



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

AUG 27 2018

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL AND
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS


Honorable John Shimkus
Chairman
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your May 30, 2018, letter and the opportunity to respond to the questions for the record from the Subcommittee on Environment hearing on April 26, 2018, entitled *The Fiscal Year 2019 Environmental Protection Agency Budget*. Please find our responses in the enclosed documents.

Again, thank you for your letter. If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may contact Christina J. Moody, in EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, at moody.christina@epa.gov or 202.564.0260.

Sincerely,



Aaron E. Ringel
Deputy Associate Administrator

Enclosures

cc: The Honorable Paul Tonko, Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Environment

ROY Y S BIA

Attachment 1—Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable John Shimkus

1. While some are interested in ensuring EPA actions to limit one or more FIFRA-regulated substances, I am more interested in all FIFRA related activities, particularly in view of the uncertainty about the future deployment of user fees now made available under the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act.

a. If PRIA fees were to expire:

- i. Would this mean the reinstatement of tolerance fees?

ANSWER – PRIA prohibits EPA from levying these tolerance fees, but with a lapse of PRIA, the prohibition would expire and EPA could take action to resume collection of these fees.

- ii. If yes, would the reinstatement of tolerance fees produce enough revenue to ensure the robustness reviews mandated by FIFRA?

ANSWER – While it is EPA’s goal that the robustness of EPA review would not change with a reduction in fees, it is likely that the time frames in which EPA conducts its reviews would be impacted. As the majority of maintenance fees collected go to support of pesticide registration review activities, this reduction in fees would severely impact EPA’s ability to meet the statutory deadline of completion of the 725 chemical cases by October 1, 2022. EPA’s performance reviewing other maintenance fee-supported activities such as fast-track amendments to registered products and notifications would also be impacted. In addition, registration service fee actions received after a lapse of PRIA would not receive statutorily-mandated decision review time frames.

b. What percentage of staffing expenses are covered by PRIA fees?

ANSWER - PRIA fees provide approximately 33 percent of the funding for EPA’s pesticide program activities. Currently operating under the third iteration of the statute, PRIA provides two funding sources to EPA’s pesticide program:

- **One time registration service fees (i.e., PRIA fees) for the evaluation of new applications submitted to the EPA; and**
- **Annual FIFRA maintenance fees assessed to products currently in the marketplace, a significant portion of which are used to support the re-evaluation of pesticides in order to meet the statutory deadline of October 1, 2022, for completing the first round of registration review.**

c. If PRIA fees expire:

- i. How many EPA employees – both FTE and contract workers – would be impacted, including through the loss of employment?

ANSWER – Activities reliant on maintenance fee and pesticide registration service fee funds could be supported for a duration of time after a lapse in PRIA relying on carryover registration service and maintenance fee money. Starting on October 1, 2020, EPA would not be able to support approximately 75 FTEs funded by the PRIA fund. Beginning on October 1, 2021, EPA would no longer be able to support an estimated additional 91 FTEs with FIFRA funds, bringing the total FTE count that EPA could no longer support with PRIA and FIFRA funds to approximately 166FTEs. For reference, the current “on-board” OPP count is right around 600 employees, down 42 from the start of FY 2017.

There are 32 contracts supported by PRIA pesticide user fees with 49 on-site contractors administering the functions of those contracts.

- ii. How much in budget resources would EPA need to transfer to OCSPP to make up for lost PRIA revenues for FIFRA activities?

ANSWER – EPA’s pesticide program activities through two fee funds. On average, EPA collects approximately \$46M in fees each year to support pesticide program activities. To continue to complete registration and registration review decision-making in current timeframes, in the absence of fees, funding for OCSPP’s pesticide activities would need to increase by \$46M. In addition, if PRIA were not reauthorized, \$2 million per year for worker protection activities, pesticide safety education programs, and partnership grants, monies that currently come from PRIA funds, would not be available and these programs would not be funded.

- iii. What is the impact on the pace of pesticide applications reviews? How much longer will they take?

ANSWER – Pesticide registration applications received prior to a lapse of PRIA would retain the decision time frames specified in FIFRA section 33. Applications received after the expiration of PRIA would not receive decision time frames. EPA would continue reviewing these applications as expeditiously as possible provided the resources available.

2. Legislation pending in Congress would provide PRIA fees for another 3 years, but also address other matters as well.

- a. Please explain the need for and characterize the significance of having, including in practical terms:

- i. \$500,000 in funding for efficacy guidelines for public health pesticides;

ANSWER – This proposed maintenance fee set-aside would provide EPA resources to develop and implement guidance and rulemaking for product performance data requirements to evaluate products claiming efficacy against pests of significant public health or economic importance. This effort, desired by the regulated community and of benefit to those who might be subject to vector-borne illnesses, would give EPA better information on how well a product works against public health pests and organisms, which is part of EPA’s evaluation in determining whether to allow a product onto the market. These products include hospital disinfectants as well as repellants and insecticides that control mosquitoes that are vectors of the Zika virus.

- ii. \$500,000 for good laboratory practices funding;

ANSWER – This proposed maintenance fee set-aside would be used to increase the number of laboratory inspections and data audits conducted in support of pesticide product registrations under PRIA, an outcome desired by the registrant community and important to the data integrity of the studies that EPA uses to support its regulatory decisions.

- iii. An increase in maintenance fees from \$27.8 to \$31 million for review and registration;

ANSWER – Raising maintenance fees by \$3.2 million annually would provide additional resources for registration review and other specified activities on which maintenance fees can be spent. These additional resources are important to helping EPA meet its statutory obligation to complete the first round of registration review by October 1, 2022.

- iv. Additional categories and deadlines for products reviewed; and

ANSWER – PRIA 4 proposes new fee for service categories as well as revisions to existing categories. To name a few examples, PRIA categories for antimicrobial products are revised to be consistent with subpart 158W, there are revisions to time frames and fees for antimicrobial and conventional new products and amendments to existing products that involve the review of product performance data for public health pests, new plant-incorporated protectant (PIP) categories are added, categories for safer inert ingredients are established, and a new category is created whereby applicants can receive a determination from EPA on whether or not a proposed product would be subject to registration requirements under FIFRA. These new categories better align time frames and fees to the resources it takes EPA to review those types of applications.

- v. Removal of FIFRA section 4(k)(2).

ANSWER – Maintenance fees are annual fees assessed to registrants to maintain their product registrations in the marketplace, and are deposited by EPA into the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund. These fees are primarily used to support the re-evaluation of pesticides as part of the statutorily-mandated registration review program, the first round of which FIFRA mandates is to be completed by October 1, 2022. These fees also support the agency’s review of inert ingredients, the expedited processing and review of certain applications for products that are substantially similar to registered product and products intended for public health, and the enhancement of information technology systems to improve the review of pesticide registration applications. An unspent balance of over \$40 million has built up in the fund due to decreases in staff levels administering functions that can be charged to the fund (due to attrition, a hiring freeze, and typical time lags involved in recruiting qualified staff to fill key scientific and regulatory positions), and the spending restriction in FIFRA section 4(k)(2)(A), commonly referred to as the “1-to-1” provision.

FIFRA section 4(k)(2)(A) states “moneys derived from fees may not be expended in any fiscal year to the extent such moneys derived from fees would exceed money appropriated for use by the Administrator and expended in such year . . .” This provision effectively limits the amount of fees that can be spent in any given fiscal year relative to the amount of annually appropriated dollars that are spent on the same functions in that fiscal year, and likewise prevents EPA from being able reduce the unspent balance of the maintenance fee fund unless appropriated spending exceeds maintenance fee collection in a given fiscal year. To the extent fee collections have exceeded appropriation spending on the specified functions, the unspent balance has continued to grow and EPA has not been able to reduce the unspent balance in the maintenance fee fund. The removal of FIFRA section 4(k)(2) is essential to EPA’s ability to access these funds paid by registrants in support of registration review and other specified activities.

- 3. Beginning in 2023, the agency will have more flexibility to set targets under the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS). Given EIA projections of a 31 percent decrease in motor gasoline consumption between 2017 and 2050, based upon increases in fuel economy standards and electric vehicles market penetration:
 - a. Will EPA have authority in 2023 and subsequent years to reduce biofuel volume requirements below the existing statutory guidelines? Could this result in fewer gallons of biofuel in the market in the future than exist today?

ANSWER – EPA has broad authority under CAA 211(o)(2)(B)(ii) to determine the applicable volumes for years beyond 2023, including volumes lower than those provided in the statutory tables.

- b. Will EPA have authority in 2023 and subsequent years to allow a RIN to be generated by recharging an electric vehicle with electricity generated from a biogas power plant or other renewable energy source?

ANSWER – EPA’s authority to assess biofuel production pathways to determine if they satisfy the lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions reduction levels required in the statute for different types of renewable fuels is not modified for 2023 and subsequent years. Similarly, the requirement that renewable fuels be produced from renewable biomass remains unchanged. Accordingly, EPA will be authorized in 2023 to evaluate particular biofuel pathway, such as electricity derived from biogas that may be sourced from different locations and used as transportation fuel, to determine if the fuel satisfies the requirements of the statute.

- c. Will EPA have authority in 2023 and subsequent years to reorganize the program’s four existing nested categories?

ANSWER – The statute does not specifically grant EPA authority to reorganize these categories in 2023 and subsequent years. The nested categories are a result of statutorily defined categories of fuel, which are not modified for 2023 and subsequent years.

- 4. Is EPA engaged in planning for 2023 and subsequent years with regard to the agency’s reset authority and the RFS? If so, please describe the range of options that EPA is considering.

ANSWER – EPA is not currently engaged in any substantive planning process for determining the applicable volumes for 2023 and subsequent years.

- 5. The Folcroft Landfill (Operable Unit 2 of the Lower Darby Creek Superfund Site in Pennsylvania) was placed on the NPL in 2001, and the Remedial Investigation has not been finalized. The July 2017 Superfund Taskforce report recommends inquiry and additional resources for sites on the NPL for five years or more without a significant movement. What inquiries and additional resources have been directed to the Folcroft Landfill which has been on the NPL since 2001 without completion of the Remedial Investigation?

ANSWER – The schedule and length of time to complete the Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for the Folcroft Landfill, Operable Unit 2 (OU2) of the Lower Darby Creek Area Superfund Site is not attributable to a lack of resources, nor does EPA believe that additional resources are necessary at this time. The duration of the RI is primarily due to lengthy negotiations with a group of potentially responsible parties (PRP Group) to finance and perform the RI/FS, as well as unanticipated findings during the RI/FS and challenging field conditions, as described in detail below.

The RI/FS at Folcroft Landfill is being performed by a PRP Group that consists of 14 companies that historically disposed of waste at the landfill. After listing the Site on the National Priorities List in 2001, EPA began negotiations with the PRP Group, which concluded in November 2006 with the signature of an Administrative Order on Consent (AOC) for the RI/FS. The duration of the negotiations was due to both the number of PRPs and technically complicated enforcement evidence.

Initial RI field activities were completed in 2008 by the PRP Group in accordance with EPA-approved RI/FS Work Plan. However, in May 2010, based on a review of the initial RI data, EPA identified contaminated groundwater outside of the boundary of the Folcroft Landfill that was not anticipated in the RI/FS Work Plan. The RI/FS Work Plan was subsequently amended in December 2011 to investigate groundwater contamination outside the boundary of the Folcroft Landfill. Significant technical challenges were encountered during the supplemental RI field work due to the location of the landfill in a tidal marsh area within the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge. The supplemental RI field activities were completed in July 2016.

The PRP Group submitted the draft RI Report in May 2017, and the EPA has worked with the PRP Group for the past year to resolve outstanding issues. The PRP Group submitted the draft final RI Report on May 22, 2018, and EPA is currently reviewing the document to ensure that all remaining issues have been addressed. A scoping meeting for the FS was held on May 8, 2017, and subsequent FS discussions were held throughout 2017 and early 2018. EPA and the PRP Group, as well as other site stakeholders such as the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), met on June 18, 2018, to discuss next steps in the FS process.

6. The EPA Taskforce Report recommends the establishment of a clarification to the principles for groundwater restoration. What is the goal for groundwater remediation at the Folcroft Landfill (Operable Unit 2 of the Lower Darby Creek Superfund Site in Pennsylvania)?

ANSWER – The Record of Decision (ROD) for the Folcroft Landfill (Operable Unit 2 of the Lower Darby Creek Superfund Site in Pennsylvania) has not yet been issued; therefore, no groundwater cleanup level has been established. The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) sets forth certain guiding principles for addressing groundwater, particularly “to return usable groundwaters to their beneficial uses wherever practicable, within a timeframe that is reasonable given the particular circumstances of the site.” The NCP further states that federal Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) “shall be attained by remedial actions for ground or surface waters that are current or potential sources of drinking water.”

Contaminated groundwater within the boundary of the Folcroft Landfill is within a waste management area and is not considered a potential source of drinking water. However, the contaminated groundwater that extends outside of boundary of the Folcroft Landfill is considered a potential source of drinking water through a classification system by the State of Pennsylvania. Therefore, EPA anticipates that

federal MCLs will be evaluated as potential cleanup levels for contaminated groundwater outside of the boundary of the Folcroft Landfill.

7. This Operable Unit, which is owned by the Department of the Interior, is within the John Heinz Wildlife Refuge.
- a. Do EPA's goals for groundwater restoration take into account the Department of Interior's long range plan for the Refuge?

ANSWER – EPA has coordinated extensively with the Department of the Interior (DOI) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) with regard to Operable Unit 2 (OU2), Folcroft Landfill, throughout the Remedial Investigation (RI). Additionally, EPA entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with DOI in 2005 to clearly define the roles of both agencies at this OU. USFWS indicated in a letter dated February 23, 2018, that groundwater extraction for various uses is routinely permitted in refuges, if the refuge manager determines that it is appropriate to do so. Currently, the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge (the Refuge) Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) does not prohibit groundwater extraction on the Refuge, and the USFWS cannot eliminate the possibility that groundwater extraction may be necessary in the future. This is consistent with the State and EPA's position that groundwater at OU2 is considered a potential future source of drinking water.

- b. Is the Folcroft Landfill eligible for a Technical impracticability waiver for groundwater?

ANSWER – Any Superfund site is eligible for a technical impracticability (TI) waiver if it is demonstrated that it is technically impracticable, from an engineering perspective, of achieving applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), such as federal maximum contaminant levels (MCLs), throughout the groundwater contaminant plume. EPA and the Potentially Responsibility Party Group (PRP Group) at OU2 have discussed the possibility of a TI waiver at OU2. The PRP Group is currently evaluating the collection of additional groundwater data that would be required to support a TI waiver application.

- c. What is the process and standard to receive a TI waiver?

