



Appendix A

*Comprehensive Listing of
Program Evaluations
Affecting FY 2001 Performance*

**APPENDIX A:
COMPREHENSIVE LISTING OF PROGRAM EVALUATIONS AFFECTING
FY 2001 PERFORMANCE**

TITLE/SCOPE	EPA GOAL/ OBJECTIVE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	AUTHOR AND LOCATION OF THE REPORT
<p>Environmental Protection: Wider Use of Advance Technologies Can Improve Emissions Monitoring</p> <p>This report reviews the use and development of monitoring technologies for measuring emissions from stationary air sources and point and nonpoint water sources of pollution.</p>	<p>Goal 1 Objectives 1, 2, and 3</p>	<p>Overall, the General Accounting Office (GAO) found that commercially available technologies could assist in monitoring compliance with clean air regulations and in identifying process and efficiency improvements that could lead to decreased use of raw materials and reduced emissions. Many of these technologies, including those that monitor criteria and toxic air pollutants, provide continuous measurement of emissions or of operating parameters that correlate to emissions.</p>	<p>GAO GAO-01-313 June 22, 2001 Located at http://www.gao.gov</p>
<p>Air Pollution: EPA Should Improve Oversight of Emissions Reporting by Large Facilities</p> <p>This report provides information on (1) the steps that EPA and state regulators take to verify that large sources comply with their Title V or state permit and the extent of compliance found; (2) the steps that regulators take to verify the accuracy of emissions reports submitted by large industrial sources and the extent of errors found; and (3) the steps that EPA is taking, if any, to improve its oversight of these processes.</p>	<p>Goal 1 Objectives 1, 2, and 3</p>	<p>EPA has taken three steps to improve its oversight of facilities' compliance with the Clean Air Act (CAA) but does not plan to enhance its oversight of the states' processes for reviewing large facilities' emissions reports. First, the Agency is training and encouraging personnel in its regional offices and the states to conduct intensive investigations. Second, EPA is revising its strategy for monitoring facilities' compliance with the CAA's requirements. Third, in September 1998 the Agency issued guidance encouraging large facilities to use more reliable methods, such as continuous emissions monitors and source tests, to support certifications of compliance with operating permits. This guidance, however, was set aside by an April 2000 court decision. EPA did not appeal the decision and is currently evaluating other regulatory options that would achieve the same objective. EPA performs limited oversight of states' efforts to verify large facilities' emissions reports. Although the Agency has encouraged its regional offices to evaluate states' emissions fee programs for major sources, it has not asked them to evaluate the processes used to verify emissions reports.</p>	<p>GAO GAO-01-46 April 6, 2001 Located at http://www.gao.gov</p>

TITLE/SCOPE	EPA GOAL/ OBJECTIVE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	AUTHOR AND LOCATION OF THE REPORT
<p>Assessing the TMDL Approach to Water Quality Management (2001)</p> <p>In the conference report accompanying EPA's FY 2002 appropriations bill, Congress directed EPA to contract with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, to review the quality of the science used to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). TMDLs establish the analytical basis for watershed-based decisions on pollution reductions necessary to meet water quality standards.</p>	<p>Goal 2 Objective 2</p>	<p>There is enough science to move forward with decision-making and implementation of the TMDL Program. Program changes should be made to better account for uncertainties, to improve the water quality standards and monitoring programs, and to employ adaptive implementation. The report also recommends that states strengthen their water quality monitoring programs.</p>	<p>National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences</p> <p>Located at http://www.nap.edu/books</p> <p>Search: 0309075793</p>
<p>EPA Should Strengthen Its Efforts to Measure and Encourage Pollution Prevention</p> <p>The audit reviewed not only the extent to which companies are employing pollution prevention strategies but also the major incentives and disincentives that affect the employment of those strategies.</p>	<p>Goal 4 Objective 5</p>	<p>The evaluation found limitations with the available Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) data when trying to determine the extent to which companies were adopting pollution prevention strategies. It also found that the public availability of the TRI data and the opportunity for financial return are the major incentives for businesses to employ pollution prevention strategies, whereas technical challenges and costs are disincentives.</p>	<p>GAO</p> <p>GAO-01-283 February 21, 2001</p> <p>Located at http://www.gao.gov</p>
<p>Hazardous Waste: Effect of Proposed Rule's Extra Cleanup Requirements Is Uncertain</p> <p>EPA proposed several amendments to the 1993 Corrective Action Management Unit (CAMU) rule. GAO described the major differences between the 1993 rule and the most recently proposed CAMU rule, determined what data are available to demonstrate that CAMUs approved under the 1993 rule remain protective of human health and the environment, and determined stakeholders' views on the possible deterrent effects that the proposed CAMU rule could have on corrective action.</p>	<p>Goal 5 Objective 1</p>	<p>EPA intended the 1993 CAMU rule to provide regulatory relief from three RCRA requirements that were disincentives to some hazardous waste cleanups. The Agency also expected the rule to provide parties with the flexibility to design CAMUs according to site-specific circumstances rather than "one size fits all" requirements. EPA expected the rule to lead to faster and more efficient, but equally safe, cleanups under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action and Superfund programs. However, the legal challenge to the 1993 rule discouraged some parties from requesting CAMUs or using the full flexibility afforded by the rule, and consequently relatively few CAMUs were requested. The proposed rule is intended to resolve the legal uncertainty over the 1993 rule; however, it would add requirements and processes. Certain groups believe these requirements are necessary to ensure the future safety of CAMUs. Other groups believe the changes would necessarily reduce the flexibility intended by the 1993 rule, which would increase the time and cost of some cleanups and could discourage requests for some CAMUs after the proposed rule is issued.</p>	<p>GAO</p> <p>GAO-01-57 October 20, 2000</p> <p>Located at http://www.gao.gov</p>

