals and objectives. (2)	EPA is reviewing its original response to this recommendation and will provide GAO with an update during the next scheduled response.
GAO-20-73	2019-10-18	The Director of the Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation should provide direction on how to integrate information on the potential impacts of climate change effects into risk assessments at nonfederal NPL sites. (3)	EPA drafted a memo providing direction on integrating information on the potential impacts of climate change effects into risk assessments at nonfederal NPL sites. The Agency anticipated issuance in summer 2021.
GAO-20-73	2019-10-18	The Director of the Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation should provide direction on how to integrate information on the potential impacts of climate change effects into risk response decisions at nonfederal NPL sites. (4)	EPA drafted a memo providing direction on integrating information on the potential impacts of climate change effects into risk assessments at nonfederal NPL sites. The Agency anticipated issuance in summer 2021.
GAO-20-81	2019-11-21	The Environmental Protection Agency Administrator should evaluate training needs for agency officials or others involved in reviewing the merits of researchers' data management plans and, if additional training is found to be warranted, develop and provide such training. (20)	The Agency fully implemented this recommendation and provided supporting documentation and a request for closure on 5/5/2021.

Report Number	Report Issue Date	Recommendation Text	Status Comments
GAO-20-95	2020-01-31	The Assistant Administrator for EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance should clearly document in guidance to the regional offices how they should use the definition of informal enforcement actions to collect data on these actions. (1)	EPA is in the process of amending the September 2019 guidance to be consistent with the Executive Order and expects to finalize the amended guidance in spring 2021.
GAO-20-95	2020-01-31	The Assistant Administrator for EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance should clearly document in guidance to the regional offices that they should collect data on compliance assistance activities and specify which mechanism to use to maintain the data, such as ICIS. (2)	As part of the NPDES SNC NCI strategy, guidance was provided to the regions about collecting compliance assistance data. OECA-HQ is collecting and maintaining the data the regions reported on their NCI templates. EPA requested closure of this recommendation.
GAO-20-95	2020-01-31	The Assistant Administrator for EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance should include the known limitations of data in its annual reports and provide information on the intended use of EPA's data. (3)	The list of known data limitations will be included for the FY20 Annual Results. EPA requested closure of this recommendation.

**On-Site Inspections and Off-site Compliance Monitoring Compliance Activities from
EPA’s Integrated Compliance Information System¹⁶**

The table below provides the numbers in EPA’s Integrated Compliance Information (ICIS) data system for on-site inspection and off-site compliance monitoring activities from fiscal years (FY) 2016-2020. We have a few critical caveats (listed below the chart) that should be kept in mind when reviewing or using these numbers.

Fiscal Year (FY)	On-Site Inspections	Off-Site Compliance Monitoring Activities <i>(EPA has not set separate targets for this category of activities)</i>	Total Completed
FY 2016 actual	9,300	4,500	13,800
FY 2017 actual	8,800	3,100	11,900
FY 2018 actual	7,900	2,900	10,800
FY 2019* actual	Target: 7,400 Actual: 8,100	2,200	10,329
FY 2020 actual	Target: not set** Actual: 3,600	4,900	8,500
FY 2021 projection	Target: not set** Actual: TBD		10,000
FY 2022 projection	Target: not set** Actual: TBD		10,000

*2019 was the first year that EPA specifically set targets for on-site inspections only. Previous targets were for combination of on-site inspections and off-site compliance monitoring activities.

**Targets were not set for on-site inspections in FY 2020 and FY 2021 due to travel restrictions and uncertainty resulting from COVID-19.

Caveats:

1. **Definitions:** Nationally consistent definitions of on-site inspections and off-site compliance monitoring activities did not exist for our compliance monitoring program until we issued guidance on April 24, 2020. As a result, earlier data may include mis-categorized activities. EPA’s April 24, 2020 memorandum provided definitions for both on-site and off-site compliance monitoring activities, which will create more consistency in each of the categories. These improvements are effective for all of FY 2020 for on-site inspections and from April 1, 2020, forward for off-site compliance monitoring.

¹⁶ The Explanatory Statement accompanying the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 instructs EPA to follow guidance as set forth in House Report 116-448. House Report 116-448 directs EPA to provide “separate targets for onsite inspections and offsite compliance monitoring activities, and separate target and actuals data for onsite and offsite compliance monitoring activities for the previous five fiscal years”. Please see page 80: <https://www.congress.gov/116/crpt/hrpt448/CRPT-116hrpt448.pdf>. This report fulfills this requirement.