ANSWER – The detailed process for requesting a TI waiver is provided in the following the EPA guidance documents:

- **OSWER Directive 9234.2-25, Guidance for Evaluating Technical Impracticability of Groundwater Restoration September, 1993;**
- **OSWER Directive 9200.4-14, Consistent Implementation of the FY 1993 Guidance on Technical Impracticability of Groundwater Restoration at Superfund Sites, January 19, 1995;**

- **OLEM Directive 9200.3-117, Clarification of the Consultation Process for Evaluating the Technical Impracticability of Groundwater Restoration at CERCLA Sites, December 28, 2016.**

In general, in accordance with the guidance, the applicant is required to provide the following information in a TI waiver application:

- **Specific applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) or media cleanup standards for which TI determinations are sought;**
- **Spatial area over which the TI decision will apply;**
- **Conceptual model that describes site geology, hydrology, groundwater contamination sources, transport, and fate;**
- **An evaluation of the restoration potential of the site, including data and analyses that support any assertion that attainment of ARARs or media cleanup standards is technically impracticable from an engineering perspective. At a minimum, this generally should include a demonstration that contamination sources have been identified and have been, or will be, removed and contained to the extent practicable; an analysis of the performance of any ongoing or completed remedial actions; predictive analyses of the timeframes to attain required cleanup levels using available technologies; and a demonstration that no other remedial technologies (conventional or innovative) could reliably, logically, or feasibly attain the cleanup levels at the site within a reasonable timeframe;**
- **Estimates of the cost of the existing or proposed remedy options, including construction, operation, and maintenance costs;**
- **Any additional information or analyses that the EPA deems necessary for the TI evaluation.**

EPA will then evaluate the TI waiver application and decide if a TI waiver is warranted, and issue a Record of Decision documenting the TI waiver.

- d. How would changes to the process and standards for awarding a TI waiver, as recommended by the July 2017 EPA Taskforce Report, impact the Superfund process at the Folcroft Landfill?

ANSWER – To date, no changes to the groundwater restoration policy have resulted from the Superfund Task Force Recommendations. If changes to the groundwater restoration policy occur in the future, the groundwater cleanup approach at OU2 will be evaluated accordingly.

8. EPA’s recently released proposed rule on increasing transparency in regulatory science states that the proposal is consistent with the requirements for major scientific journals like Science, Nature, and the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
 - a. Why are more journals and scientific institutions implementing these transparency policies?

ANSWER –The proposed rule is in line with the scientific community’s moves toward increased data sharing to allow for transparency and reproducibility. EPA believes that making regulatory science publicly available in a manner sufficient for independent validation will strengthen the integrity of EPA’s regulatory actions and its obligation to ensure the Agency is not arbitrary in its conclusions.

- b. Isn’t replication and verification a key step in the scientific process?

ANSWER – Replicating and verifying science and data are important ways to help ensure that the resulting data was not skewed or based on other factors outside the scientific process.

9. Despite the many claims made prior to the release of this proposal, would this proposed rule violate any existing federal laws on privacy?

ANSWER – EPA has sought to ensure that this proposed rule is consistent with existing privacy laws; as we note in the NPRM, the intention is to make data available in a manner consistent with statutory requirements for protection of privacy and confidentiality of research participants, protection of proprietary data and confidential business information, and other compelling interests.

10. What is this proposed rule’s impact on confidential business information (CBI)? Please state how you plan to ensure that in any final rule EPA will neither: be (1) prevented from using science that cannot be published (because it has CBI in it) nor forced into the default position that EPA should endeavor to publicly release all scientific data – including legally colorable CBI – so that this science can be used by the Agency?

ANSWER – The proposed rule is consistent with existing laws on CBI. EPA will follow all laws relating to CBI in developing the final rulemaking.

11. I understand the Agency is looking at its work force to see how it can better function.

- a. How many people does EPA have working full-time for the Agency in headquarters?

ANSWER – As of June 6, 2018, the EPA has a total of 7,266 full-time employees in its headquarters program offices. Of these, 4,444 work in the Washington, D.C.-area offices and 2,822 work in EPA’s field offices.

- b. How many people does EPA have working full-time for it in its regional offices?

ANSWER – As of June 6, 2018, the EPA has 6,574 full-time employees at its regional offices.

- c. How many contractors currently work for EPA? [if he doesn’t know what number ask him for a percentage. If that fails, ask him why not]?

ANSWER – As of June 6, the number of active EPA contractors with EPA contractor badges is 4,007 including 1,164 contractors in the Washington, D.C.-area offices, and 2,843 contractors in EPA regions and field offices ¹.

12. One of the priorities for the proposed budget includes an “EPA Reform Plan.” Projects under this plan include streamlining the permit review process, developing a Lean Management System, and reducing the reporting burden on the regulated community.

a. Why were these areas made priorities?

ANSWER – EPA’s Reform Plan reflects a balance of improvements EPA must achieve to provide both better customer service to those we regulate and better mission outcomes for the American taxpayer who expects a return on their investment.

b. What progress has been made so far on these efforts?

ANSWER – Before this Administration, EPA had no system to track the amount of time it took to issue permits. We have now established such a system and it is reviewed on a monthly basis as part of the Lean Management System (LMS). Using this data we have initiated several lean process improvement projects to shorten the amount of time it takes for EPA to issue permits in those areas with the longest lead time and highest volume. We have also established a working group to identify opportunities for reducing the reporting burden on the regulated community. This work is ongoing. As for developing EPA’s LMS, each national program and regional office now has a set of draft performance measures that they review during a monthly executive meeting and submit to the Chief of Operations. As a result, over 400 measures are reported in a standard red/yellow/green “bowling chart” showing whether monthly targets are being met. If a target is not met over several months, documentation is submitted stating what actions will be taken to get the measure back on track. The Administrator also holds Quarterly Performance Reviews with his leadership team to track progress on Strategic Measures and Reform Plan priority areas. Furthermore, EPA has developed a Readiness Assessment to prepare the entire agency for full-scale LMS deployment and has begun deploying in Region 7.

c. Do you have benchmarks and timelines for the Reform Plan?

¹The count includes active contractors on active contracts where the individuals have been issued a badge in compliance with the requirements of Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD) 12. HSPD 12 badges are issued when a contractor requires physical or logical access to EPA facilities or network for more than 6 months.

ANSWER – We are actively working on setting benchmarks and timelines for the Reform Plan. Many of the priority areas lacked data or comprehensive information from the previous administration.

13. What are the biggest obstacles to meaningfully reforming EPA to engage the 21st Century?

ANSWER – The biggest obstacle to reform is creating urgency in implementing institutional reforms and ensuring that leaders within EPA understand the importance of breaking with the status quo and addressing long needed institutional change.

14. The proposed budget has four Agency Priority Goals, including that EPA intends to meet statutory deadlines for chemical reviews under the Toxic Substances Control Act. In particular, EPA plans 100 percent compliance with “existing” chemicals and only 80 percent compliance certain “new” chemicals.

Under the law, EPA is the gatekeeper to innovation because these chemicals cannot go to onto the market until EPA decides they can and companies cannot work to improve these chemicals unless EPA says there is a problem.

As of April 17, 2018, EPA’s website was reporting that EPA had 449 pending applications for new chemicals. In addition, the EPA website claims the typical caseload for new chemicals under review is approximately 300 cases.

- a. Is the increase in pending applications – at one-third of EPA’s historical output, due to a higher number of new chemicals applications coming into the Agency at the same time or EPA falling behind again on getting them processed?

ANSWER – Although the Agency has not seen a significant increase in the number of notifications received, the current caseload number does not mean that EPA is “falling behind.” While the average caseload is around 300, that number can be higher or lower at any given time. Companies often voluntarily agree to suspend the review period to have technical discussions with EPA or to work on developing additional supporting information. Completing these reviews in a timely manner remains a top priority for the Agency. The Agency is taking several steps to address the immediate backlog, and to identify ways to increase overall efficiency for the program to maintain its viability over the long term. For example, we are continuing to increase the number of staff working in the new chemicals program. We’re also currently implementing process improvements identified through a recent LEAN event.

- b. What do you intend to do to eliminate the backlog and keep it at bay?

ANSWER – See response to question 14(a).

- c. One thing the EPA website does not give data on is just how long some of those applications have been sitting at EPA. The law is very clear 90 days and no more than 180 days to review and regulate.

- i. How many of the 449 new chemicals applications sitting at EPA are less than 90 days old?

ANSWER – It is important to note that companies often voluntarily agree to suspend the TSCA review period to have technical discussions with EPA or to work on developing additional supporting information. Thus, there is a difference between the time that has elapsed (A) since EPA’s receipt of a notice and (B) for purposes of the TSCA review period. For the responses below, EPA is providing statistics for the number of calendar days that a notice has been with EPA – not for purposes of the TSCA review period.

46 cases have been with EPA for less than 90 days.

- ii. How many of the 449 new chemical applications sitting at EPA are more than 90 days old, but less than 180 days?

ANSWER – 63 cases have been with EPA for less than 180 days.

- iii. How many of the 449 new chemical applications have been filed with EPA for more than 180 days and what is the range of time on them?

ANSWER – 340 cases have been with EPA for 180 days or more. The TSCA review period has been voluntarily suspended by the submitters for all of these cases. Of these 93 cases were reset on June 22, 2016, so they have been with EPA the longest. Of those 93 oldest cases:

- **40 are cases where the submitter is undertaking testing or gathering additional data;**
- **12 are cases involving Consent Orders that have not yet been signed by submitters; and**
- **41 cases involve various types of ongoing issues including: pending EPA issuance of Non-Order SNURs; company is exploring possible ways to mitigate identified risks; and company is in discussions with EPA about developing test protocols and other necessary testing information.**

15. Under TSCA section 26, the Agency has authority to set fees to defray the costs of chemical testing, new and existing chemical review and regulation and to offset related costs for processing confidential business information. For new chemicals, EPA moved the fee from \$2,500 to \$16,000 – a more than 6-fold increase – and for small manufacturing entities – EPA raised the fee for new chemicals from \$100 to \$2,800 – or a 28-fold increase.

- a. How much impact with these dramatic fee increases have on improving the speed at which the Agency is reviewing new chemicals?

ANSWER – The fees collected by the Agency under TSCA Section 26 are expected to improve our ability to effectively and efficiently administer the new chemicals program and improve the timeliness of our reviews. Additional fee revenue is expected to enable the Agency to increase the number of staff working in the new chemicals program, further enhance ongoing efforts to increase overall efficiency for the program to maintain its viability over the long term, and implement process improvements identified through a recent LEAN event.

b. If not much, then what is the problem?

ANSWER – See above. The Agency anticipates that fee revenues will help further efforts to improve the timeliness of new chemical reviews.

16. The proposed fee rule suggests EPA will see 10 percent fewer new chemical applications based on legal changes to how EPA is supposed to review new chemicals. What kind of new chemical applicant attrition is expected due to the combined fee increase and lack of generated revenue from the chemical?

ANSWER – The proposed fee rule includes a planning assumption that the Agency will receive 20% fewer new chemicals applications as a result of the increased fees. This assumption is based on the notion that companies may be more selective in terms of which chemicals they submit for review and the timing of those submissions given the higher upfront investment due to the increased fee.

17. Portland Harbor is complex site at which almost 100 potentially responsible parties (PRPs) have been identified. It is my understanding that on March 16, 2018, EPA sent all of the PRPs a letter indicating that EPA will be issuing Special Notice Letters for full performance of the remedial design/remedial action (RD/RA) at the Portland Harbor Site by the end of 2019. However, several of the PRPs have indicated that the allocation process will not be complete by that time, and that the issuance of Special Notice Letters will actually slow the clean-up, because companies will choose to litigate rather than potentially bear the full cost of the clean-up at that point. How will EPA balance the allocation process timeline and issuing the Special Notice Letters?

ANSWER – EPA is focused on getting the cleanup selected in the Record of Decision (ROD) underway at the Portland Harbor Superfund site as soon as possible. EPA is not privy to the allocation process among the PRPs at the Portland Harbor Superfund site and generally does not get involved in how responsible parties allocate costs among themselves. EPA issued the ROD at the Portland Harbor Site in January 2017. At Portland Harbor, the PRPs are conducting additional sampling to help design the remedy. That sampling also may be relevant to the PRP cost allocation, and is expected to be complete by early 2019.

Taking into account the ongoing sampling work and its potential relevance to the allocation process while still maintaining the overall goal to proceed with cleanup, on March 16, 2018, EPA sent a letter to the PRPs to notify them that EPA plans to issue

Special Notice letters to commence settlement negotiations, but not until the end of 2019. To maintain progress towards cleanup while the sampling is taking place, EPA also is working with parties to perform remedial design work at specific locations of the site. By the end of 2019, the PRPs should be able to proceed on a parallel path of presenting a plan to implement the Portland Harbor ROD even if there are remaining allocation issues.

The Honorable David B. McKinley

1. I appreciate your commitment to supporting cooperative federalism under the Coal Combustion Residuals (CCR) permitting program by working with states to develop, submit, and implement state CCR permit programs. How is EPA working with states as they develop and submit these plans, particularly those that are seeking to incorporate WIIN Act authorities rather than just adopting the current, self-implementing federal rule?

ANSWER – EPA has been actively working with states since the passage of the WIIN Act. The agency developed an interim final guidance outlining the process and procedures that the agency generally intends to use to review and make determinations on state Coal Combustion Residual (CCR) permit programs. This document provides guidance to the states for developing and submitting a program to EPA for approval. The guidance is divided into four chapters:

- **Chapter 1 provides an overview of the provisions of the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (WIIN Act).**
- **Chapter 2 contains the process and procedures the EPA is planning to use to review and make determinations on state CCR permit programs as well as the documentation EPA will ask states seeking approval of a program to submit.**
- **Chapter 3 contains a checklist of all the requirements of the current CCR rule at 40 CFR Part 257 subpart D.**
- **Chapter 4 provides a checklist of those items a state would submit when seeking approval of its CCR permit program.**

EPA encourages states who are or may be considering submitting a CCR permit program for approval to consult with the agency early in the process. Such consultations will enable EPA and the state to work through any areas where the state program may be different from the federal CCR regulation. The agency is currently working with about a dozen states and we look forward to working with these and other states and key stakeholders as we move forward in implementing the WIIN Act.

2. As states develop these programs, guidance from EPA will be important. With that in mind, Congress appropriated \$6 million to EPA for FY18 to develop its own federal permitting program for “non-participating states”. Please provide an update on and timeline for the development of that federal permit program.

ANSWER – EPA has several activities underway which support the development of a federal permit program. First, the agency has been engaged in modifications to the 2015 CCR rule which will provide the basis for both state and federal permit programs. EPA anticipates another rulemaking later this year, and as part of that, EPA hopes to further modify regulations for the federal permit program. In addition, EPA is developing draft templates for permit applications and also permits. Finally, EPA is working with our state partners to determine which states will be developing their own permit program and which will not, so that federal permitting efforts will not duplicate state efforts.