TITLE/SCOPE	EPA GOAL/ OBJECTIVE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	AUTHOR AND LOCATION OF THE REPORT
<p>Brownfields: Information on the Programs of EPA and Selected States</p> <p>In reviewing EPA and five states, GAO provided information about how the assistance provided under EPA's programs compares with the assistance provided by selected states with respect to overall strategy, the forms of assistance, eligibility, and other factors; the amounts of assistance provided by EPA and these states; and the results reported by EPA and these states.</p>	<p>Goal 5 Objective 1</p>	<p>GAO found that EPA and the states have difficulty in determining whether their programs are achieving their overall goals. Although EPA maintains a database to track the progress of its program, the data it collects are limited because recipients of EPA's assistance are not required to report on the status of their cleanup projects. The states also have limited information, primarily because they do not track the economic benefits of the assistance they provide or they use forecasted results, rather than actual results, to measure progress.</p>	<p>GAO GAO-01-52 December 15, 2000 Located at http://www.gao.gov</p>
<p>Hazardous Waste: EPA's National and Regional Ombudsmen Do Not Have Sufficient Independence</p> <p>GAO compared the national hazardous waste ombudsman's operations with professional standards for independence and other factors and determined the relative roles and responsibilities of EPA's national and regional ombudsmen.</p>	<p>Goal 5 Objective 1</p>	<p>GAO found that key aspects of the operations of EPA's national hazardous waste ombudsman differ from professional standards for ombudsmen who deal with inquiries from the public. For example, the position of the national ombudsman is in the organization unit whose decisions the ombudsman is responsible for investigating. The regional ombudsmen are less independent than the national ombudsman and play a more reduced role. Communication between the national and regional ombudsmen is limited.</p>	<p>GAO GAO-1-813 July 27, 2001 Located at http://www.gao.gov</p>
<p>Ensure the Safety of Underground Storage Tanks (USTs)</p> <p>GAO was asked to determine whether the USTs regulated by EPA and the states have the required equipment and are being properly operated and maintained. GAO also looked at the breadth of EPA's and the states' tank inspections, the types of enforcement actions taken, and whether upgraded tanks were still leaking. Surveys were sent to tank program managers in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, and GAO spoke with officials in all 9 EPA regions that are responsible for monitoring tanks on tribal lands.</p>	<p>Goal 5 Objective 2</p>	<p>GAO estimates that about 89% (616,685) of the total number of regulated tanks had received federally required equipment upgrades by the end of FY 2000. GAO also estimates that about 29% (201,001) of the regulated tanks are not being operated or maintained properly, increasing the risk of soil and groundwater contamination. Most states and EPA do not physically inspect USTs frequently enough or have access to the most effective enforcement tools to ensure compliance with federal requirements. The states and EPA cannot ensure that all active USTs have the required leak-, spill-, and overfill-protection equipment installed, nor can they guarantee that the installed equipment is being properly operated and maintained. EPA has the opportunity to correct these limitations and to help states correct them through its new tank program initiatives.</p>	<p>GAO GAO-01-464 May 4, 2001 Located at http://www.gao.gov</p>