2. Incomplete Data Entry: Given that EPA has not historically required most types of off-site compliance monitoring activities to be entered into an EPA database, these numbers are likely incomplete. EPA's April 24, 2020, guidance for reporting key off-site compliance monitoring activities establishes expectations for national reporting of these activities.
3. COVID-19: Restrictions on travel during the pandemic affected EPA's ability to conduct on-site inspections in FY 2020 and FY 2021. While on-site inspection numbers dropped substantially during much of FY 2020, EPA was able to increase its off-site compliance monitoring activities.
4. States Conduct Majority of Inspections: Most inspections are performed by authorized states. For example, states performed over 34,000 NPDES inspections - that is just one program.
5. Data Mining: With modern tools, EPA mines data from monitoring reports and manifests. EPA conducts off-site compliance monitoring to try to detect violations, including possible violations of emission and discharge limitations. EPA uses this information to target facilities for on-site inspections. The new April 2020 guidance will help EPA nationally focus and track this important off-site compliance monitoring work.
6. Totals More Reliable Than Subtotals: The sum of the two subtotals (on-site inspections + offsite compliance monitoring activities) is a more reliable value because it smooths out some of the variability in each subtotal. EPA believes that the April 2020 guidance finalizing definitions of on-site inspections and off-site compliance monitoring activities will help make the subtotal data more reliable going forward.
7. Staffing Levels: The number of inspections EPA completes each year generally correlates with our annual staffing levels. During the time period reported in the table, OECA's number of full-time equivalents (FTEs) has decreased from 2,880 in FY 2016 to 2,423 in FY 2020.

Office of Enforcement Compliance Assurance (OECA) Travel Budget by Program Project FY 2016 - FY 2022¹

Appropriation	Program Project	FY 2016		FY 2017		FY 2018		FY 2019		FY 2020 ²		FY 2021	FY 2022 ³
		Enacted	Actuals ⁴	Enacted	Actuals ⁴	Enacted	Actuals ⁴	Enacted	Actuals ⁴	Enacted	Actuals ⁴	Enacted	PresBud
EPM													
	Brownfields	\$16.0	\$1.0	\$16.0	\$3.6	\$16.0	\$10.4	\$16.0	\$4.2	\$16.0	\$18.2	\$16.0	\$16.0
	Civil Enforcement	\$2,247.0	\$2,221.8	\$2,148.0	\$1,882.4	\$2,148.0	\$1,860.9	\$2,216.0	\$1,942.2	\$2,197.0	\$886.2	\$2,197.0	\$2,197.0
	Compliance Monitoring	\$1,615.0	\$1,654.5	\$1,524.0	\$1,338.5	\$1,524.0	\$1,498.3	\$1,529.0	\$1,397.2	\$1,516.0	\$694.8	\$1,516.0	\$1,516.0
	Criminal Enforcement	\$1,522.0	\$1,465.3	\$1,522.0	\$1,337.3	\$1,522.0	\$1,385.7	\$1,522.0	\$1,458.1	\$1,522.0	\$748.4	\$1,522.0	\$1,522.0
	Environmental Justice	\$186.0	\$175.2	\$186.0	\$209.3	\$186.0	\$103.7	\$0.0	\$5.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
	Geographic Program: Chesapeake Bay	\$20.0	\$23.9	\$20.0	\$15.9	\$20.0	\$17.0	\$20.0	\$24.0	\$20.0	\$6.9	\$20.0	\$20.0
	NEPA Implementation ⁴	\$571.0	\$340.4	\$505.0	\$251.6	\$505.0	\$251.1	\$0.0	\$70.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
	Facilities Infrastructure and Operations	\$238.0	\$324.8	\$238.0	\$643.7	\$238.0	\$503.4	\$238.0	\$234.5	\$238.0	\$204.4	\$238.0	\$238.0
	TOTAL EPM	\$6,415.0	\$6,206.9	\$6,159.0	\$5,682.3	\$6,159.0	\$5,630.5	\$5,541.0	\$5,136.0	\$5,509.0	\$2,558.9	\$5,509.0	\$5,509.0
S&T													
	Forensics Support	\$260.0	\$256.5	\$260.0	\$144.8	\$260.0	\$157.8	\$260.0	\$193.1	\$260.0	\$115.0	\$260.0	\$260.0
	TOTAL S&T	\$260.0	\$256.5	\$260.0	\$144.8	\$260.0	\$157.8	\$260.0	\$193.1	\$260.0	\$115.0	\$260.0	\$141.0
LUST													
	Civil Enforcement	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
	TOTAL LUST	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
OIL													
	Civil Enforcement	\$14.0	\$11.3	\$14.0	\$9.4	\$14.0	\$16.4	\$14.0	\$8.1	\$14.0	\$3.1	\$14.0	\$14.0
	Compliance Monitoring	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
	TOTAL OIL	\$14.0	\$11.3	\$14.0	\$9.4	\$14.0	\$16.4	\$14.0	\$8.1	\$14.0	\$3.1	\$14.0	\$14.0
SUPERFUND													
	Compliance Monitoring	\$8.0	\$0.0	\$8.0	\$0.0	\$8.0	\$0.0	\$8.0	\$0.0	\$8.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
	Criminal Enforcement	\$472.0	\$239.6	\$468.0	\$216.8	\$468.0	\$237.4	\$468.0	\$236.7	\$468.0	\$125.8	\$468.0	\$468.0
	Forensics Support	\$50.0	\$41.2	\$50.0	\$36.4	\$50.0	\$25.5	\$50.0	\$32.9	\$50.0	\$17.2	\$50.0	\$50.0
	Superfund: Enforcement	\$1,221.0	\$996.8	\$1,135.0	\$904.9	\$1,135.0	\$798.7	\$1,145.0	\$995.7	\$1,143.0	\$445.0	\$1,143.0	\$1,143.0
	Superfund: Federal Facilities Enforcement	\$140.0	\$77.3	\$120.0	\$68.3	\$120.0	\$69.0	\$120.0	\$65.1	\$120.0	\$81.7	\$120.0	\$120.0
	TOTAL SUPERFUND	\$1,891.0	\$1,354.9	\$1,781.0	\$1,226.4	\$1,781.0	\$1,130.6	\$1,791.0	\$1,330.4	\$1,789.0	\$669.7	\$1,781.0	\$1,781.0
	GRAND TOTAL	\$8,580.0	\$7,829.7	\$8,214.0	\$7,062.9	\$8,214.0	\$6,935.3	\$7,606.0	\$6,667.6	\$7,572.0	\$3,346.7	\$7,564.0	\$7,564.0