The National Association of Scholars recently published a report titled, “THE IRREPRODUCIBILITY CRISIS OF MODERN SCIENCE, Causes, Consequences, and the Road to Reform”. They state, “The Federal government should also consider instituting review commissions for each regulatory agency to investigate whether existing regulations are based on well-grounded, reproducible research. These should establish the scope of the problem by identifying those regulations that rely on un-replicated or irreproducible research, and recommending which regulations should be revoked.”

3. Will you commit the EPA to investigate whether existing regulations are based on well-grounded, reproducible research?

ANSWER – EPA supports efforts to ensure that the regulations it promulgates are based on well-grounded, reproducible research. In accordance with Executive Order 13777, EPA is taking steps to identify regulatory issues, including the basis for existing regulations (Section 3(d)(v) specifically addresses reproducibility), through ongoing regulatory reform efforts.

4. Will you commit the EPA to identify those regulations that rely on un-replicated or irreproducible research?

ANSWER – EPA supports efforts to ensure that the regulations it promulgates are based on well-grounded, reproducible research. As discussed above, per E.O. 13777, EPA is taking steps to identify regulatory issues through continuing regulatory reform efforts.

5. Will you provide a report to our committee and my office with the results of your investigation?

ANSWER – EPA is open to providing updates on its regulatory reform efforts as they continue. EPA provides ongoing information about its regulatory reform efforts at <https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/regulatory-reform>.

6. Will you provide a report to our committee and my office regarding if the endangerment finding for CO2 was based upon well-grounded, reproducible research?

ANSWER – EPA welcomes the opportunity to address specific issues with the committee, and encourages you to reach out to EPA staff to further discuss this request.

Administrator Pruitt, I know that the ethanol industry has recently attacked the EPA for granting small refinery hardship relief.

7. Does the Clean Air Act establish small refinery hardship relief?

ANSWER – Section 211(o)(9)(B) of the CAA and 40 CFR 80.1441(e)(2) allow EPA to grant an extension of a small refinery’s exemption from compliance with its renewable fuel volume obligations for a given year based on a small refinery’s demonstration of “disproportionate economic hardship” in that year. The statute also directs EPA to consult with the Department of Energy (DOE) in evaluating small refinery exemption petitions. EPA will grant a hardship exemption if we conclude, after review of available information and in consultation with DOE, that a refinery will experience disproportionate economic hardship that can be relieved in whole or in part by removing its RFS obligations for that year.

8. Has the Congress affirmed this on several occasions by directing the DOE to study this issue and, more recently, reminding the EPA that it did not intend for small refineries to bear a disproportionate regulatory burden?

ANSWER – In the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017, an explanatory statement directed EPA “to follow DOE’s recommendations which are based on the original 2011 Small Refinery Exemption study prepared for Congress and the conference report to division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016.”

9. Did the DOE’s 2011 report for Congress predict that harm to small refineries would increase over time, not diminish?

ANSWER – DOE’s 2011 report did not make any predictions regarding whether the number of small refineries seeking relief would increase or decrease over time.

10. Did the 10th circuit decision last year instruct the EPA to grant small refinery hardship relief?

ANSWER – No. The 10th Circuit, in *Sinclair Wyoming Refining Company v. EPA*, 874 F.3d 1159 (2017), vacated EPA’s decisions to deny petitions for exemption from the Renewable Fuel Standard for 2014 for two of Sinclair’s small refineries and remanded those decisions back to EPA.

Some have made the argument that hardship relief results in “demand destruction” for ethanol by resulting in less blending. Regardless of if small refineries receive hardship relief, they are incentivized to blend ethanol for many economic reasons: 1) it is cheaper than gasoline, 2) they must meet their RVO, and 3) they can sell RINS not needed for compliance.

11. Was ethanol consumption up in the first quarter of 2018?

ANSWER – According to ethanol consumption data from the Energy Information Administration (EIA), ethanol consumption was 6% lower in the first quarter of 2018 relative to the fourth quarter of 2017, and 2% higher in the first quarter of 2018 relative to the first quarter of 2017.

12. Was it, in fact, higher than projected in November of 2017 when RINS were 80-90 cents a gallon?

ANSWER – According to ethanol consumption data from the EIA, the monthly average ethanol consumption in the first quarter of 2018 was 6% lower than ethanol consumption in November 2017.

13. Did ethanol consumption increase throughout 2017 despite hardship relief?

ANSWER – According to ethanol consumption data from the EIA, ethanol consumption increased through the first three quarters of 2017 (from 3.37 billion gallons in the first quarter to 3.66 billion gallons in the second quarter and 3.70 billion gallons in the third quarter) before decreasing in the 4th quarter (to 3.67 billion gallons).

President Obama used an EPA “veto” twice in unprecedented fashion. The Spruce Coal Mine located in West Virginia, had the required permits and approvals in hand, when the EPA “vetoed” the project. The project went through the entire regulatory process and was approved by ALL parties. Then the Obama Administration’s “War on Coal” went into high gear. The EPA vetoed the project. The second instance was the Pebble Mine in Alaska, where they vetoed the project prior to the approval process starting. Both instances of using the EPA veto are very dangerous if they are allowed to stay in place. A future administration can use the veto to shut down the entire coal mining industry if both precedents are not reversed by the EPA. I can think of no greater threat to the industry.

14. Will you consider revoking both the Spruce Mine and Pebble Mine vetoes?

ANSWER – Regarding Pebble Mine, the EPA has not made a Final Determination pursuant to Section 404(c). In 2014, the EPA issued a Proposed Determination pursuant to 404(c) regarding Pebble Mine. In 2017, the EPA considered withdrawing that Proposed Determination but, as outlined in its January 26, 2018, decision, the EPA suspended the proceeding to withdraw the Proposed Determination and left that Proposed Determination in place pending consideration of any other information that is relevant to the protection of the world-class fisheries contained in the Bristol Bay watershed in light of the permit application that has now been submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers by the mine proponent. The EPA’s January 2018 decision neither deters nor derails the Corps’ review of Pebble’s Section 404 permit application, which is currently ongoing. Regarding Spruce Mine, the EPA issued a Final Determination under 404(c) in 2011 that protected portions of the mine site with high ecological value from being adversely impacted by the mine’s development. The mine

proponent has been exploring development of revised proposals to expand mining at the site. If a revised proposal is developed and submitted to the EPA, the agency would review and consider it.

15. Do you believe that the EPA should have the authority to preemptively veto development projects under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act before any permit applications have been submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers?

ANSWER – EPA believes it has the authority to exercise its discretion under Section 404(c) to restrict, prohibit, or deny the discharge of dredged or fill material “whenever” it makes the requisite finding that the discharge will have an unacceptable adverse effect on municipal water supplies, shellfish beds and fishery, wildlife, or recreation areas, and EPA takes very seriously the authority it was provided by Congress pursuant to Section 404(c). As a general matter, EPA has policy concerns about issuing a final determination under Section 404(c) before the submission of a permit application to the Corps or the completion of an EIS. EPA’s decision whether to exercise such authority preemptively would involve considerations of basic fairness and due process.

16. President Trump, in his Infrastructure Initiative, has proposed legislation that eliminates entirely EPA’s authority to veto projects under the Clean Water Act. Why have you taken a position, by leaving in place the Pebble veto, that is different than the President’s policy?

ANSWER – The EPA’s January 26, 2018 decision suspends the proceeding to withdraw the Proposed Determination and leaves that Determination in place pending consideration of any other information that is relevant to the protection of the world-class fisheries contained in the Bristol Bay watershed in light of the permit application that has now been submitted to the Corps. This decision neither deters nor derails the Corps’ review of Pebble’s Section 404 permit application, which is currently ongoing.

In making the decision regarding whether to withdraw the 2014 Proposed Determination at this time, the EPA considered its relevant statutory authority, applicable regulations, and the input it received as part of the tribal consultation, Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, Corporation consultation, and public comment periods regarding the agency’s reasons for its proposed withdrawal, as well as recent developments, including Pebble’s submittal of a Section 404 permit application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in December of 2017. The EPA received more than one million public comments regarding its proposal to withdraw the 2014 Proposed Determination, the overwhelming majority of which expressed opposition to withdrawal.

17. Isn’t it correct that under the applicable regulations the Army Corps of Engineers cannot issue a permit to a project developer if the EPA has even begun the process of issuing a veto?

ANSWER – While it is true that the Army Corps cannot issue a permit while a pending 404(c) determination proceeding is ongoing, the Corps’ regulations allow it to

accept, review, and process a permit application for a proposed project even if EPA has an ongoing Section 404(c) review for that project. The Corps is processing Pebble's permit application consistent with its regulations, including developing an Environmental Impact Statement for the Pebble Project. EPA's decision to suspend the withdrawal process states that it will review and consider any relevant information that becomes available to inform future Section 404(c) decisions regarding the Pebble Project.

18. Is there any environmental harm that occurs whatsoever by allowing a permit application to be considered by the Army Corps of Engineers without a veto pending?

ANSWER – As a general matter, EPA has policy concerns about issuing a final determination under Section 404(c) before the submission of a permit application to the Corps or the completion of an EIS. EPA believes that a decision regarding whether to exercise its section 404(c) authority preemptively would involve considerations of basic fairness and due process. To be sure, the Corps' regulations allow it to accept, review, and process a permit application for a proposed project even if the EPA has an ongoing Section 404(c) review for that project. Pebble has now submitted its permit application to the Corps and the Corps has initiated its permit review process and begun taking steps to develop an EIS for this project. These actions resolve any potential uncertainty about Pebble's ability to submit a permit application and have that permit application reviewed by the Corps.

The EPA's January 26, 2018 decision to suspend the withdrawal process states that the EPA will review and consider any relevant information that becomes available. This will allow EPA to get the information needed to determine what specific impacts the proposed mining project will have on those critical resources.

19. Isn't it better to wait until the Army Corps of Engineers has decided whether to grant a permit before EPA issues a veto, if one is to be issued at all?

ANSWER – As a general matter, EPA has policy concerns about issuing a final determination under Section 404(c) before the submission of a permit application to the Corps or the completion of an EIS. EPA believes that a decision regarding whether to exercise its section 404(c) authority preemptively would involve considerations of basic fairness and due process. To be sure, the Corps' regulations allow it to accept, review, and process a permit application for a proposed project even if the EPA has an ongoing Section 404(c) review for that project. Pebble has now submitted its permit application to the Corps and the Corps has initiated its permit review process and begun taking steps to develop an EIS for this project. These actions resolve any potential uncertainty about Pebble's ability to submit a permit application and have that permit application reviewed by the Corps.

The EPA's January 26, 2018 decision to suspend the withdrawal process states that the EPA will review and consider any relevant information that becomes available. This will allow EPA to get the information needed to determine what specific impacts the proposed mining project will have on those critical resources.

20. Has EPA ever before issued a preemptive veto of the sort you have left in place with your decision not to withdraw the veto of the Pebble mine?

ANSWER – Of the 13 Final Determinations completed by the EPA, two involved circumstances where permit applications had not yet been submitted to the Corps, both of which were completed nearly thirty years ago. Although Section 404(c) actions are extremely rare, and rarer still in advance of the submittal of a permit application, the EPA’s 2014 Proposed Determination is not unprecedented.

21. In the Agency’s decision not to withdraw the preemptive Pebble veto, you cited the risk created by the project. In doing so, you are relying on the Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment, which many of the Agency’s own peer reviewers said was insufficient to support a regulatory decision. Why are you relying on science that has been discredited?

ANSWER – The EPA published its proposal to withdraw its CWA Section 404 (c) Proposed Determination in July 2017 and took public comment, held two public hearings in the Bristol Bay region, and consulted with tribal governments and Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) Corporations from the Bristol Bay region. The EPA received more than a million public comments on its withdrawal proposal. In making its decision not to withdraw the Proposed Determination at this time, the EPA considered its relevant statutory authority, applicable regulations, and the input it received as part of the tribal consultation, ANCSA consultation, and public comment periods regarding the agency’s reasons for its proposing withdrawal as well as the recent developments (e.g., the submittal of Pebble’s permit application to the Army Corps).

The Honorable Gregg Harper

1. Does the Clean Air Act establish small refinery hardship relief?

ANSWER - Section 211(o)(9)(B) of the CAA and 40 CFR 80.1441(e)(2) allow EPA to grant an extension of a small refinery’s exemption from compliance with its renewable fuel volume obligations for a given year based on a small refinery’s demonstration of “disproportionate economic hardship” in that year. The statute also directs EPA to consult with the Department of Energy (DOE) in evaluating small refinery exemption petitions. EPA will grant a hardship exemption if we conclude, after review of available information and in consultation with DOE, that a refinery will experience disproportionate economic hardship that can be relieved in whole or in part by removing its RFS obligations for that year.

2. Has the Congress affirmed this on several occasions by directing the DOE to study this issue and, more recently, reminding the EPA that it did not intend for small refineries to bear a disproportionate regulatory burden?

ANSWER - In the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017, an explanatory statement directed EPA “to follow DOE’s recommendations which are based on the original 2011

Small Refinery Exemption study prepared for Congress and the conference report to division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016.”

3. Did the DOE’s 2011 report for Congress predict that harm to small refineries would increase over time, not diminish?

ANSWER - DOE’s 2011 report did not make any predictions regarding whether the number of small refineries seeking relief would increase or decrease over time.

4. Do small refineries typically produce more diesel than gasoline?

ANSWER - Based on EIA data, most small refineries produce more gasoline than diesel.

5. Blending gasoline with ethanol to current standards will separate more RINs than blending the same volume of diesel. EPA’s RVO calculation, however, imposes the same proportional ethanol RIN obligation on all refiners even though some produce significantly less gasoline and more diesel than others. Even if they blend all their production, these diesel rich refiners cannot separate enough RINs to meet their total obligation while their gasoline rich competition will separate more than required. These refiners who produce more diesel are then forced to buy RINS.

Does the hardship process give EPA a tool to mitigate this structural discrimination against these small refineries?

ANSWER - One of the metrics that DOE uses when scoring small refinery hardship petitions is whether the small refinery has an above-average percentage of diesel production.

6. RFA has made the argument that hardship relief results in “demand destruction” for ethanol by resulting in less blending. Regardless of whether or not small refineries receive hardship relief, they are incentivized to blend ethanol for a number of economic reasons: 1) it is cheaper than gasoline, 2) they must meet their RVO, and 3) they can sell RINS not needed for compliance.

- a. Was ethanol consumption up in the first quarter of 2018?

ANSWER - According to ethanol consumption data from EIA, ethanol consumption was 6% lower in the first quarter of 2018 relative to the fourth quarter of 2017, and 2% higher in the first quarter of 2018 relative to the first quarter of 2017.

- b. Was it, in fact, higher than projected in November of 2017 when RINS were 80-90 cents a gallon?