TITLE/SCOPE	EPA GOAL/ OBJECTIVE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	AUTHOR AND LOCATION OF THE REPORT
<p>State of the Great Lakes 2001</p> <p>Scientific experts used 33 of a proposed 80 indicators to assess the health of the lakes and identify management implications.</p>	<p>Goal 6 Objective 1</p>	<p>Conditions in the Great Lakes range from “good” for the quality of drinking water to “poor” for the impacts of invasive species. About 25% of the indicators showed good or improving conditions, 25% showed poor or deteriorating conditions, and the rest demonstrated mixed results.</p>	<p>EPA’s Great Lakes National Program Office and Environment Canada, with input from more than 50 governmental and nongovernmental entities.</p> <p>EPA-905-R-01-003</p> <p>Located at http://www.binational.net/sogl2001/index.html</p>
<p>Great Lakes Ecosystem Report 2000</p> <p>The Great Lakes Ecosystem Report 2000 reported to Congress on progress in reducing and virtually eliminating toxic chemicals, managing contaminated sediments, protecting and restoring habitat and natural areas, monitoring the health of the Great Lakes, and protecting human health, noting that great challenges remain in each area.</p>	<p>Goal 6 Objective 1</p>	<p>Noteworthy progress on mercury reduction has been made under existing agreements with the American Hospital Association, three Northwest Indiana steel mills, and the Chlorine Institute. Recent sediment remediation under a variety of authorities has resulted in the removal of large amounts of contaminated sediments. Recent biological monitoring reveals a Great Lakes ecosystem in flux. Significant changes to the food web have occurred, likely as a result of invasive species.</p>	<p>EPA’s Great Lakes National Program Office</p> <p>EPA-905-R-01-001</p> <p>Located at http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/rptcong/2001/index.html</p>
<p>Review of the Research Program of the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles (PNGV): Seventh Report (2001)</p> <p>The scope of the project is to critically assess research progress and commented on a number of issues related to the efficacy of the program to meet its goals within the PNGV time frame. In particular, the scope of the project is to comment on the overall balance and adequacy of the PNGV research effort, examine emission control research efforts, and conduct an international bench-marking evaluation of selected PNGV related technologies.</p>	<p>Goal 6 Objective 2</p>	<p>The review panel stated that “the need to reduce the fuel consumption and carbon dioxide emissions of the US automotive fleet is more urgent than ever.” In particular, the panel cited the change in consumer preferences away from traditional cars to sport utility vehicles.</p>	<p>Standing Committee to Review the Research Program of the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles, Board on Energy and Environmental Systems, Transportation Research Board of of the National Research Council</p> <p>Located at http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10180.html?onpi_topnews081301</p>