¹ The Explanatory Statement accompanying the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 instructs EPA to provide "requested enforcement travel budget, and budgeted and actual enforcement travel spending for the previous five fiscal years". Please see page 228: <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CREC-2020-12-21/pdf/CREC-2020-12-21-house-bk4.pdf>

² Restrictions on travel during the COVID-19 pandemic affected EPA's ability to conduct on-site inspections.

³ The FY 2022 enforcement travel budget has been straight-lined from the FY 2021 Enacted Level. This level can be adjusted when the Agency develops its FY 2022 Enacted Budget.

⁴ Actuals include final obligations of New Obligation Authority (NOA) and Carryover for OECA.

⁵ While NEPA Implementation is in the Enforcement Program Area, OECA transitioned this program project to EPA's Office of Administrator.

FY 2022 Administrator's Priorities

Funding for the Administrator's priorities are allocated by program project in the FY 2022 President's Budget with a total of \$2.375 million in the Environmental and Program Management Account and \$125 thousand in the Science and Technology Account.

These funds, which are set aside for the Administrator's priorities, are used to address unforeseen issues that may arise during the year. These funds are used by the Administrator to support critical unplanned issues and the amounts shown in the below table will be reallocated as needed, in accordance with reprogramming limits.

FY 2022 President's Budget Funding for Administrator's Priorities

Appropriation	Program Project	Dollars in Thousands
EPM	Acquisition Management	\$150
EPM	Brownfields	\$25
EPM	Civil Enforcement	\$150
EPM	Civil Rights / Title VI Compliance	\$75
EPM	Compliance Monitoring	\$100
EPM	Criminal Enforcement	\$145
EPM	Drinking Water Programs	\$100
EPM	Exchange Network	\$75
EPM	Federal Stationary Source Regulations	\$100
EPM	Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$130
EPM	Human Resources Management	\$25
EPM	International Sources of Pollution	\$50
EPM	IT / Data Management	\$175
EPM	Legal Advice: Environmental Program	\$100
EPM	Legal Advice: Support Program	\$75
EPM	NEPA Implementation	\$100
EPM	Pesticides: Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk	\$150
EPM	Pesticides: Protect the Environment from Pesticide Risk	\$150
EPM	Pesticides: Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability	\$100
EPM	RCRA: Waste Management	\$25
EPM	Science Advisory Board	\$100
EPM	State and Local Prevention and Preparedness	\$100
EPM	Surface Water Protection	\$50
EPM	TRI / Right to Know	\$75
EPM	Tribal - Capacity Building	\$50
S&T	Federal Support for Air Quality Management	\$25
S&T	Research: Air, Climate and Energy	\$50
S&T	Research: Chemical Safety and Sustainability	\$50
Total		\$2,500