ANSWER - According to ethanol consumption data from the EIA, the monthly average ethanol consumption in the first quarter of 2018 was 6% lower than ethanol consumption in November 2017.

- c. Did ethanol consumption increase throughout 2017 despite the EPA granting small refinery hardship relief?

ANSWER - According to ethanol consumption data from the EIA, ethanol consumption increased through the first three quarters of 2017 (from 3.37 billion gallons in the first quarter to 3.66 billion gallons in the second quarter and 3.70 billion gallons in the third quarter) before decreasing in the 4th quarter (to 3.67 billion gallons).

7. Some of my constituents have raised an issue regarding oil spill response training. I am told that the funding for certain training courses for federal and local responders involved in inland oil spill prevention and cleanup has been eliminated and that the EPA Environmental Response Team is no longer able to consistently make these courses available.
- a. With an increase in oil production across the country, there remains a need for oil spill response training for local, state, and federal responders. Would you commit to looking into whether funding can and will be made available for this important training?

ANSWER - The agency will continue to provide oil spill inspector training to federal and state inspectors.

8. I want to applaud the work EPA is doing to streamline or eliminate unnecessarily costly regulations. And while most of the attention is focused on major rules like the Clean Power Plan or Waters of the United States, I am particularly pleased that under your leadership EPA is taking a second look at other regulations that may not be major but nonetheless have a serious impact on small businesses. In particular, I hear that EPA is reviewing the Obama era rule targeting wood heater manufacturers such as Hardy Manufacturing back in my district. But time is of the essence, as the regulatory deadlines are coming soon. Can you assure us that you will do all you can to provide timely regulatory relief for wood heater manufacturers?

ANSWER - EPA is considering steps to provide relief for manufacturers of certain types of wood-burning heaters while the agency works to ensure its New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for Residential Wood Heaters are based on real-world conditions. The EPA expects to issue shortly a proposed rule which will set forth certain specific issues in the NSPS on which the agency is ready to take comment. In addition, the EPA expects to issue an advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPR) to take comment on additional issues. The EPA will use the comments received in response to the ANPR to develop a second proposed rule later this year covering these additional issues.

The Honorable Tim Walberg

1. This is a very technical issue but an extremely important one to manufacturers in Michigan. In 2011, EPA approved the use of Isobutane as a refrigerant and limited the amount of refrigerant that could be used in a refrigerator to 57 grams. This amount was based on a well-recognized safety standard limit at the time. However, the safety standard has since been updated to increase the allowable amount of refrigerant to 150 grams. These refrigerants are more environmentally friendly and supported by both industry and environmental advocates yet manufacturers are still in limbo as they await EPA's rulemaking.

a. Can you commit to working on this issue to recognize the updated safety standard so manufacturers can begin retooling and redesigning refrigeration products? Delay will only add cost to American workers and our manufacturing shop floors.

ANSWER - Yes, this past December, EPA issued a direct final rule (82 FR 58122; December 11, 2017) and companion proposal to incorporate by reference the revised UL safety standard that allows for a larger charge size for the approved flammable refrigerants in household refrigerators and freezers. Because we received adverse comment during the public comment period, we withdrew the direct final rule (83 FR 9703; March 7, 2018). EPA is moving forward to address the relevant comments in a subsequent final rule.

b. I know you have a lot of issues to deal with at the EPA, but I urge you to publish the technical correction without delay. It's my understanding refrigerator manufacturers have been working with your staff at the EPA for over a year now on this and would welcome the update.

ANSWER - We understand the interest and importance of this issue to the industry. EPA has been working with a number of equipment manufacturers and trade associations which has been very helpful.

2. ENERGY STAR is an important program and one that consumers in my district value. Over the past year, manufacturers in my state have stressed the need for the program to be reformed. In the FY18 Omnibus Appropriations package, EPA and DOE were directed to revisit the Obama era Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that changed the way the program was managed and report back to Congress within 90 days.

a. The 2009 MOU for example moved home appliances out of DOE and over to EPA, where the products had never been managed before. DOE has the expertise in these products because they regulate them through the appliance standards program required by EPCA. It doesn't make sense to me to have duplicative programs built up within two agencies. From a good governance perspective and in the era of streamlining programs under the EPA's purview, I would like to hear from you on this specific topic.

ANSWER - As you acknowledge, language in the conference report for the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018 directed EPA to “work with the DOE to review the 2009 MOU and report to the Committees within 90 days of enactment of this Act on whether the expected efficiencies for home appliance products have been achieved.” EPA is currently working with DOE to review the 2009 MOU and to draft a report to Congress as directed. Prior to the signing of the 2009 MOU, EPA managed more than 50 product categories, including two appliances, and DOE managed seven product categories, including four appliances. In September 2009, EPA and DOE signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that redefined roles and responsibilities for EPA and DOE in response to industry concerns and to enhance and expand the various aspects of ENERGY STAR. The 2009 MOU realigned roles for the ENERGY STAR products program to capitalize on each Agency’s expertise. Under the MOU, EPA and DOE work together to implement the ENERGY STAR program. The division of responsibilities established by the MOU have resulted in significant improvements to the program including standardized program approaches, program enhancements, and reduced duplication of effort, benefiting American consumers, ENERGY STAR partners, and the environment. It also has helped resolve market confusion. EPA remains committed to improving the ENERGY STAR program in response to stakeholder feedback and to work closely with our industry partners to ensure the ENERGY STAR program continues to work well for those partners and American consumers.

- b. Would you support moving the ENERGY STAR program for home appliances back to DOE while still maintaining a majority of the management within EPA? It’s my understanding a broad set of industries are eager to work with your agency on these issues and I look forward to working with you to revisit the MOU.

ANSWER - As stated above, EPA is currently working with DOE to review the 2009 MOU and to draft a report to Congress, as directed, on whether the expected efficiencies for home appliance products have been achieved. The division of responsibilities established by the MOU have resulted in significant improvements to the program including standardized program approaches, program enhancements, and reduced duplication of effort, benefiting American consumers, ENERGY STAR partners, and the environment. It also has helped resolve market confusion. EPA remains committed to improving the ENERGY STAR program in response to stakeholder feedback and to work closely with our industry partners to ensure the ENERGY STAR program continues to work well for those partners and American consumers.

The Honorable Earl L. “Buddy” Carter

EPA Marine Engine Waivers

In a recent Energy & Commerce Committee hearing, you mentioned that you would now be personally involved in the marine engine waiver issue for pilot boats, after giving the commitment

to look into in your December testimony from the committee. This is a pressing issue that could have a wide-ranging impact on our port operations and growth.

1. Mr. Administrator, can you please provide a breakdown of the actions the EPA has taken to address the Tier 4 concerns?

ANSWER - EPA staff performed outreach with affected stakeholders including meeting with the Savannah Bar Pilots with specific questions about their concerns, as well as the pilot boat builder. After the April 26 hearing, EPA sent technical experts to Seattle to meet with the pilot boat builder to discuss technical issues in detail. EPA staff also met with seven marine engine manufacturers to better understand what Tier 4 engines are available now or will be available in the near future. EPA staff also spoke with NOAA to discuss the NOAA whale strike rule impacts on pilot boat operations. EPA will use information gathered in these meetings to inform a path forward.

2. Please provide a timeline of what the EPA has done and any upcoming actions that will be taken by the EPA to address this concern.

ANSWER - Since October 2017, EPA has engaged in technical outreach with industry stakeholders and NOAA, as described above. Currently, EPA is reviewing our options for moving forward.

3. After you send technical experts to California, what will need to be done?

ANSWER - EPA's technical experts have recently met with the boat builder in Seattle (not California). EPA will use information gathered in that meeting and other discussions to inform any future action.

4. Does the EPA have the authority to move forward with a waiver system? If not, what are your legal restrictions?

ANSWER - EPA regulations provide limited exemptions from the Tier 4 marine engine standards for specific circumstances such as national security. However, these exemptions would not apply in these circumstances. Additionally, there is no waiver process for Tier 4 marine engine standards where a compliant engine is not available that meets a boat operator's needs. Any potential waiver process for boat operators or other change to EPA's existing regulations would require a rulemaking.

Tier 4 Restrictions for Generators

1. Administrator Pruitt, I have a similar concern for the Tier 4 restrictions placed on large, 1-megawatt generators. It's my understanding that the Tier 4 restrictions are preventing Tier-4 generators from being sold in the market due to that and the portability restrictions. It's forecasted that there won't be a viable solution in the market until the early 2020s. Is this something you are working on?

ANSWER - Engine manufacturers had several years of lead time before the Tier 4 standards took effect, which provided ample time to develop compliant engines. Engine manufacturers have a low volume of sales in this power category and chose not to initially focus on developing Tier 4 engines. Engine manufacturers prepared their customers for the lag time in engine availability and have indicated that Tier 4 generators will be available soon.

2. What would need to be done by the EPA to remedy this situation and allow for the sale of currently developed generators?

ANSWER - Any revisions to the emission standards would need to go through notice and comment rulemaking. The emission standards would have to be revised. This likely could not be accomplished before Tier 4 generators become available, due to the need to undertake a notice and comment rulemaking. In addition, it would greatly disrupt the market to allow new Tier 2 generators to be sold, since some engine manufacturers have already invested resources to develop Tier 4 generators.

3. Is the EPA currently reviewing this concern or working on any changes that would remedy it?

ANSWER - EPA has reviewed this issue and does not currently believe that revisions to the regulations are warranted.

Biomass

I commend you for your policy statement clarifying biomass carbon neutrality on Monday, April 23 in my home state of Georgia. As you know, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018 included language in Section 431 Policies Relating to Biomass Energy directing the Secretaries of Energy and Agriculture and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish clear and simple policies that reflect the carbon-neutrality of forest bioenergy and recognize biomass as a renewable energy source provided the use of forest biomass does not cause the conversion of forests to non-forest use.

1. What is the EPA's progress in implementing a regulation on carbon neutrality of biomass? What are the next steps?

ANSWER - As follow up to the April 23, 2018 memo regarding EPA's policy on the treatment of biogenic carbon dioxide emissions and to align with the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018, the EPA is considering how this policy may be implemented in EPA permitting programs and other parts of the Clean Air Act. In addition, the Agency is having a dialogue with USDA and DOE on how to best coordinate on this topic to align our policies.

The Honorable Jeff Duncan

Some of my corporate constituents are subject to complex and, at times, inconsistent regulation by the Environmental Protection Agency. Inconsistent actions or interpretations by EPA are

particularly burdensome to my constituents when the Agency's Policy and Enforcement Offices take positions that are at odds with each other. To that end, please explain whether, and to what extent, EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance ("OECA") consults with EPA's Office of Transportation and Air Quality ("OTAQ") prior to initiating any enforcement action involving a certification issued by OTAQ (for example, an enforcement action alleging uncertified engine parameters).

1. In addition, what steps can be taken by EPA to improve and streamline consultation between OTAQ and OECA to avoid unnecessary hardship on the regulated community?

ANSWER: EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) consults with the Office of Transportation and Air Quality (OTAQ) on all significant enforcement actions. OECA staff and middle management have weekly meetings with their OTAQ counterparts on enforcement matters. This partnership ensures efficient use of government resources and consistent compliance expectations for the regulated community.

EPA believes the current process for coordination between OECA and OTAQ is appropriate.

During the last Administration, many Energy Star program operations were shifted from the Department of Energy, where they had been since 1996, to EPA. I understand from home appliance manufacturers that they would like Energy Star efforts related to home appliances transferred back to the DOE. One of these is Electrolux, a home appliance manufacturer that has a large presence in my district in Anderson, SC. This is an important issue for South Carolina as we have recently seen a great deal of investment in the home appliance industry. In Newberry, SC Samsung recently opened its first U.S. based home appliance manufacturing facility and is on track to create over 1,000 jobs by 2020.

1. With the Appliance Standard program at DOE and Energy Star at EPA, companies currently have two federal agencies attempting to coordinate changes in product specifications and test procedures on the same products. This creates unnecessary cost, confusion and uncertainty for manufacturers and does not appear to bring any benefit to consumers. **Administrator Pruitt**-are there any efforts to make such a change?

ANSWER - EPA and DOE work together to implement the ENERGY STAR program under an MOU jointly agreed upon in 2009. There is language in the conference report for the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018 that directs EPA to "work with the DOE to review the 2009 MOU and report to the Committees within 90 days of enactment of this Act on whether the expected efficiencies for home appliance products have been achieved." EPA is currently working with DOE to review the 2009 MOU and to draft a report to Congress as directed. Prior to the signing of the 2009 MOU, EPA managed more than 50 product categories, including two appliances, and DOE managed seven product categories, including four appliances. In September 2009, EPA and DOE signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that redefined roles and responsibilities for EPA and DOE in response to industry concerns and to enhance and expand the various aspects of ENERGY STAR. The 2009 MOU realigned roles for

the ENERGY STAR products program to capitalize on each Agency’s expertise. The division of responsibilities established by the MOU resulted in significant improvements to the program including standardized program approaches, program enhancements, and reduced duplication of effort, benefiting American consumers, ENERGY STAR partners, and the environment. It also helped resolve market confusion. EPA remains committed to improving the ENERGY STAR program in response to stakeholder feedback and to work closely with our industry partners to ensure the ENERGY STAR program continues to work well for those partners and American consumers.

2. Wouldn’t this change fit in with your desire to get EPA back to its core functions?

ANSWER - The ENERGY STAR program was established in 1992 under the authority of the Clean Air Act Section 103(g). Section 103(g) of the Clean Air Act directs EPA to "develop, evaluate, and demonstrate nonregulatory strategies and technologies for air pollution prevention... with opportunities for participation by [stakeholders]... including end-use efficiency" (42 USC Section 7403g). In 2005, Congress enacted the Energy Policy Act. Section 131 of the Act amended Section 324 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and directed the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy to implement “a voluntary program to identify and promote energy-efficient products and buildings in order to reduce energy consumption, improve energy security, and reduce pollution through voluntary labeling of or other forms of communication about products and buildings that meet the highest energy efficiency standards” (42 USC Section 6294a).

The FY 2019 President’s Budget includes a proposal to authorize the EPA to establish user fees for entities that participate in the ENERGY STAR program. By administering the ENERGY STAR program through the collection of user fees, the EPA would continue to provide a trusted resource for consumers and businesses who want to purchase products that save them money and help protect the environment.

The Honorable Frank Pallone, Jr.

During your appearance on April 26th, you stated that purchasing real estate through a Limited Liability Corporation, or LLC, is “normally how you buy real estate in Oklahoma.” Your ownership stake in that LLC was not included in your financial disclosures at the time.

1. How often have you purchased real estate through an LLC?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

2. Do you currently own property through an LLC or have a stake in an LLC that owns property?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

3. Please list all property you have purchased and/or owned a stake in through an LLC.

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

4. Please explain why your ownership stake in Capital House, LLC was not listed in your financial disclosures at the time.