TITLE/SCOPE	EPA GOAL/ OBJECTIVE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	AUTHOR AND LOCATION OF THE REPORT
<p>Economic Indicators of Market Transformation: Energy Efficient Lighting and EPA's Green Lights</p> <p>The scope of the study was to derive the market transformation effect of EPA's Green Lights program in the market for energy-efficient lighting products.</p>	<p>Goal 6 Objective 2</p>	<p>The study concludes that market transformation programs—and Green Lights in particular—were highly effective in transforming the market for electronic ballasts.</p>	<p>Marvin J. Horowitz, Adjunct Professor, Johns Hopkins University, and president, Demand Research</p> <p>Published in the fall edition of <i>The Energy Journal</i> 22(4): 95–122.</p>
<p>Freedom of Information Act Task Force Report</p> <p>On April 27, 2001, EPA's Administrator established a Task Force to undertake a 90-day review of EPA's implementation of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).</p>	<p>Goal 7 Objective 1</p>	<p>The Task Force made 18 recommendations in three areas: accountability, centralization, and updating/amending current policies, regulations, and guidance. During the review, the Task Force discovered that FOIA processing is often given low priority. The report cited that when backlogs develop or litigation ensues because of errors in processing, no one can be held accountable. The Task Force found that problems in communication and consistency are linked to EPA's highly decentralized operation.</p>	<p>EPA FOIA Task Force</p> <p>Located at http://www.epa.gov/foia/images</p> <p>Search: Finaltaskforce.pdf</p>
<p>Design for Objective 8.4 Could Be Improved by Reorienting Focus on Outcomes</p> <p>The purpose of this pilot program evaluation was to determine whether program evaluation techniques are appropriate for measuring progress in accomplishing GPRA goals and to document and evaluate the program designs for Goal 8 and Objective 8.4.</p>	<p>Goal 8 Objective 4</p>	<p>The program evaluation approach provided a better understanding of the programs, answered key questions, and provided a partnership approach between the Office of the Inspector General and the Office of Research and Development that was beneficial in developing meaningful observations about the designs for Goal 8 and Objective 8.4.</p>	<p>EPA's Office of the Inspector General</p> <p>November 2001</p> <p>Report No. 2002-P-00002</p>
<p>Project XL: Directory of Regulatory, Policy, and Technology Innovations</p> <p>This report evaluates more than 70 innovations being tested by Project XL (eXcellence and Leadership).</p>	<p>Goal 8 Objective 6</p>	<p>The report assesses the expected advantage of the Project XL innovations over the current approach, the results to date, the efficacy of the innovation, and its suitability for application beyond the pilot scale.</p>	<p>EPA's Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation</p> <p>November 2000</p> <p>Located at http://www.epa.gov/projectxl</p> <p>Search: EPA 100-R-00-023A</p>

TITLE/SCOPE	EPA GOAL/ OBJECTIVE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	AUTHOR AND LOCATION OF THE REPORT
<p>Stakeholder Involvement & Public Participation at the U.S. EPA: Lessons Learned, Barriers, & Innovative Approaches</p> <p>This is the first-ever assessment of Agency-wide lessons learned on stakeholder involvement, supporting the development of EPA's Public Involvement Policy.</p>	<p>Goal 8 Objective 6</p>	<p>The report reviews EPA's efforts to involve the public through a meta-analysis of formal evaluations and informal summaries from across the Agency. The meta-analysis identifies key cross-cutting lessons learned, pinpoints unique barriers and ways to overcome them, and highlights innovative approaches to stakeholder involvement and public participation.</p>	<p>EPA's Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation</p> <p>EPA-100-R-00-040 January 2001</p> <p>Located at http://www.epa.gov/stakeholders/pdf/sipp.pdf</p>
<p>Living the Vision</p> <p>This document reports on the progress of the Metal Finishing Strategic Goals Program.</p>	<p>Goal 8 Objective 7</p>	<p>The document describes the industry Performance Partnership Program and shows the degree to which the industry met a series of voluntary "better than compliance" facility performance targets.</p>	<p>EPA's Office of Policy, Economics and Innovation</p> <p>EPA 240-R-00-007 January 2001</p> <p>Located at http://www.strategicgoals.org</p>
<p>EPA's Science Advisory Board Panels: Improved Policies and Procedures Needed to Ensure Independence and Balance</p> <p>The purpose of this evaluation was to determine whether the Board's policies and procedures are adequate to ensure panel independence and balance and to provide sufficient information to the public.</p>	<p>Goal 8 Objective 9</p>	<p>Science Advisory Board (SAB) staff policies and procedures do not ensure, in all cases, that SAB peer review panelists are independent and that the panels are properly balanced. Staff policies and procedures do not ensure in all cases that the public is sufficiently informed about points of view represented on the panels. The staff needs to better maintain records and train staff.</p> <p>The SAB is implementing the following recommended improvements: institute a more formal method of determining and documenting conflict of interest situations, more aggressively open the panel formation to the public so they can provide input, implement more thorough documentation of the process and rationale by which panelists are finally selected, further develop the "disclosure process," improve record-keeping procedures, and provide more systematic training for SAB panelists and staff.</p>	<p>GAO</p> <p>GAO-01-536 June 12, 2001</p> <p>Located at http://www.gao.gov</p>