FY 2022 Congressional Justification Estimated Resources and FTE for Environmental Justice Program ^{1,2}			
Dollar in Thousands			
Appropriation	Program Activities	FY 2022 CJ Estimated Resources ³	FY 2022 CJ Estimated FTE
EPM	HQ Environmental Justice(EJ) Program Management and Coordination ⁴	\$63,443.0	70.8
EPM	EJSCREEN	\$6,900.0	6.5
EPM	Environmental Justice Small Grants ⁵	\$12,526.0	5.5
EPM	Environmental Justice Collaborative Problem-Solving Cooperative Agreements ⁵	\$18,476.0	5.5
EPM	White House(WH) EJ Inter-Agency Council (formerly EJ IWG) Support and EJ coordination with Other Federal Agencies	\$3,607.0	5.5
EPM	National EJ Advisory Council/WHEJ Advisory Council Support, and Climate EJ Advisory Council	\$5,056.0	9.0
EPM	Environmental Justice Competitive Grant Program ⁶	\$50,000.0	5.0
EPM	Environmental Justice Community Grant Program ⁶	\$25,000.0	2.0
EPM	Environmental Justice State Grant Program ⁶	\$25,000.0	2.0
EPM	Tribal Environmental Justice Grant Program ⁶	\$25,000.0	2.0
EPM	Community-based Participatory Research Grant Program ⁶	\$15,000.0	1.0
EPM	Environmental Justice Training Program ⁶	\$10,000.0	3.0
EPM	Environmental Justice Clearinghouse	\$5,000.0	3.0
EPM	Environmental Justice Legal Support	\$4,000.0	3.0
EPM	Agency Technical Assistance, Research, Training, Education and Communication	\$1,739.0	5.5
EPM	Regional Outreach Centers	\$10,000.0	12.0
EPM	Regional Resources for Environmental Justice Program	\$13,115.0	65.1
Subtotal of EPM Environmental Justice Resources and FTE		\$293,862.0	206.4
Superfund	Superfund Environmental Justice Program Coordination	\$5,841.0	5.5
Subtotal of Superfund Environmental Justice Resources and FTE		\$5,841.0	5.5
Total FY 2022 CJ Estimated Resources and FTE for Environmental Justice Program		\$299,703.0	211.9
¹ The Explanatory Statement accompanying the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 instructs EPA to provide "allocations for each component of funding for environmental justice programs". Please see page 228: https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CREC-2020-12-21/pdf/CREC-2020-12-21-house-bk4.pdf .			
² "The Accelerating Environmental and Economic Justice Initiative at EPA provides \$936 million in FY 2022 funding for established programs across the Agency that will contribute to securing environmental justice. This breakout details the portion of this Initiative's funding specifically within the Agency's EJ Program. Further details about the Initiative can be found throughout EPA's Congressional Justification."			
³ Estimated program activity resources include both payroll and non-payroll resources.			
⁴ EPA retains flexibility to adjust the distribution of resources into other program activities, as necessary.			
⁵ Resources for Small Grants and EJ Collaborative Problem-Solving Cooperative Agreements will likely be reviewed based upon applications the Agency receives in FY 2021. This is considered a base level.			
⁶ The FY 2022 Budget includes proposed authorization language to carry out \$140 million in new environmental justice grants aimed at reducing the disproportionate health impacts of environmental pollution and \$10 million to establish an Environmental Justice Training Program charged with increasing the capacity of residents of underserved communities to identify and address disproportionately adverse human health or environmental effects.			

Index

A

Acquisition Management	xv, 119, 124, 321, 457, 460, 512, 514, 559, 561, 567, 812, 815, 816, 888
Acronyms for Statutory Authority	749
Administrative Law	118, 124, 289, 290, 774, 812, 838
Administrative Provisions	715, 794, 825
Alternative Dispute Resolution	118, 124, 292, 295, 457, 460, 506, 812, 815
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	797
American Rescue Plan	xv, 443, 797, 818
Analytical Methods	83, 489, 756
Annual Performance Report	723, 724, 780
Attorney Fee and Cost Payments	749
Audits, Evaluations, and Investigations	433, 435, 436, 437, 457, 459, 465, 466, 814

B

Beach / Fish Programs	119, 125, 408, 813
Brownfields .xi, 117, 121, 122, 162, 163, 164, 165, 206, 440, 531, 607, 613, 618, 619, 671, 672, 673, 737, 739, 758, 797, 800, 805, 811, 816, 838, 888	
Brownfields Projects	165, 607, 613, 619, 671, 816