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

Also at the April 26th hearing, you disavowed knowledge of whether you had paid taxes on the income from your ownership stake in Capital House LLC. You said “you provide information to your accountant, they determine what you pay.”

5. Did you sign your tax filings for the years in question? Do you take responsibility for the accuracy of the information contained therein?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

Extensive questions have been raised about your tax liability for the expenses of your security detail when they accompanied you on personal travel, including to Disney World and the Rose Bowl.

6. Did you pay taxes on that benefit?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

It has been revealed that the EPA reimbursed your former landlord, Vicki Hart, for the repair of a door at your residence.

7. Did you reimburse the EPA for that expense?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

8. If not, did you pay taxes on that income?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

During the Administrator's April appearance before the Subcommittee, Chairman Walden underscored the importance of staffing and internal management issues at EPA, stating "it is essential that EPA have the staff with proper expertise, implementing and enforcing programs that correlate with their experience."

9. Please provide the Committee a copy of the EPA's reorganization plan submitted to OMB pursuant to Executive Order 13781, including any interim and final drafts submitted to OMB.

ANSWER – Following a briefing on this issue, the Agency has provided all relevant information on the reform plan to your staff in June of 2018.

10. Please provide the Committee a copy of the EPA reform plan.

ANSWER – Following a briefing on this issue, the Agency has provided all relevant information on the reorganization plan to your staff in June of 2018.

11. Explain the similarities and differences between the reform plan and the reorganization plan.

ANSWER – Following a briefing on this issue, the Agency has provided all relevant information on the reform plan to your staff in June of 2018.

12. Please provide the Committee a copy of the EPA's operating plan for new hires and indicate how many new employees EPA plans to hire in each program office.

ANSWER – Following a briefing on this issue in June of 2018, the Agency has provided all relevant information on this topic to your staff.

13. Please provide the Committee with the names of political and career members of the hiring review panel.

ANSWER - Career members of the panel: Mike Flynn, Donna Vizian, David Bloom, Jennifer Orme-Zavaleta, Michelle Pirzadeh, Cheryl Newton. Political Members of the panel: Henry Darwin.

- a. On what criteria were the panel members chosen?

ANSWER - The panel members represented a cross section of the agency career management including the senior career official at the agency.

- b. What procedures do the offices need to do to make a hiring request of the panel?

ANSWER - Offices completed a template summarizing their strategy for managing their interim FTE levels. The template included the current on-board FTE level: the FY18 interim FTE level: the number FTE over/under FY 18 interim level: the strategy to meet the new level by end of FY18 and any special requests to meet short term critical needs.

The panel is no longer operative since it was an interim mechanism until the agency received its 2018 operating plan.

14. When filling a position from within the agency, how is it determined a staff member possesses the technological skills appropriate for the office of which they are being transferred?

ANSWER - There are several factors considered when deciding whether an internal employee is qualified for a reassignment. The human resources specialist within a human resources shared service center in the Office of Administration and Resources Management reviews the position description of the position to which the employee will be reassigned and reviews the employees' resume to determine whether the employee possesses the requisite knowledge, skills and abilities to successfully perform the assigned major duties and responsibilities. The human resources specialist also reviews the employees' college/university transcripts when the position has a positive education requirement.

Attention should be bestowed to qualification reviews whereby the proposed reassignment moves the employee to a position with a positive education requirement. There are instances whereby the employee meets positive education requirements, but lacks the one year of specialized experience which would render the employee qualified for the reassignment. The management official, with support from the servicing HRSSC, has the flexibility to use OPM's In-service Placement Provisions whereby an employee who does not meet specialized experience may be reassigned to the position. Please note for positions with positive education requirements, the employee would need to meet education requirements under In-service Placement Provisions.

15. Please provide the following information:

- a. FTE on EPA payroll in regional offices and in HQ.

**FTE
As of July 2018**

RPIO	RPIO Title	FY 2017 Ena	FY 2018 Ena
01	REGION 1, BOSTON	590.1	541.8
02	REGION 2, NEW YORK	783.6	723.8
03	REGION 3, PHILADELPHIA	782.5	724.6
04	REGION 4, ATLANTA	945.6	869.9
05	REGION 5, CHICAGO	1,077.3	995.7
06	REGION 6, DALLAS	755.5	684.3
07	REGION 7, KANSAS CITY	496.6	455.4
08	REGION 8, DENVER	527.5	484.8
09	REGION 9, SAN FRANCISCO	717.8	654.5
10	REGION 10, SEATTLE	531.3	482.8
11	OA	391.4	350.3
13	OITA	80.3	68.1
16	OARM	735.4	667.4
17	OCFO	344.4	319.9
18	OEI	396.3	377.6
20	OCSPP	1,001.8	974.9
26	ORD	1,703.9	1,513.9
27	OAR	1,145.3	1,086.7
30	OW	582.4	547.3
35	OIG	318.1	270.0
39	OGC	229.8	224.9
75	OLEM	502.9	463.3
77	OECA	768.3	690.1
	EPA Total	15,408.1	14,172.0

- b. The number of employees that have left the EPA through attrition during 2017 and 2018, and the numbers from each office.

AAship/ Region	Count of All Attrition
OA	211
OAR	131
OARM	108
OCFO	33
OCSPP	133
OECA	101
OEI	42
OGC	25

OIG	30
OITA	5
OLEM	48
ORD	206
OW	68
R01	57
R02	44
R03	84
R04	79
R05	92
R06	70
R07	71
R08	44
R09	66
R10	69
Grand Total	1817

This is attrition 01/01/2017 to 06/12/2018.

- c. Please provide a list of employees that have been moved to a new position within the agency, including their previous office, title, position description, and their new office, title, and position description.

ANSWER –Due to the personal nature of this question for career staff, the agency believes that QFRs are not the appropriate venue in which to respond to document requests of this nature and will seek to work with your staff on this request.

- d. The predetermined employee headcounts for each office.

ANSWER – The table provided shows onboard employees by office and division as of January 15, 2017 and June 18, 2018. It includes part-time and special government employees, i.e. Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) participants.

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OA		NEPA COMPLIANCE DIVISION		9
OA		PERMITTING POLICY DIVISION		5
OA	ASSOC ADMR FOR CONGRESS&INTERGOV RLNS		2	6
OA	ASSOC ADMR FOR CONGRESS&INTERGOV RLNS	INFORMATION & MANAGEMENT DIVISION	11	14
OA	ASSOC ADMR FOR CONGRESS&INTERGOV RLNS	OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS	8	13
OA	ASSOC ADMR FOR CONGRESS&INTERGOV RLNS	OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS	16	15
OA	ASSOC ADMR FOR OFFICE OF POLICY	Immediate Office	20	26
OA	ASSOC ADMR FOR OFFICE OF POLICY	NATL CENTER FOR ENVIRO ECONOMICS	31	33
OA	ASSOC ADMR FOR OFFICE OF POLICY	OFC OF REGULATORY POLICY & MANAGEMENT	31	35
OA	ASSOC ADMR FOR OFFICE OF POLICY	OFC OF STRATEGIC ENVIRO MANAGEMENT	26	
OA	ASSOC ADMR FOR OFFICE OF POLICY	OFFICE OF SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES	27	18
OA	OFC OF CHILDREN'S HEALTH PROTECTION	Immediate Office	3	1
OA	OFC OF CHILDREN'S HEALTH PROTECTION	PROG IMPLEMENTATION&COORDINATION DIV	6	7
OA	OFC OF CHILDREN'S HEALTH PROTECTION	REGULATORY SUPPORT&SCIENCE POLICY DIV	6	6
OA	OFC OF PUBLIC ENGAGMNT &ENVRNMNTL EDUC			2
OA	OFFICE OF ADMIN & EXECUTIVE SERVICES	ADMINISTRATIVE/MANAGEMENT STAFF	10	7

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OA	OFFICE OF ADMIN & EXECUTIVE SERVICES	Immediate Office	2	2
OA	OFFICE OF ADMIN & EXECUTIVE SERVICES	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT STAFF	7	8
OA	OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS	AFF EMPLOY ANALYS & ACCOUNT STAFF	5	4
OA	OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS	EMPLOYMENT COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION STF	12	9
OA	OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS	EXTERNAL COMPLIANCE STAFF	1	
OA	OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS	Immediate Office	5	4
OA	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION		8	17
OA	OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT		16	15
OA	OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY		10	9
OA	OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS	Immediate Office	5	12
OA	OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS	OFFICE OF INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS	3	3
OA	OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS	OFFICE OF MEDIA RELATIONS	6	4
OA	OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS	OFFICE OF MULTIMEDIA	10	8
OA	OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS	OFFICE OF PRESS SECRETARY		1
OA	OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS	OFFICE OF WEB COMMUNICATIONS	11	9
OA	OFFICE OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT		5	5
OA	OFFICE OF SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD		396	311
OA	OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS		13	11

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OA	OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	Immediate Office	15	32
OA	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE			21
OA Total			727	682
OAR	ASST ADMR FOR AIR & RADIATION	Immediate Office	17	22
OAR	OFC OF AIR POLICY & PROGRAM SUPPORT	Immediate Office	2	2
OAR	OFC OF AIR POLICY & PROGRAM SUPPORT	POLICY GROUP	5	5
OAR	OFC OF AIR POLICY & PROGRAM SUPPORT	PROGRAM SUPPORT	10	10
OAR	OFC OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING&STANDARDS	AIR QUALITY ASSESSMENT DIV	79	76
OAR	OFC OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING&STANDARDS	AIR QUALITY POLICY DIVISION	52	51
OAR	OFC OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING&STANDARDS	CENTRAL OPERATIONS & RESOURCES OFFICE	23	21
OAR	OFC OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING&STANDARDS	HEALTH & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS DIV	54	50
OAR	OFC OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING&STANDARDS	Immediate Office	5	5
OAR	OFC OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING&STANDARDS	OUTREACH & INFORMATION DIV	45	43
OAR	OFC OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING&STANDARDS	POLICY ANALYSIS & COMMUNICATIONS STF	11	11
OAR	OFC OF AIR QUALITY PLANNING&STANDARDS	SECTOR POLICIES & PROGRAMS DIV	90	77
OAR	OFFICE OF ATMOSPHERIC PROGRAMS	CLEAN AIR MARKETS DIVISION	57	49

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OAR	OFFICE OF ATMOSPHERIC PROGRAMS	CLIMATE CHANGE DIVISION	60	55
OAR	OFFICE OF ATMOSPHERIC PROGRAMS	CLIMATE PROTECTION PARTNERSHIPS DIV	78	70
OAR	OFFICE OF ATMOSPHERIC PROGRAMS	Immediate Office	5	4
OAR	OFFICE OF ATMOSPHERIC PROGRAMS	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT STAFF	18	13
OAR	OFFICE OF ATMOSPHERIC PROGRAMS	STRATOSPHERIC PROTECTION DIV	18	18
OAR	OFFICE OF PROGRAM MGMT OPERATIONS	ACQUISITION POLICY	5	3
OAR	OFFICE OF PROGRAM MGMT OPERATIONS	BUDGET EXECUTION	3	2
OAR	OFFICE OF PROGRAM MGMT OPERATIONS	BUDGET FORMULATION	5	3
OAR	OFFICE OF PROGRAM MGMT OPERATIONS	Immediate Office	4	3
OAR	OFFICE OF PROGRAM MGMT OPERATIONS	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1	4
OAR	OFFICE OF PROGRAM MGMT OPERATIONS	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1	
OAR	OFFICE OF RADIATION & INDOOR AIR	Immediate Office	4	5
OAR	OFFICE OF RADIATION & INDOOR AIR	INDOOR ENVIRONMENTS DIV	31	32
OAR	OFFICE OF RADIATION & INDOOR AIR	NATL ANALYTICAL RADIATION ENVIRO LAB	38	39
OAR	OFFICE OF RADIATION & INDOOR AIR	NATL CENTER FOR RADIATION FIELD OPS	23	20

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OAR	OFFICE OF RADIATION & INDOOR AIR	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE	8	6
OAR	OFFICE OF RADIATION & INDOOR AIR	RADIATION PROTECTION DIV	39	39
OAR	OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION & AIR QUALITY	ASSESSMENT & STANDARDS DIV	80	73
OAR	OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION & AIR QUALITY	CENTRALIZED SERVICES CENTER	15	11
OAR	OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION & AIR QUALITY	CHIEF OF STAFF ANN ARBOR	12	10
OAR	OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION & AIR QUALITY	CHIEF OF STAFF WASHINGTON	7	9
OAR	OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION & AIR QUALITY	COMPLIANCE DIVISION	78	74
OAR	OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION & AIR QUALITY	Immediate Office	7	6
OAR	OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION & AIR QUALITY	POLICY, PLANNING & BUDGET STAFF	4	3
OAR	OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION & AIR QUALITY	TESTING AND ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DIV	93	84
OAR	OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION & AIR QUALITY	TRANSPORTATION AND CLIMATE DIV	74	69
OAR Total			1,161	1,077
OARM	ASST ADMR FOR ADMIN & RESOURCES MGMT	Immediate Office	6	7
OARM	ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD	Immediate Office	14	14
OARM	OFC OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES		12	11
OARM	OFC OF HUMAN RESOURCES	DIVERSITY, RECRUITMENT & EMPL SRVCS DIV	18	14

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OARM	OFC OF HUMAN RESOURCES	EXECUTIVE RESOURCES DIV	8	6
OARM	OFC OF HUMAN RESOURCES	Immediate Office	8	5
OARM	OFC OF HUMAN RESOURCES	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DIV	12	12
OARM	OFC OF HUMAN RESOURCES	LABOR & EMPLOYEE RELATIONS DIVISION	12	11
OARM	OFC OF HUMAN RESOURCES	POLICY, PLANNING & TRAINING DIVISION	29	25
OARM	OFC OF HUMAN RESOURCES	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT STAFF	4	4
OARM	OFC OF MGMT & ADMINISTRATION-CINC		5	5
OARM	OFC OF MGMT & ADMINISTRATION-CINC	FACILITIES MGMT & SERVICES DIV	12	12
OARM	OFC OF MGMT & ADMINISTRATION-CINC	HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV	33	27
OARM	OFC OF MGMT & ADMINISTRATION-CINC	HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV - LV	22	13
OARM	OFC OF MGMT & ADMINISTRATION-CINC	INFORMATION RESOURCES MGMT DIV	14	11
OARM	OFC OF MGMT & ADMINISTRATION-CINC	SAFETY, HEALTH & SECURITY STAFF	3	3
OARM	OFC OF MGMT & ADMINISTRATION-RTP		3	5
OARM	OFC OF MGMT & ADMINISTRATION-RTP	FACILITIES MANAGEMENT & SUPPORT DIV	19	17
OARM	OFC OF MGMT & ADMINISTRATION-RTP	HUMAN RESOURCES MGMT DIV - RTP	63	53
OARM	OFC OF MGMT & ADMINISTRATION-RTP	INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV	10	9
OARM	OFC OF RESOURCES, OPERATIONS & MGMT	ADMINISTRATIVE OPER & STEWARDSHIP DIV	9	9