TITLE/SCOPE	EPA GOAL/ OBJECTIVE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	AUTHOR AND LOCATION OF THE REPORT
<p>Program Element Review: FIFRA Worker Protection Standard (WPS)</p> <p>EPA, with state assistance, reviewed EPA and state implementation of the enforcement and compliance components of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) Worker Protection Standard (WPS).</p>	<p>Goal 9 Objective 1</p>	<p>The goal of the WPS Program Element Review is to assess the effectiveness of EPA (OECA and regional offices) and state efforts to ensure compliance with WPS provisions that protect workers who handle, prepare, and apply pesticides in the field or who work in fields where pesticides are applied. The preliminary results of the WPS Program Element Review indicate that specific improvements in implementation of the WPS program at all levels (EPA and state) would make for a more effective program. Important among these findings, OECA found that improvements in EPA's management of the program are called for, including improved planning and communication, issuance of additional guidance, enhanced efforts to ensure results associated with EPA/state cooperative agreements, and improved training. EPA also found that state WPS enforcement and compliance implementation could be enhanced. In particular, the Agency found that some states have not yet taken up enforcement of this program and that certain states' WPS inspections could be enhanced and made more effective. EPA also found that additional efforts need to be made to facilitate better communication of farm-workers' complaints to the regulating agencies.</p>	<p>EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, Office of Compliance, Enforcement Planning, Targeting and Data Division</p> <p>Report will be available early in CY 2002 from palmer.daniel@epa.gov.</p>
<p>Validation Study: To Measure the Effectiveness of the Agency's Corrective Actions to Strengthen Grants Management</p> <p>This study addresses the FY 2001 Agency-level weakness "Improved Management of Assistance Agreements."</p>	<p>Goal 10 Objective 2</p>	<p>The validation study shows that EPA headquarters and regional offices are making progress in improving grants management and that they are generally implementing the Agency's post-award policies. The study does indicate a few problem areas that EPA is continuing to address, and the authors believe that the Agency-level weakness can be eliminated in FY 2002.</p>	<p>EPA's Office of Administration and Resources Management, Office of Grants Debarment, Grants Administration Division</p> <p>Contact Martha Monell, Director, Grants Administration Division at (202) 564-5387.</p>

TITLE/SCOPE	EPA GOAL/ OBJECTIVE	FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	AUTHOR AND LOCATION OF THE REPORT
<p>Human Capital: Implementing an Effective Workforce Strategy Would Help EPA to Achieve Its Strategic Goals</p> <p>The GAO reviewed the extent that EPA's strategy includes the key elements associated with successful human capital strategies, the major challenges EPA faces in the successful implementation of its strategy, and the extent to which EPA's deployment of its enforcement workforce ensures that federal environmental requirements are consistently enforced across regions.</p>	<p>Goal 10 Objective 2</p>	<p>The report found that EPA's human capital strategy is a promising first step towards improving the Agency's management of its workforce, but it lacks some of the key elements that are commonly found in the human capital strategies of high performing organizations. EPA's major challenges in human capital management involve assessing the work requirements for its employees, ensuring continuity of leadership in the Agency, and hiring and developing skilled staff. EPA does not systematically deploy its enforcement workforce to ensure the consistent enforcement of federal regulations throughout all EPA regions and bases deployment decisions on outdated and incomplete information on key regional workload factors.</p>	<p>GAO GAO-01-812 July 31, 2001 Located at http://www.gao.gov</p>
<p>Using GPRA to Manage for Environmental Results—Linking Agency Mission and Systems to Maximize Environmental Results</p> <p>This report evaluated EPA's progress, challenges, and opportunities in the near and short term improvements in implementing GPRA. The report covered Goals, Priorities, Strategies Measurement, Human Capital, and Accountability as interlocking, mutually dependent components.</p>	<p>Goal 10 Objective 2</p>	<p>This evaluation suggested that to improve GPRA implementation and efficiency, EPA must strengthen its partnerships with states and other agencies. Also, EPA needs to place greater focus on the ultimate results and outcomes of its activities rather than actions performed, and should more carefully consider science and cost when setting priorities. Additionally, EPA needs to invest in management, scientific, and technical competencies of its staff, as well as develop and integrate quality outcomes-oriented performance and cost information into budgeting, decision making and accountability systems.</p>	<p>EPA's Office of the Inspector General Report No. 2001-B-00001 June 2001</p>