C

CASTNET	11, 12, 13, 128, 129, 130, 657
Categorical Grant	
Beaches Protection	614, 817
Brownfields	614, 817
Environmental Information	614, 817
Hazardous Waste Financial Assistance	614, 817
Lead	614, 817
Multipurpose Grants	607, 614, 629, 817
Nonpoint Source (Sec. 319)	614, 817
Pesticides Enforcement	614, 817
Pesticides Program Implementation	614, 817
Pollution Control (Sec. 106)	614, 817
Pollution Prevention	614, 817
Public Water System Supervision	614, 817
Radon	614, 817
Toxics Substances Compliance	614, 817
Tribal Air Quality Management	614, 817
Tribal General Assistance Program	614, 817
Underground Injection Control	614, 817
Underground Storage Tanks	614, 817
Wetlands Program Development	614, 817
Categorical Grants	378, 379, 607, 614, 615, 616, 618, 620, 623, 626, 627, 629, 630, 633, 635, 638, 642, 645, 648, 650, 654, 656, 659, 661, 663, 665, 817
Central Planning, Budgeting, and Finance	62, 119, 124, 229, 325, 334, 338, 450, 457, 460, 516, 518, 521, 523, 527, 559, 561, 568, 812, 815, 818
Chesapeake Bay	xii, 188, 189, 190
Children/Other Sensitive Populations	
Agency Coordination	118, 123, 240, 812
Civil Enforcement	x, 38, 117, 122, 173, 174, 176, 178, 559, 561, 564, 587, 589, 597, 598, 781, 811, 815, 816, 837, 888
Civil Rights / Title VI Compliance	888
Clean Air Allowance Trading Programs	5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 117, 122, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 809, 810
Clean Air and Climate	7, 11, 15, 17, 20, 122, 127, 133, 143, 147, 155, 160, 809, 810, 818

Climate Protection Program	15, 133
Commission for Environmental Cooperation	270, 274, 752, 771
Communities . vii, xii, 6, 89, 92, 93, 140, 175, 180, 197, 198, 250, 295, 314, 322, 333, 371, 383, 392, 458, 477, 513, 522, 529, 536, 549, 559, 581, 587, 602, 620, 627, 691, 699, 710, 773, 787, 800	
Compliance.....ix, 15, 61, 69, 117, 122, 166, 167, 168, 170, 175, 177, 256, 263, 294, 297, 298, 309, 331, 398, 412, 438, 440, 457, 459, 467, 472, 473, 475, 520, 551, 564, 576, 577, 587, 589, 590, 591, 592, 607, 633, 640, 654, 663, 731, 746, 749, 750, 759, 767, 769, 781,784, 793, 800, 807, 811, 814, 816, 837, 846, 885, 887, 888	
Compliance Monitoringix, 117, 122, 167, 168, 412, 457, 459, 473, 587, 589, 591, 633, 640, 654, 749, 781, 811, 814, 816, 885, 888	
Computational Toxicology	9, 99, 810, 839
Congressional Priorities	6, 9, 113, 114, 119, 125, 430, 431, 614, 810, 813, 817
Congressionally Mandated Projects.....	614, 817
Coronavirus.....	xv, 321, 326, 512, 797
COVIDxv, 11, 13, 14, 23, 49, 60, 64, 152, 181, 237, 238, 272, 285, 286, 301, 306, 309, 318, 321, 330, 336, 346, 347, 348, 353, 440, 442, 443, 468, 502, 503, 512, 519, 525, 594, 712, 730, 780, 781, 782, 788, 877, 885, 886	
Covid-19.....	574, 577, 579
Criminal Enforcement.....	38, 117, 122, 177, 178, 457, 459, 475, 479, 597, 768, 811, 814, 837, 888

D

Decontamination	45
Diesel Emissions Reduction Grant Program	607, 613, 668, 816
Drinking Water Infrastructure Resilience and Sustainability.....	608, 613, 697, 817
Drinking Water Programs	6, 9, 47, 110, 119, 125, 227, 410, 662, 691, 693, 696, 698, 756, 810, 813, 888

E

Ecosystems.....	119, 125, 192, 400, 401, 404, 813
eEnterprise.....	836
E-Enterprise	168, 286, 390, 503
El Paso	277
Electronic Reporting	167, 168, 247, 388, 495, 640
Eliminated Programs	749, 819
Endocrine Disruptors.....	9, 119, 125, 375, 810, 813
Enforcementix, 5, 8, 37, 38, 40, 69, 117, 122, 167, 168, 170, 172, 173, 175, 177, 178, 180, 185, 254, 256, 263, 314, 440, 441, 457, 459, 460, 469, 474, 475, 477, 479, 481, 482, 485, 486, 559, 561, 563, 564, 587, 589, 591, 592, 596, 597, 607, 633, 634, 640, 750, 767,769, 770, 773, 800, 807, 809, 811, 814, 815, 816, 837, 887	
Enforcement Training	773
Environmental Education.....	114, 118, 123, 192, 243, 244, 245, 249, 812, 836
Environmental Justice ..i, vii, viii, ix, 21, 26, 117, 121, 122, 153, 178, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 198, 240, 265, 289, 302, 303, 306, 376, 391, 395, 457, 459, 475, 477, 478, 490, 627, 652, 660, 672, 777, 790, 791, 811, 814, 834, 879, 880	
EPA User Fee Program	749, 792
Exchange Network.....	118, 123, 246, 457, 460, 494, 613, 620, 622, 775, 776, 808, 812, 814, 888
Executive Management and Operations	118, 123, 249, 811
Expected Benefits of E-Government Initiatives	749, 820