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OARM	OFC OF RESOURCES, OPERATIONS & MGMT	FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MGMT DIV	11	9
OARM	OFC OF RESOURCES, OPERATIONS & MGMT	Immediate Office	3	4
OARM	OFC OF RESOURCES, OPERATIONS & MGMT	RESOURCES, ANALYSIS AND PLANNING DIV	8	7
OARM	OFC OF THE CHIEF SUSTAINABILITY OFFICER		1	1
OARM	OFFICE OF ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT	CINCINNATI PROCUREMENT OPERATIONS DIV	36	35
OARM	OFFICE OF ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT	HEADQUARTERS PROCUREMENT OPS DIV	46	41
OARM	OFFICE OF ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT	Immediate Office	22	23
OARM	OFFICE OF ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT	POLICY TRAINING & OVERSIGHT DIV	36	31
OARM	OFFICE OF ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT	RTP PROCUREMENT OPERATIONS DIV	33	32
OARM	OFFICE OF ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT	SUPERFUND/RCRA/RGNL PROC OPS DIV	29	18
OARM	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION	FACILITIES MANAGEMENT & SERVICES DIV	27	25
OARM	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION	Immediate Office	7	6
OARM	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION	REAL PROPERTY SERVICES STAFF	13	13
OARM	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STAFF	9	8
OARM	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION	SAFETY & SUSTAINABILITY DIVISION	22	22
OARM	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION	SECURITY MANAGEMENT DIV	23	19
OARM	OFFICE OF GRANTS & DEBARMENT	GRANTS&INTERAGENCY AGRMNTS MGMT DIV	20	19

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OARM	OFFICE OF GRANTS & DEBARMENT	Immediate Office	10	12
OARM	OFFICE OF GRANTS & DEBARMENT	NATL POLICY, TRAINING & COMPLIANCE DIV	11	10
OARM	OFFICE OF GRANTS & DEBARMENT	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STAFF	11	10
OARM	OFFICE OF GRANTS & DEBARMENT	SUSPENSION & DEBARMENT DIVISION	12	9
OARM Total			706	627
OCFO	OFC OF E-ENTERPRISE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT		6	8
OCFO	OFC OF PLANNING, ANLS & ACCOUNTABILITY	ANALYSIS DIVISION	10	9
OCFO	OFC OF PLANNING, ANLS & ACCOUNTABILITY	Immediate Office	7	5
OCFO	OFC OF PLANNING, ANLS & ACCOUNTABILITY	PLANNING DIVISION	9	8
OCFO	OFC OF RESOURCE & INFORMATION MGMT		13	14
OCFO	OFC OF TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS	APPLICATIONS MANAGEMENT DIVISION	12	11
OCFO	OFC OF TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS	BUSINESS SUPPORT DIVISION	7	10
OCFO	OFC OF TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS	Immediate Office	6	7
OCFO	OFC OF TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS	INFORMATION MGMT & SECURITY DIVISION	9	12

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OCFO	OFC OF TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS	PLANNING AND EVALUATION DIVISION	10	11
OCFO	OFC OF TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS	SYSTEMS RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT DIVISI	11	10
OCFO	OFFICE OF BUDGET	BUDGET FORMULATION AND CONTROL STAFF	8	9
OCFO	OFFICE OF BUDGET	Immediate Office	8	8
OCFO	OFFICE OF BUDGET	MULTI-MEDIA ANALYSIS STAFF	8	6
OCFO	OFFICE OF BUDGET	RESOURCE PLANNING & REGIONAL OPS STF	8	6
OCFO	OFFICE OF BUDGET	TRUST FUNDS & ADMIN ANALYSIS STF	8	5
OCFO	OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER	Immediate Office	5	7
OCFO	OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER	ACCOUNTING & COST ANALYSIS DIVISION	21	20
OCFO	OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER	BUSINESS PLANNING & OPS DIVISION	18	17
OCFO	OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER	FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION	108	94
OCFO	OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER	Immediate Office	8	5
OCFO	OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER	POLICY, TRAINING & ACCOUNTABIL ITY DIV	16	14
OCFO	POLICY & COMMUNICATIONS STAFF		3	1
OCFO Total			319	297
OCSP	ASST ADMR FOR CHEM SAFETY & PLTN PREV	Immediate Office	10	11
OCSP	OFC OF POLLUTION PREVENTION & TOXICS	CHEMICAL CONTROL DIV	45	47

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OCSP	OFC OF POLLUTION PREVENTION & TOXICS	CHEMISTRY,ECONOMIC&SUSTNBL STRG DIV	63	55
OCSP	OFC OF POLLUTION PREVENTION & TOXICS	ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE DIV	36	37
OCSP	OFC OF POLLUTION PREVENTION & TOXICS	Immediate Office	7	9
OCSP	OFC OF POLLUTION PREVENTION & TOXICS	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT DIV	43	33
OCSP	OFC OF POLLUTION PREVENTION & TOXICS	NATIONAL PROGRAM CHEMICALS DIV	29	24
OCSP	OFC OF POLLUTION PREVENTION & TOXICS	RISK ASSESSMENT DIVISION	76	69
OCSP	OFC OF POLLUTION PREVENTION & TOXICS	TOXIC RELEASE INVENTORY PROGRAM DIV	26	23
OCSP	OFC OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS		10	11
OCSP	OFC OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STAFF	6	4
OCSP	OFC OF SCIENCE COORDINATION & POLICY	EXPOSURE ASSMT COORDINATION&POL DIV	8	7
OCSP	OFC OF SCIENCE COORDINATION & POLICY	HAZARD ASSMT COORDINATION&POL DIV	5	5
OCSP	OFC OF SCIENCE COORDINATION & POLICY	Immediate Office	124	148
OCSP	OFFICE OF PESTICIDES PROGRAMS	ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION	77	71
OCSP	OFFICE OF PESTICIDES PROGRAMS	BIOLOGICAL & ECONOMIC ANALYSIS DIV	58	54
OCSP	OFFICE OF PESTICIDES PROGRAMS	BIOPESTICIDES&POLLUTION PREV DIV	55	55

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OCSP	OFFICE OF PESTICIDES PROGRAMS	ENVIRONMENTAL FATE & EFFECTS DIV	94	82
OCSP	OFFICE OF PESTICIDES PROGRAMS	FIELD & EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIV	39	32
OCSP	OFFICE OF PESTICIDES PROGRAMS	HEALTH EFFECTS DIVISION	100	89
OCSP	OFFICE OF PESTICIDES PROGRAMS	Immediate Office	11	12
OCSP	OFFICE OF PESTICIDES PROGRAMS	IT & RESOURCES MGMT DIV	85	80
OCSP	OFFICE OF PESTICIDES PROGRAMS	PESTICIDE RE-EVALUATION DIV	48	48
OCSP	OFFICE OF PESTICIDES PROGRAMS	REGISTRATION DIVISION	98	81
OCSP	REGULATORY COORDINATION STAFF		7	6
OCSP Total			1,160	1,093
OECA	ASST ADMR FOR ENF&COMPL ASSURANCE	Immediate Office	9	8
OECA	OFC OF CRIMINAL ENF,FORENSICS&TRNG	CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION DIV	184	182
OECA	OFC OF CRIMINAL ENF,FORENSICS&TRNG	Immediate Office	11	5
OECA	OFC OF CRIMINAL ENF,FORENSICS&TRNG	LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION	13	13
OECA	OFC OF CRIMINAL ENF,FORENSICS&TRNG	OFC OF NATL ENF INVESTIGATIONS CENTER	72	66
OECA	OFC OF CRIMINAL ENF,FORENSICS&TRNG	PLANNING,ANALYSIS&COMMUNICATIONS STF	3	1

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OECA	OFC OF CRIMINAL ENF,FORENSICS&TRNG	PROF INTEGRITY&QUALITY ASSURANCE STF	8	5
OECA	OFC OF CRIMINAL ENF,FORENSICS&TRNG	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STAFF	7	7
OECA	OFC OF FEDERAL FACILITIES ENF OFC	Immediate Office	2	3
OECA	OFC OF FEDERAL FACILITIES ENF OFC	PLANNING, PREVENTION & COMPLIANCE STF	2	
OECA	OFC OF FEDERAL FACILITIES ENF OFC	SITE REMEDIATION & ENFORCEMENT STAFF	11	9
OECA	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION ENFORCEMENT	Immediate Office	5	5
OECA	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION ENFORCEMENT	POLICY & PROGRAM EVALUATION DIV	26	24
OECA	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION ENFORCEMENT	PROGRAM SUPPORT OFFICE	9	9
OECA	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION ENFORCEMENT	REGIONAL SUPPORT DIVISION	32	27
OECA	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY	ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT DIVISION	9	8
OECA	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY	BUDGET AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT DIV	5	6
OECA	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY	Immediate Office	8	8
OECA	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DIVISION	8	6
OECA	OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY	POLICY & LEGISLATIVE COORDINATION DIV	6	6
OECA	OFFICE OF CIVIL ENFORCEMENT	AIR ENFORCEMENT DIVISION	45	40
OECA	OFFICE OF CIVIL ENFORCEMENT	CROSS-CUTTING POLICY STAFF	8	7

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OECA	OFFICE OF CIVIL ENFORCEMENT	Immediate Office	5	3
OECA	OFFICE OF CIVIL ENFORCEMENT	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT BRANCH	7	5
OECA	OFFICE OF CIVIL ENFORCEMENT	WASTE & CHEMICAL ENFORCEMENT DIV	33	34
OECA	OFFICE OF CIVIL ENFORCEMENT	WATER ENFORCEMENT DIVISION	36	31
OECA	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE	ENF PLANNING, TARGETING & DATA DIV	49	43
OECA	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE	Immediate Office	10	7
OECA	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE	MONITORING, ASSISTANCE & MEDIA PROGS DIV	45	40
OECA	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE	NATIONAL ENF TRAINING INSTITUTE	4	4
OECA	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE	PLANNING, MEASURES & OVERSIGHT DIV	14	14
OECA	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STAFF	6	5
OECA	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	<i>NOTE: MOVED TO OA IN FY19 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET</i>	23	
OECA	OFFICE OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES	Immediate Office	4	
OECA	OFFICE OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES	INTL COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE DIV	7	
OECA	OFFICE OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES	NEPA COMPLIANCE DIVISION	13	
OECA Total			739	631
OEI	OFC OF CUST ADVO, POL & PORTFOLIO MGT	CUSTOMER ADVOCACY & COMMUNICATION DIV	15	15
OEI	OFC OF CUST ADVO, POL & PORTFOLIO MGT	Immediate Office	4	5

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OEI	OFC OF CUST ADVO, POL & PORTFOLIO MGT	POLICY, PLANNING & EVALUATION DIV	7	5
OEI	OFC OF CUST ADVO, POL & PORTFOLIO MGT	PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT DIV	6	8
OEI	OFC OF DIGITAL SERVICES & TECH ARCH	DIGITAL SERVICES DIV	10	8
OEI	OFC OF DIGITAL SERVICES & TECH ARCH	Immediate Office	7	6
OEI	OFC OF DIGITAL SERVICES & TECH ARCH	TECHNICAL ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING DIV	9	7
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	DATA MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIV	15	13
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	Immediate Office	5	6
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	INFO ACCESS & ANALYTICAL SERVICES DIV	13	11
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	INFORMATION EXCHANGE SERVICES DIV	22	20
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	WEB CONTENT SERVICES DIV	11	9
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION SECURITY & PRIVACY		21	18
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OPS	DESKTOP SUPPORT SERVICES DIV	9	8
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OPS	ENDPOINT & COLLAB SOLUTIONS DIV	12	12
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OPS	ENTERPRISE HOSTING DIV	19	20
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OPS	Immediate Office	8	6

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OPS	NETWORK & SECURITY OPERATION DIV	18	21
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OPS	SERVICE & BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIV	25	24
OEI	OFC OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OPS	WASHINGTON D.C. OPERATIONS DIV	10	9
OEI	OFFICE OF BUSINESS OPERATIONS & SERVICES	HR&ADMINISTRATION DIV	9	7
OEI	OFFICE OF BUSINESS OPERATIONS & SERVICES	Immediate Office	7	5
OEI	OFFICE OF BUSINESS OPERATIONS & SERVICES	INFORMATION AND SECURITY PROGRAM DIV	9	10
OEI	OFFICE OF BUSINESS OPERATIONS & SERVICES	RESOURCE & PROGRAM MANAGEMENT DIV	9	9
OEI	OFFICE OF ENTERPRISE INFO PROGRAMS	EDISCOVERY DIV	8	6
OEI	OFFICE OF ENTERPRISE INFO PROGRAMS	ENTERPRISE QUALITY MANAGEMENT DIV	9	7
OEI	OFFICE OF ENTERPRISE INFO PROGRAMS	ENTERPRISE RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIV	7	7
OEI	OFFICE OF ENTERPRISE INFO PROGRAMS	ERULEMAKING & FOIAONLINE DIV	6	7
OEI	OFFICE OF ENTERPRISE INFO PROGRAMS	FOIA, LIBRARIES & ACCESSIBILITY DIV	10	6
OEI	OFFICE OF ENTERPRISE INFO PROGRAMS	Immediate Office	6	4
OEI	OFFICE OF ENTERPRISE INFO PROGRAMS	REGULATORY SUPPORT DIV	3	6
OEI	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION	Immediate Office	11	8
OEI Total			340	313

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OGC	AIR & RADIATION LAW OFFICE		48	45
OGC	ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RES LAW OFC		7	6
OGC	CIVIL RIGHTS & FINANCE LAW OFFICE		25	22
OGC	CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES LAW OFFICE		21	19
OGC	ETHICS OFFICE		3	4
OGC	FOIA EXPERT ASSISTANCE TEAM		3	12
OGC	GENERAL LAW OFFICE		29	26
OGC	OFFICE OF EXTERNAL COMPLIANCE		9	12
OGC	OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL	Immediate Office	14	10
OGC	PESTICIDES & TOXIC SUBSTANCES LAW OFC		23	22
OGC	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT OFFICE		14	13
OGC	SOLID WASTE & EMER RESPONSE LAW OFC		15	15
OGC	WATER LAW OFFICE		19	19
OGC Total			230	225
OIG	OFC PF CNSL&CONGRESSIONAL&PUB AFFAIRS	CONGRESSIONAL & PUB AFFAIRS DIRECTORATE	8	9
OIG	OFC PF CNSL&CONGRESSIONAL&PUB AFFAIRS	Immediate Office	3	2

