ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115

Majority (202) 225–2927 Minority (202) 225–3641

September 21, 2017

Mr. Alfredo Gómez Director Natural Resources and Environment Government Accountability Office 441 G Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20548

Dear Mr. Gómez:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on Wednesday, September 6, 2017, to testify at the hearing entitled "EPA Oversight: Unimplemented Inspector General and GAO Recommendations."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Thursday, October 5, 2017. Your responses should be mailed to Ali Fulling, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to Ali.Fulling@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

Tim Murphy

Chairman

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

cc: The Honorable Diana DeGette, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

Attachment

Attachment—Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Tim Murphy

- 1. Given EPA's long-standing failure to conduct satisfactory workforce and workload assessments, does the agency know for certain whether it is carrying out all of its statutory obligations?
- 2. Your written testimony noted that EPA has failed to identify project officer critical skills and competencies or monitored its recruitment and retention efforts for grants specialists. Are these problems limited to certain regional offices or does it cut across the entire agency?
 - a. If EPA were to institute greater accountability in its grants program would the agency be better suited to accomplish its core mission, and if so, how?
- 3. What benefits could EPA realize if it adopted polices and review processes for its grant programs that could be consistently applied and analyzed?
- 4. The number of unimplemented GAO recommendations that relate to management and operations is significantly higher than other subject matter areas, could you explain the reason for this?
 - a. What steps could EPA take to improve its ability to implement management and operations recommendations?

The Honorable Michael C. Burgess

In 2015, the EPA's OIG released its findings related to the EPA's use of Title 42 hiring authority to fill specific positions in its Office of Research and Development (ORD). After reviewing this report, I'd like to explore its results and any action the EPA has taken in the past two years.

- 1. While Title 42 appointments were designed to attract specialists in specific scientific fields, the OIG report points out that 78% of the ORD's Title 42 appointments were in management positions.
 - a. How does this compare to HHS' use of Title 42?
 - b. Did the OIG find the ORD's use of Title 42 in these positions to agree with the intent of the program?