F

Facilities Infrastructure and Operations...5, 8, 60, 62, 119, 124, 330, 445, 447, 452, 454, 457, 460, 504, 519, 521, 559, 561, 570, 587, 589, 600, 809, 812, 814, 815, 816	
Federal Stationary Source Regulations.....	117, 122, 143, 810, 888
Federal Support for Air Quality Management	xii, 5, 7, 17, 18, 117, 122, 147, 651, 652, 657, 809, 810, 888
Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification	5, 7, 15, 20, 21, 809
Forensics Support.....	5, 8, 38, 457, 460, 479, 809, 814
FY 2022 Evaluation Plan	729

G

General Counsel	293, 294, 304, 786, 795
-----------------------	-------------------------

Geographic Program	
Chesapeake Bay	117, 122, 188, 811
Gulf of Mexico	117, 122, 191, 811
Lake Champlain.....	117, 123, 194, 811
Long Island Sound	117, 123, 197, 811
Geographic Programs	117, 121, 122, 123, 187, 188, 191, 194, 197, 199, 206, 209, 211, 214, 811
Great Lakes Legacy Act.....	215
Great Lakes Restoration	117, 123, 214, 811

H

Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund	3, 4, 325, 367, 516, 568, 713, 715, 718, 794, 818, 826
Hazardous Waste Facilities	175
Homeland Security	5, 8, 33, 34, 41, 42, 46, 47, 48, 55, 69, 72, 117, 118, 123, 158, 221, 222, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 235, 236, 248, 282, 283, 442, 445, 447, 448, 449, 450, 457, 460, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 496, 499, 500, 544, 631, 753, 761, 762, 763, 766, 787, 809, 811, 814, 836, 864, 865, 871, 873, 875
Communication and Information.....	117, 123, 222, 811
Critical Infrastructure Protection.....	5, 8, 42, 118, 123, 226, 809, 811
Human Health.....	104, 105, 156, 535, 536, 762
Human Health Risk Assessment	104, 535
Human Resources Management.....	119, 124, 336, 337, 457, 460, 525, 526, 812, 815, 888

I

Indoor Air.....	5, 7, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 118, 122, 230, 231, 233, 235, 237, 457, 459, 462, 463, 648, 809, 810, 811, 814, 836
Radon Program	5, 7, 29, 118, 122, 231, 809, 810
Indoor Air and Radiation	5, 7, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 118, 122, 230, 231, 233, 235, 237, 457, 459, 462, 463, 809, 810, 811, 814
Information Exchange / Outreach.....	123, 240, 243, 246, 249, 254, 257, 260, 262, 266, 457, 460, 493, 494, 811, 812, 814
Information Security.....	58, 118, 124, 223, 248, 281, 282, 283, 284, 287, 437, 439, 440, 457, 460, 468, 496, 498, 499, 500, 501, 504, 787, 799, 812, 815, 838, 880
Infrastructure Assistance	277, 607, 613, 674, 676, 680, 686, 816
Alaska Native Villages	613, 816
Clean Water SRF	613, 816
Drinking Water SRF	613, 816
Mexico Border.....	613, 816
Inspector General	3, 4, 43, 325, 327, 433, 435, 437, 438, 441, 443, 444, 459, 466, 467, 469, 471, 516, 517, 749, 773, 778, 779, 780, 799, 814, 851
Integrated Environmental Strategies.....	118, 124, 299, 812
International Programs	118, 123, 269, 270, 274, 276, 812
International Sources of Pollution.....	118, 123, 270, 812, 888
IT / Data Management.....	5, 8, 56, 118, 124, 281, 285, 457, 460, 498, 502, 809, 812, 815, 888
IT / Data Management / Security	8, 56, 124, 281, 285, 460, 498, 502, 809, 812, 815

L

Lake Pontchartrain.....	xii, 123, 200, 203, 811
Lead Testing in Schools.....	608, 613, 695, 817
Legal / Science / Regulatory / Economic Review.....	124, 289, 292, 294, 299, 304, 308, 311, 314, 318, 457, 460, 505, 506, 508, 812, 815
Legal Advice	
Environmental Program	118, 124, 304, 457, 460, 508, 812, 815, 888
Support Program	118, 124, 308, 310, 812, 888
LUST / UST.....	119, 125, 397, 559, 561, 573, 813, 816
LUST Cooperative Agreements	399, 559, 561, 575, 578, 580, 816
LUST Prevention.....	559, 561, 576, 664, 816