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OIG	OFC PF CNSL&CONGRESSIONAL&PUB AFFAIRS	LEGAL AFFAIRS DIRECTORATE	8	8
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	CONT&ASTNC AGREEMENT ADTS DIRECTORATE	14	11
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	EFFICIENCY AUDITS DIRECTORATE	13	13
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	FINANCIAL AUDITS DIRECTORATE	25	26
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	FORENSIC AUDITS DIRECTORATE	12	12
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	Immediate Office	3	7
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	INFO RSRCS MGMT AUDITS DIRECTORATE	16	15
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	AIR DIRECTORATE		13
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	LAND CLEANUP & WASTE MGMT DIRECTORATE		14
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	WATER DIRECTORATE		13
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	TOX CHEM MGMT & POL PREVNTN DIRECTORA		14
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	SPECIAL PROGRAMS DIRECTORATE		4
OIG	OFFICE OF AUDITS	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH DIRECTORATE		11
OIG	OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	Immediate Office	3	3
OIG	OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS	ATLANTA FIELD OFFICE	8	6
OIG	OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS	CHICAGO FIELD OFFICE	7	8
OIG	OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS	ELECTRONIC CRIMES DIVISION	4	5
OIG	OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS	Immediate Office	4	3
OIG	OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS	OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY	7	7

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OIG	OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS	OPERATIONS SUPPORT DIVISION	6	6
OIG	OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS	SAN FRANCISCO FIELD OFFICE	7	8
OIG	OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS	WASHINGTON FIELD OFFICE	11	9
OIG	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT	BUDGET, ANALYSIS & RESULTS DIRECTORATE	7	10
OIG	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT	HUMAN CAPITAL & SOLUTIONS DIRECTORATE	4	8
OIG	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT	Immediate Office		4
OIG	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT	IT SOLUTIONS AND SERVICES DIRECTORATE	22	20
OIG	OFFICE OF PROGRAM EVALUATION		74	
OIG Total			266	269
OITA	AMERICAN INDIAN ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICE		16	13
OITA	ASST ADMR FOR INTL&TRIBAL AFFAIRS	Immediate Office	5	4
OITA	OFC OF MGMT & INTERNATIONAL SERVICES		13	12
OITA	OFC OF REGIONAL AND BILATERAL AFFAIRS		23	20
OITA	OFFICE OF GLOBAL AFFAIRS AND POLICY		21	18
OITA Total			78	67
OLEM	ASST ADMR OFC OF LAND & EMER MGMT	Immediate Office	7	10
OLEM	CENTER FOR PROGRAM ANALYSIS		15	13

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OLEM	FED FACILITIES RESTORATION&REUSE OFC		13	13
OLEM	OFC OF BROWNFIELDS&LAND REV		19	16
OLEM	OFC OF RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RECOVERY	Immediate Office	5	5
OLEM	OFC OF RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RECOVERY	MATERIALS RECOVERY & WASTE MGMT DIV	41	41
OLEM	OFC OF RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RECOVERY	OFC OF PROG MGMT,COMMS&ANALYSIS	31	30
OLEM	OFC OF RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RECOVERY	PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION & INFO DIV	59	56
OLEM	OFC OF RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RECOVERY	RSRC CONSERVATION&SUSTAINABILITY DIV	32	28
OLEM	OFC OF SUPERFUND REMTION&TECH INNOV	ASSESSMENT & REMEDIATION DIV	48	43
OLEM	OFC OF SUPERFUND REMTION&TECH INNOV	Immediate Office	3	4
OLEM	OFC OF SUPERFUND REMTION&TECH INNOV	OFC OF TECH INNOVATION&FIELD SERVICES	56	57
OLEM	OFC OF SUPERFUND REMTION&TECH INNOV	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV	39	35
OLEM	OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	CBRN CONSEQUENCE MGMT ADVISORY DIV	17	17
OLEM	OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	Immediate Office	3	3
OLEM	OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	PREPAREDNESS &RESPONSE OPERATIONS DIV	19	19
OLEM	OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTATION DIVISION	14	15

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OLEM	OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION	11	15
OLEM	OFFICE OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	ACQUISITION & RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STF	13	10
OLEM	OFFICE OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	Immediate Office	4	4
OLEM	OFFICE OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	INFORMATION MGMT & DATA QUALITY STF	6	6
OLEM	OFFICE OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	POLICY ANALYSIS & REGULATORY MGMT STF	7	7
OLEM	OFFICE OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS	CLEANUP AND REVITALIZATION DIVISION	6	6
OLEM	OFFICE OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS	Immediate Office	5	5
OLEM	OFFICE OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS	MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS DIV	8	7
OLEM	OFFICE OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS	RELEASE PREVENTION DIVISION	6	6
OLEM	ORGANIZATIONAL MGMT & INTEGRITY STF		9	9
OLEM Total			496	480
ORD	ASST ADMR FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT	Immediate Office	99	75
ORD	NATIONAL CENTER FOR ENVIRO RESEARCH	APPLIED SCIENCE & EDUCATION DIVISION	13	11
ORD	NATIONAL CENTER FOR ENVIRO RESEARCH	Immediate Office	12	7
ORD	NATIONAL CENTER FOR ENVIRO RESEARCH	POLICY, PLANNING, & REVIEW DIVISION	16	13

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
ORD	NATIONAL CENTER FOR ENVIRO RESEARCH	WATER, HEALTH, & INNOVATION DIVISION	15	10
ORD	NATL CENTER FOR ENVIRO ASSESSMENT	Immediate Office	18	11
ORD	NATL CENTER FOR ENVIRO ASSESSMENT	INTEGRATED RISK INFO SYSTEM DIV	37	30
ORD	NATL CENTER FOR ENVIRO ASSESSMENT	NCEA-CINCINNATI	27	27
ORD	NATL CENTER FOR ENVIRO ASSESSMENT	NCEA-RTP	38	36
ORD	NATL CENTER FOR ENVIRO ASSESSMENT	NCEA-WASHINGTON	44	39
ORD	NATL CENTER FOR ENVIRO ASSESSMENT	PROGRAM SUPPORT STAFF	8	9
ORD	NATL CTR FOR COMPUTATIONAL TOXICOLOGY		31	28
ORD	NATL EXPOSURE RSCH LABORATORY - RTP	COMPUTATIONAL EXPOSURE DIVISION	72	63
ORD	NATL EXPOSURE RSCH LABORATORY - RTP	EXPOSURE METHODS & MEASUREMENTS DIV	132	121
ORD	NATL EXPOSURE RSCH LABORATORY - RTP	Immediate Office	14	11
ORD	NATL EXPOSURE RSCH LABORATORY - RTP	PROGRAM OPERATIONS STAFF	3	7
ORD	NATL EXPOSURE RSCH LABORATORY - RTP	RESEARCH PROG DEVELOP&INTEGRATION STF	8	7
ORD	NATL EXPOSURE RSCH LABORATORY - RTP	SHEM & FACILITIES STAFF	8	9
ORD	NATL EXPOSURE RSCH LABORATORY - RTP	SYSTEMS EXPOSURE DIVISION	86	76

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	ATLANTIC ECOLOGY DIV - NARRAGANSETT	69	67
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH DIV	69	68
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	GULF ECOLOGY DIV - GULF BREEZE	54	46
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	Immediate Office	10	8
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	INTEGRATED SYSTM TOXICOLOGY DIV	58	49
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	MID-CONTINENT ECOLOGY DIV - DULUTH	63	57
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	PROGRAM OPERATIONS STAFF	10	12
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	RESEARCH CORES UNIT	16	16
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	RESEARCH PLANNING & COORDINATION STF	9	9
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	TOXICITY ASSESSMENT DIV	52	48
ORD	NATL HLTH&ENVIRO EFFECTS RSCH LAB-RTP	WESTERN ECOLOGY DIV - CORVALLIS	59	53
ORD	NATL HOMELAND SECURITY RESEARCH CTR	DECONTAMINATION&CONSEQUENCE MGMT DIV	14	11
ORD	NATL HOMELAND SECURITY RESEARCH CTR	Immediate Office	13	10
ORD	NATL HOMELAND SECURITY RESEARCH CTR	THREAT & CONSEQUENCE ASSESSMENT DIV	16	10
ORD	NATL HOMELAND SECURITY RESEARCH CTR	WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION DIV	11	12

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	AIR AND ENERGY MANAGEMENT DIVISION	65	61
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	ENVIRO TECH ASSMT, VERIFS&OUTCOMES STF	5	
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	GROUNDWATER, WATERSHED & ECO RESTORATION DIV-ADA	42	38
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	Immediate Office	7	7
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	LABORATORY SUPPORT&ACCOUNTABILITY STF	11	9
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	LAND AND MATERIALS MANAGEMENT DIV		61
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	LAND REMEDIATION&PLTN CONTROL DIV	36	
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	PROGRAM OPERATIONS STAFF	6	7
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	RESEARCH PLANNING & COORDINATION STF		9
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	SUSTAINABLE TECHNOLOGY DIV	45	
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	TECHNICAL COMMUNICATION&OUTREACH STF	4	
ORD	NATL RISK MGMT RSCH LAB - CINC	WATER SYSTEMS DIVISION	67	75
ORD	OFC OF ADMINISTRATIVE&RSCH SUPPORT		7	7
ORD	OFC OF ADMINISTRATIVE&RSCH SUPPORT	BUDGET EXECUTION DIVISION	35	33
ORD	OFC OF ADMINISTRATIVE&RSCH SUPPORT	EXTRAMURAL MANAGEMENT DIV	39	34

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
ORD	OFC OF ADMINISTRATIVE&RSCH SUPPORT	HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION	25	23
ORD	OFC OF ADMINISTRATIVE&RSCH SUPPORT	TRAVEL MANAGEMENT DIVISION	11	12
ORD	OFC OF PROG ACCOUNTABILITY&RSRCS MGMT	Immediate Office	3	6
ORD	OFC OF PROG ACCOUNTABILITY&RSRCS MGMT	PLANNING,BUDGET&PERFORMA NCE ANLS BR	5	7
ORD	OFC OF PROG ACCOUNTABILITY&RSRCS MGMT	POLICY ADMIN & MGMT INTEGRITY DIV	11	9
ORD	OFC OF PROG ACCOUNTABILITY&RSRCS MGMT	RESOURCE AND SYSTEM ANALYSIS BRANCH	6	5
ORD	OFC OF PROG ACCOUNTABILITY&RSRCS MGMT	RSRCS,PLNG,PERFORMANCE&BU DGET POL DIV	4	3
ORD	OFFICE OF SCIENCE INFORMATION MGMT	APPLICATIONS SUPPORT DIVISION	9	9
ORD	OFFICE OF SCIENCE INFORMATION MGMT	CUSTOMER SUPPORT DIVISION	10	10
ORD	OFFICE OF SCIENCE INFORMATION MGMT	ENTERPRISE OPERATIONS DIVISION	4	4
ORD	OFFICE OF SCIENCE INFORMATION MGMT	Immediate Office	7	7
ORD	OFFICE OF SCIENCE INFORMATION MGMT	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT DIV	6	5
ORD	OFFICE OF SCIENCE INFORMATION MGMT	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIVISION	6	6
ORD	OFFICE OF SCIENCE POLICY	CROSS PROGRAM STAFF	2	

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
ORD	OFFICE OF SCIENCE POLICY	Immediate Office	69	89
ORD	OFFICE OF SCIENCE POLICY	PROGRAM SUPPORT STAFF	13	10
ORD	OFFICE OF SCIENCE POLICY	REGIONAL, STATE, TRIBAL SCIENCE STAFF	13	15
ORD	OFFICE OF THE SCIENCE ADVISOR		29	21
ORD	SCIENCE COMMUNICATION STAFF		12	12
ORD Total			1,818	1,660
OW	ASST ADMR FOR WATER	Immediate Office	10	9
OW	COMMUNICATIONS STAFF		4	5
OW	MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS STAFF	Immediate Office	6	8
OW	MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS STAFF	ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES	5	5
OW	MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS STAFF	PROJECT MANAGEMENT OFFICE	10	8
OW	OFC OF WETLANDS, OCEANS & WATERSHEDS	Immediate Office	5	8
OW	OFC OF WETLANDS, OCEANS & WATERSHEDS	OCEANS & COASTAL PRT DIV	22	
OW	OFC OF WETLANDS, OCEANS & WATERSHEDS	OCEANS, WETLANDS, & COMMUNITIES DIV	28	47
OW	OFC OF WETLANDS, OCEANS & WATERSHEDS	PLANNING, COMMS, & RSRC MGMT STAFF	13	10
OW	OFC OF WETLANDS, OCEANS & WATERSHEDS	URBAN WATERS STAFF	4	
OW	OFC OF WETLANDS, OCEANS & WATERSHEDS	WATERSHED RESTORATION, ASSESS & PROT DIV	41	43

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OW	OFFICE OF GROUNDWATER&DRINKING WATER	DRINKING WATER PROTECTION DIV	64	58
OW	OFFICE OF GROUNDWATER&DRINKING WATER	Immediate Office	7	5
OW	OFFICE OF GROUNDWATER&DRINKING WATER	NATL DRINKING WATER ADVISORY COUNCIL	15	10
OW	OFFICE OF GROUNDWATER&DRINKING WATER	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT & EVALUATION STF	5	6
OW	OFFICE OF GROUNDWATER&DRINKING WATER	STANDARDS & RISK MANAGEMENT DIV	76	58
OW	OFFICE OF GROUNDWATER&DRINKING WATER	WATER SECURITY DIVISION	27	26
OW	OFFICE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY		5	4
OW	OFFICE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING & ANALYSIS DIV	29	26
OW	OFFICE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	HEALTH & ECOLOGICAL CRITERIA DIVISION	41	33
OW	OFFICE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	RESOURCES MGMT & INFORMATION STF	10	9
OW	OFFICE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	STANDARDS & HEALTH PROTECTION DIV	35	34
OW	OFFICE OF WASTEWATER		4	3
OW	OFFICE OF WASTEWATER	PLANNING INFO & RESOURCES MGMT STF	10	9

