In Fiscal Year (FY) 2007, EPA reached a record high of **over 3 million regulated entities and assistance providers**, with compliance assistance (CA) designed to increase understanding of environmental requirements, improve environmental management practices and reduce pollution.1

### Entities Reached in FY 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How did the Agency reach over 3 million entities with assistance?** EPA–led CA activities reached more than 1.28 million entities, an increase of 47% compared to FY 2006. EPA reached 80% of these entities through targeted outreach such as the distribution of sector-specific or regulation-specific compliance guides and brochures.

Also, fifteen (15) EPA-sponsored, web-based Compliance Assistance Centers (Centers) hosted more than 1.87 million user sessions. These Centers represent unique partnerships between EPA, industry and other stakeholders; they provide compliance information tailored to the needs of industries, such as auto recyclers, construction, health care, and groups such as local governments and Indian Tribes. (http://www.assistancecenters.net/).

In addition, EPA provided CA to regulated facilities during 13,516 on-site compliance inspections/evaluations in FY 2007.

**Did recipients of CA increase their understanding of environmental requirements?** More than 80% of those who responded to Centers’ surveys answered “Yes” to this question. The percentage that answered “Yes” in EPA’s surveys was even higher.

**Did regulated entities take action to improve their environmental management practices?** The percentages of “Yes” responses to the survey question about “improved EMPs” were also high.
Examples of improved EMPs included getting a permit, performing an environmental self-audit, or changing a process or practice.

**What other benefits resulted from EPA assistance?** At least half of all survey respondents reported that they reduced, eliminated or treated pollution as a result of the CA provided.

![Reduced Pollution in FY 2007](image)

**How did CA support national priorities for enforcement and compliance assurance?** In FY 2007, EPA’s Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) focused on ten national priorities that targeted significant environmental risks and noncompliance patterns. About 12% of all reported CA (4,279 activities) addressed these priorities.

CA was a specific component of some but not all OECA priorities. The priorities with the most CA reported were Tribal (including Drinking Water, Schools, and Solid Waste); Stormwater under the Clean Water Act; and New Source Review/Prevention of Significant Deterioration under the Clean Air Act.
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For more information, contact: Ms. Rebecca A. (Becky) Barclay, Program Analyst, U.S. EPA, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA), Office of Compliance (OC), 202 564-7063, barclay.rebecca@epa.gov.

---

1 *What is “compliance assistance”?* EPA’s compliance assistance includes activities, tools or technical assistance that provides clear and consistent information to help regulated entities understand and meet their obligations under environmental regulations; or to help compliance assistance providers aid the regulated community in complying with environmental regulations. EPA’s compliance assistance may also help regulated entities find cost effective ways to comply with regulations and/or go “beyond compliance” through the use of pollution prevention, environmental management practices, and innovative technologies, thus improving their environmental performance. To be counted as a compliance assistance project or activity, at least one objective must be related to achieving or advancing regulatory compliance.

2 *Who responded to surveys?* EPA did not collect these outcome data from a representative sample of the regulated entity universe. Rather, the percentages are based, in part on the number of regulated entities or Centers’ users that answered “Yes” to these questions on voluntary surveys. The percentages do not account for the number of survey respondents who either chose not to answer these questions or did not respond to the survey.