M

Major Management Challenges 749, 780
Marine Pollution 119, 125, 419, 813
Mercury and Air Toxics Standards 128, 441
Mexico Border 277, 607, 611, 686, 687, 688
Mississippi River Basin 402
Monitoring Grants 614, 817

N

Nanotechnology 103
National Estuary Program / Coastal Waterways 119, 125, 401, 813
NEPA Implementation 117, 122, 185, 186, 811, 888

O

Office of Administration and Resource Management 838
Office of Air and Radiation 733, 836, 844, 845, 846, 848, 849, 857
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Protection xv, 305, 342, 729, 735, 765, 827, 828, 837, 849, 850, 857
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance .. 168, 174, 730, 750, 782, 784, 785, 837, 849, 851, 853, 854, 855, 857, 858, 859, 874, 875, 884, 886, 887
Office of General Counsel 304, 837, 851
Office of International Affairs 838
Office of International and Tribal Affairs 838, 842
Office of Land and Emergency Management x, xi, 93, 163, 364, 397, 531, 541, 573, 576, 578, 583, 618, 671, 672, 736, 738, 739, 740, 782, 784, 838, 843, 844, 851, 853, 854, 857
Office of Mission Support 309, 741, 742, 781, 782, 783, 795, 834, 838, 861, 875
Office of Research and Development 82, 83, 84, 87, 90, 91, 95, 97, 98, 103, 454, 725, 735, 737, 738, 743, 744, 827, 828, 834, 839, 851, 855, 864
Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response 851
Office of the Administrator 294, 795, 834, 836
Office of the Chief Financial Officer 309, 326, 516, 782, 783, 785, 790, 795, 834, 836, 843, 844, 861
Office of the Inspector General xv, 57, 65, 66, 282, 309, 347, 390, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 499, 778, 779, 780, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 789, 790, 837, 840, 841, 844, 846, 848, 849, 850, 851, 857
Office of Water 745, 827, 839, 855, 858, 863
Oil 3, 4, 33, 40, 54, 60, 90, 130, 145, 151, 167, 171, 173, 176, 235, 330, 405, 415, 452, 473, 517, 519, 530, 543, 544, 564, 570, 582, 587, 589, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 597, 598, 600, 603, 605, 606, 738, 739, 762, 782, 799, 816
Oil Spill
Prevention, Preparedness and Response 587, 589, 594, 816
OP 777, 790
Operations and Administration .. 5, 8, 59, 60, 119, 124, 320, 321, 325, 330, 333, 336, 445, 447, 451, 452, 457, 460, 511, 512, 516, 519, 522, 525, 559, 561, 566, 567, 568, 570, 587, 589, 599, 600, 809, 812, 814, 815, 816, 818

P

Pesticide Safety Education Program 347, 349, 354
Pesticides
Protect Human Health from Pesticide Risk 5, 8, 64, 119, 124, 344, 809, 812, 888
Realize the Value of Pesticide Availability 5, 8, 71, 119, 124, 359, 809, 813, 888
Pesticides Licensing 5, 8, 63, 64, 68, 71, 119, 124, 340, 341, 344, 351, 359, 809, 812, 813
Pollution Prevention .. xv, 16, 54, 80, 99, 100, 103, 106, 119, 125, 142, 265, 305, 313, 378, 380, 382, 439, 468, 607, 629, 642, 643, 644, 729, 735, 749, 764, 799, 808, 813, 827, 828, 837, 849, 857
Pollution Prevention Program 99, 100, 106, 119, 125, 378, 643, 749, 764, 813
Program Projects by Program Area 809
Proposed FY 2022 Administrative Provisions 749, 825
Protect Human Health 357, 362
Puget Sound xii, 117, 123, 211, 212, 213, 811, 876

R

Radiation 5, 7, 29, 31, 32, 33, 49, 53, 106, 118, 122, 233, 234, 235, 306, 457, 459, 463, 733, 734, 749, 751, 753, 754, 755, 782, 784, 800, 809, 810, 814, 836, 837, 844, 848, 861
Protection 5, 7, 31, 118, 122, 233, 459, 463, 809, 810, 814
Response Preparedness..... 5, 7, 33, 118, 122, 235, 809, 810
RCRA
 Corrective Action 119, 124, 364, 813
 Waste Management..... 119, 124, 367, 713, 715, 718, 813, 818, 888
 Waste Minimization & Recycling..... 119, 125, 371, 813
Recovery Act ..vi, 40, 54, 165, 171, 176, 179, 190, 225, 311, 312, 313, 399, 440, 531, 575, 580, 625, 718, 800, 805, 853
Reduce Risks from Indoor Air 5, 7, 35, 118, 122, 237, 809, 810
Reducing Lead in Drinking Water..... 608, 613, 693, 817
Regional Science and Technology..... 118, 124, 311, 812
Regions 93, 170, 297, 442, 470, 531, 583, 851, 855, 857, 858, 860, 861, 862
Regulatory/Economic-Management and Analysis 118, 124, 314, 812
Research
 Air and Energy 5, 74, 818
 Safe and Sustainable Water Resources..... 8, 82, 810
 Sustainable Communities 8, 90, 460, 530, 561, 582, 589, 603, 810, 815, 816
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) ... 16, 103, 119, 124, 125, 142, 169, 173, 248, 273, 275, 279, 291, 305, 363, 364, 366, 367, 370, 371, 373, 623, 629, 713, 715, 716, 718, 719, 737, 738, 761, 813, 818

S

Safe and Sustainable Water Resources..... 6, 8, 81, 82, 743, 810
Safe Water for Small & Disadvantaged Communities 608, 613, 691, 816
San Francisco Bay..... xii, 117, 123, 209, 210, 811
Science Advisory Board..... xiv, 118, 124, 316, 318, 812, 836, 888
Science Policy and Biotechnology 119, 124, 341, 812
Security... xv, 20, 27, 42, 43, 46, 47, 52, 54, 78, 80, 118, 141, 222, 223, 224, 225, 227, 228, 272, 280, 282, 283, 308, 321, 326, 452, 457, 491, 497, 499, 500, 501, 512, 752, 754, 755, 762, 763, 772, 774, 786, 797, 798, 844, 851, 864, 865, 871, 880, 881
Sewer Overflow Control Grants 608, 613, 701, 817
Sign Language 338, 527
Small Business Ombudsman 118, 123, 254, 255, 812
Small Minority Business Assistance..... 118, 123, 257, 812
Special Accounts..... 827
State and Local Prevention and Preparedness 118, 123, 260, 811, 888
State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) 277, 378, 607, 613, 614, 667, 668, 671, 674, 676, 680, 685, 686, 689, 691, 693, 695, 697, 699, 701, 703, 816, 817
Stratospheric Ozone
 Domestic Programs 117, 122, 155, 810
 Multilateral Fund..... 117, 122, 160, 810
Superfund
 Emergency Response and Removal..... 458, 461, 541, 815
 Enforcement..... 457, 460, 481, 814
 EPA Emergency Preparedness 458, 461, 544, 815
 Federal Facilities 458, 461, 549, 815
 Federal Facilities Enforcement..... 457, 460, 485, 814
 Remedial 458, 461, 546, 815
Superfund Cleanup..... 458, 460, 461, 540, 541, 544, 546, 549, 815
Superfund Special Accounts 458, 552
Surface Water Protection..... 119, 125, 402, 421, 813, 888
Sustainable and Healthy Communities..... 6, 8, 79, 90, 95, 458, 460, 530, 533, 559, 562, 582, 584, 585, 587, 589, 603, 605, 744, 810, 815, 816

T

Targeted Airshed Grants.....608, 613, 689, 690, 816
Technical Assistance for Treatment Works..... 608, 613, 699, 817
Toxic Substances
 Chemical Risk Management.....125, 813
 Chemical Risk Review and Reduction 119, 125, 383, 813
 Lead Risk Reduction..... 119, 125, 392, 813
 Lead Risk Reduction Program 119, 125, 392, 813
Toxics Risk Review and Prevention..... 119, 125, 374, 375, 378, 383, 392, 813
Trade and Governance 118, 123, 274, 275, 812
TRI / Right to Know..... 118, 123, 262, 811, 888
Tribal - Capacity Building..... 118, 123, 266, 811, 888

U

Underground Storage Tanks (LUST / UST)..... 125, 397, 561, 573, 576, 578, 813, 816
US Mexico Border 118, 123, 276, 277, 607, 611, 686, 687, 688, 812

W

Water

 Human Health Protection..... 6, 9, 109, 110, 119, 125, 407, 408, 410, 810, 813
Water Infrastructure and Workforce Investment.....608, 614, 703, 817
Water Quality Monitoring206
Water Quality Protection 119, 125, 206, 207, 208, 418, 419, 421, 705, 708, 709, 710, 813, 818
Water Quality Research and Support Grants 6, 9, 114, 119, 125, 431, 810, 813, 819
Wetlands88, 119, 125, 206, 403, 404, 405, 607, 665, 666, 797, 799, 804, 813, 839
WIFIA..... iii, iv, 426, 677, 679, 682, 684, 700, 702, 704, 705, 708, 710, 711, 712, 723, 794, 800
Working Capital Fund..... 55, 228, 325, 449, 491, 749, 772, 795, 828