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
OW	OFFICE OF WASTEWATER	WATER INFRASTRUCTURE DIVISION	57	61
OW	OFFICE OF WASTEWATER	WATER PERMITS DIVISION	49	43
OW	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STAFF		15	11
OW	WATER POLICY STAFF		11	9
OW Total			608	548
R01	CIVIL RIGHTS & URBAN AFFAIRS		4	3
R01	OFC OF ADMIN & RESOURCES MGMT	CONTRACTS AND PROCUREMENT	8	7
R01	OFC OF ADMIN & RESOURCES MGMT	CUSTOMER SERVICE AND FACILITIES	11	10
R01	OFC OF ADMIN & RESOURCES MGMT	GRANTS MANAGEMENT	9	7
R01	OFC OF ADMIN & RESOURCES MGMT	HUMAN RESOURCES	7	7
R01	OFC OF ADMIN & RESOURCES MGMT	Immediate Office	8	7
R01	OFC OF ADMIN & RESOURCES MGMT	INFORMATION SERVICES BR	24	21
R01	OFC OF ADMIN & RESOURCES MGMT	OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER	18	15
R01	OFC OF ENVIRO MEASUREMENT&EVALUATION	ECOSYSTEM ASSESSMENT	18	16
R01	OFC OF ENVIRO MEASUREMENT&EVALUATION	Immediate Office	9	9
R01	OFC OF ENVIRO MEASUREMENT&EVALUATION	INVESTIGATION & ANALYSIS	19	17

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R01	OFC OF ENVIRO MEASUREMENT&EVALUATION	QUALITY ASSURANCE	10	10
R01	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION & RESTORATION	Immediate Office	4	4
R01	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION & RESTORATION	OFC OF EMERGENCY PLANNING & RESPONSE	27	27
R01	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION & RESTORATION	OFFICE OF REMEDIATION & RESTORATION 1	2	1
R01	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION & RESTORATION	OFFICE OF REMEDIATION & RESTORATION 2	9	9
R01	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION & RESTORATION	OFFICE OF REMEDIATION & RESTORATION 3	26	26
R01	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION & RESTORATION	OFFICE OF REMEDIATION & RESTORATION 4	17	17
R01	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION & RESTORATION	OFFICE OF REMEDIATION & RESTORATION 5	10	9
R01	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION & RESTORATION	OFFICE OF REMEDIATION & RESTORATION 6	10	7
R01	OFC OF SITE REMEDIATION & RESTORATION	OFFICE OF TECHNICAL & SUPPORT	33	29
R01	OFFICE OF ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION	AIR PROGRAM BRANCH	29	23
R01	OFFICE OF ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION	DRINKING WATER BRANCH	19	30
R01	OFFICE OF ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION	GRANTS,TRIBAL,CMTY&MUNICIPAL ASTNC BR	14	1
R01	OFFICE OF ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION	IMMED OCF, WATER PERMITS BRANCH	30	28
R01	OFFICE OF ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION	Immediate Office	3	3

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R01	OFFICE OF ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION	SURFACE WATER BRANCH	23	23
R01	OFFICE OF ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION	WATER QUALITY BRANCH	6	
R01	OFFICE OF ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION	WETLANDS & INFORMATION BR	11	15
R01	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP		35	32
R01	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP	Immediate Office	7	6
R01	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP	OFC OF ASSISTANCE&POLLUTION PREV	16	15
R01	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP	OFFICE OF LEGAL ENFORCEMENT	5	6
R01	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP	OFFICE OF TECHNICAL ENFORCEMENT	55	49
R01	OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS		17	2
R01	OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS	PUBLIC AFFAIRS SECTION		12
R01	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL		16	15
R01	Office of the Regional Administrator		5	7
R01 Total			574	525
R02	CARIBBEAN ENVIRO PROTECTION DIV	Immediate Office	6	6
R02	CARIBBEAN ENVIRO PROTECTION DIV	MULTI-MEDIA PERMITS & COMPLIANCE BR	14	12
R02	CARIBBEAN ENVIRO PROTECTION DIV	MUNICIPAL WATER PROGRAM BRANCH	11	12
R02	CARIBBEAN ENVIRO PROTECTION DIV	RESPONSE & REMEDIATION BRANCH	14	14

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R02	CLEAN AIR AND SUSTAINABILITY DIV	AIR PROGRAMS BRANCH	27	26
R02	CLEAN AIR AND SUSTAINABILITY DIV	HAZARDOUS WASTE PROGRAMS BR	19	23
R02	CLEAN AIR AND SUSTAINABILITY DIV	Immediate Office	5	5
R02	CLEAN AIR AND SUSTAINABILITY DIV	RADIATION AND INDOOR AIR BR	6	4
R02	CLEAN AIR AND SUSTAINABILITY DIV	SUSTAINABILITY&MULTIMEDIA PROGRAMS BR	24	22
R02	CLEAN WATER DIVISION	CLEAN WATER REGULATORY BR	19	20
R02	CLEAN WATER DIVISION	DRINKING WATER&MUNICIPAL INFRA BR	18	18
R02	CLEAN WATER DIVISION	Immediate Office	6	6
R02	CLEAN WATER DIVISION	WATERSHED MANAGEMENT BR	26	26
R02	DIV OF ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE	AIR COMPLIANCE BRANCH	17	17
R02	DIV OF ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE	COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE&PROG SUPPORT BR	20	16
R02	DIV OF ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE	Immediate Office	5	5
R02	DIV OF ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE	PESTICIDES & TOXIC SUBSTANCES BR	22	19
R02	DIV OF ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE	RCRA COMPLIANCE BRANCH	22	20
R02	DIV OF ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE	WATER COMPLIANCE BRANCH	28	27
R02	DIVISION OF ENVIRO SCIENCE&ASSESSMENT	HAZARDOUS WASTE SUPPORT BR	18	19
R02	DIVISION OF ENVIRO SCIENCE&ASSESSMENT	Immediate Office	7	6

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R02	DIVISION OF ENVIRO SCIENCE&ASSESSMENT	LABORATORY BRANCH	18	16
R02	DIVISION OF ENVIRO SCIENCE&ASSESSMENT	MONITORING & ASSESSMENT BR	21	21
R02	EMERGENCY & REMEDIAL RESPONSE DIV	Immediate Office	10	9
R02	EMERGENCY & REMEDIAL RESPONSE DIV	NEW JERSEY REMEDIATION BR	38	33
R02	EMERGENCY & REMEDIAL RESPONSE DIV	NEW YORK REMEDIATION BRANCH	30	28
R02	EMERGENCY & REMEDIAL RESPONSE DIV	PASSAIC/HACKENSACK/NEWARK BAY REM BR	6	6
R02	EMERGENCY & REMEDIAL RESPONSE DIV	PROGRAM SUPPORT BRANCH	37	36
R02	EMERGENCY & REMEDIAL RESPONSE DIV	REMOVAL ACTION BRANCH	27	28
R02	EMERGENCY & REMEDIAL RESPONSE DIV	RESPONSE & PREVENTION BR	26	26
R02	EMERGENCY & REMEDIAL RESPONSE DIV	SPECIAL PROJECTS BRANCH	27	23
R02	OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	CONTRACTS MANAGEMENT BR	9	7
R02	OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES & ADMINISTRATIVE MGMT BR	11	10
R02	OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT BRANCH	23	23
R02	OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	GRANTS AND AUDIT MANAGEMENT BR	13	13
R02	OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	HUMAN RESOURCES BRANCH	7	7

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R02	OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	Immediate Office	6	6
R02	OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT	INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BR	21	22
R02	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	AIR BRANCH	9	7
R02	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	Immediate Office	14	14
R02	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	NEW JERSEY SUPERFUND BRANCH	23	22
R02	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	NEW YORK/CARIBBEAN SUPERFUND BR	22	19
R02	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	WASTE & TOXIC SUBSTANCES BRANCH	13	13
R02	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	WATER, GRANTS & GENERAL LAW BRANCH	13	13
R02	OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	Immediate Office	4	5
R02	Office of the Regional Administrator		4	6
R02	PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION	Immediate Office	2	2
R02	PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION	INTERGOV&COMMUNITY AFFAIRS BR	10	10
R02	PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION	PUBLIC OUTREACH BRANCH	9	8
R02 Total			787	756
R03	AIR PROTECTION DIVISION	Immediate Office	9	8
R03	AIR PROTECTION DIVISION	OFFICE OF AIR PROGRAM PLANNING	39	38
R03	AIR PROTECTION DIVISION	OFFICE OF PERMITS & STATE PROGRAMS	29	27

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R03	ENVIRO ASSESSMENT & INNOVATION DIV	Immediate Office	9	6
R03	ENVIRO ASSESSMENT & INNOVATION DIV	OFC OF ANALYTICAL SVCS&QLTY ASSURANCE	25	20
R03	ENVIRO ASSESSMENT & INNOVATION DIV	OFC OF ENVIRO INFORMATION & ANALYSIS	12	11
R03	ENVIRO ASSESSMENT & INNOVATION DIV	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL INNOVATION	5	4
R03	ENVIRO ASSESSMENT & INNOVATION DIV	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS	19	19
R03	ENVIRO ASSESSMENT & INNOVATION DIV	OFFICE OF MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT	13	13
R03	HAZARDOUS SITE CLEANUP DIV	Immediate Office	7	6
R03	HAZARDOUS SITE CLEANUP DIV	OFC OF FED FAC REMTION&SITE ASSMT	23	21
R03	HAZARDOUS SITE CLEANUP DIV	OFC OF TECHNICAL&ADMINISTRATIVE SUPT	31	30
R03	HAZARDOUS SITE CLEANUP DIV	OFFICE OF BROWNFIELDS & OUTREACH	26	24
R03	HAZARDOUS SITE CLEANUP DIV	OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT	30	29
R03	HAZARDOUS SITE CLEANUP DIV	OFFICE OF PREPAREDNESS & RESPONSE	39	36
R03	HAZARDOUS SITE CLEANUP DIV	OFFICE OF SUPERFUND SITE REMEDIATION	45	41
R03	LAND AND CHEMICALS DIVISION	Immediate Office	10	10
R03	LAND AND CHEMICALS DIVISION	OFC OF PENNSYLVANIA REMEDIATION	12	12

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R03	LAND AND CHEMICALS DIVISION	OFFICE OF OFC TOXICS & PESTICIDES	22	20
R03	LAND AND CHEMICALS DIVISION	OFFICE OF RCRA PROGRAMS	28	26
R03	LAND AND CHEMICALS DIVISION	OFFICE OF REMEDIATION	13	10
R03	OFC OF ASST REGL ADMR FOR POL & MGMT	COMPUTER SERVICES BRANCH	15	15
R03	OFC OF ASST REGL ADMR FOR POL & MGMT	CONTRACTS BRANCH	10	12
R03	OFC OF ASST REGL ADMR FOR POL & MGMT	FACILITIES MANAGEMENT & SERVICES BR	12	10
R03	OFC OF ASST REGL ADMR FOR POL & MGMT	GRANTS & AUDIT MANAGEMENT BRANCH	12	11
R03	OFC OF ASST REGL ADMR FOR POL & MGMT	HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BRANCH	13	12
R03	OFC OF ASST REGL ADMR FOR POL & MGMT	Immediate Office	5	5
R03	OFC OF ASST REGL ADMR FOR POL & MGMT	INFORMATION SYSTEMS BRANCH	13	11
R03	OFC OF ASST REGL ADMR FOR POL & MGMT	OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL COMPTROLLER	14	11
R03	OFC OF ASST REGL ADMR FOR POL & MGMT	PLANNING & ANALYSIS BRANCH	5	6
R03	OFC OF CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM OFC	Immediate Office	4	1
R03	OFC OF CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM OFC	OFC OF PARTNERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY	9	9
R03	OFC OF CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM OFC	OFC OF SCIENCE,ANLS&IMPLEMENTATIO N	8	8

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R03	OFC OF COMMUNICATIONS&GOV'T RELATIONS		18	17
R03	OFC OF ENF,COMPL & ENVIRO JUSTICE	ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE BR	11	11
R03	OFC OF ENF,COMPL & ENVIRO JUSTICE	Immediate Office	12	11
R03	OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS		2	2
R03	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	AIR BRANCH	9	9
R03	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	Immediate Office	15	11
R03	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	MULTI-MEDIA & LEGAL SUPPORT BRANCH	6	6
R03	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	OFFICE OF SITE REMEDIATION	29	26
R03	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	UST ASBESTOS, LEAD & PESTICIDES BR	6	8
R03	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	WASTE & CHEMICAL BRANCH	6	5
R03	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	WATER BRANCH	13	11
R03	Office of the Regional Administrator		4	6
R03	WATER PROTECTION DIVISION	Immediate Office	6	6
R03	WATER PROTECTION DIVISION	OFC OF DRINKING WATER&SRC WATER PRT	30	30
R03	WATER PROTECTION DIVISION	OFC OF STANDARDS, ASSESSMENT & TMDLS	14	12
R03	WATER PROTECTION DIVISION	OFC OF STATE & WATERSHED PARTNERSHIPS	18	16
R03	WATER PROTECTION DIVISION	OFFICE OF INFRASTRUCTURE & ASSISTANCE	16	13

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R03	WATER PROTECTION DIVISION	OFFICE OF NPDES PERMITS & ENFORCEMENT	35	33
R03	WATER PROTECTION DIVISION	OFFICE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	10	4
R03 Total			826	759
R04	AIR, PESTICIDES & TOXICS MGMT DIV	AIR ANALYSIS AND SUPPORT BRANCH	32	25
R04	AIR, PESTICIDES & TOXICS MGMT DIV	AIR ENFORCEMENT AND TOXICS BR	30	27
R04	AIR, PESTICIDES & TOXICS MGMT DIV	AIR PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION BR	32	32
R04	AIR, PESTICIDES & TOXICS MGMT DIV	CHEMICAL SAFETY & ENFORCEMENT BR	34	33
R04	AIR, PESTICIDES & TOXICS MGMT DIV	Immediate Office	16	7
R04	AIR, PESTICIDES & TOXICS MGMT DIV	GRANTS MGMT & STRATEGIC PLANNING OFC		7
R04	GULF OF MEXICO PROGRAM		15	12
R04	OFC OF ENVIRO JUSTICE&SUSTAINABILITY		13	12
R04	OFFICE OF ARA FOR POLICY & MANAGEMENT	BUSINESS OPS & FINANCIAL MGMT BRANCH	27	29
R04	OFFICE OF ARA FOR POLICY & MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES, GRANTS & ACQUISTN MGMT BR	33	33
R04	OFFICE OF ARA FOR POLICY & MANAGEMENT	Immediate Office	9	10
R04	OFFICE OF ARA FOR POLICY & MANAGEMENT	INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND MGMT BRANCH	33	29
R04	OFFICE OF ARA FOR POLICY & MANAGEMENT	OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS	3	2

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R04	OFFICE OF ARA FOR POLICY & MANAGEMENT	OFFICE OF HUMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT	11	8
R04	OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT COORDINATION		11	10
R04	OFFICE OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS		8	6
R04	OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT RELATIONS		4	3
R04	Office of Regional Administrator		14	9
R04	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	Immediate Office	6	5
R04	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	OFC OF AIR, PESTIC&TOXICS LEGAL SUPT	13	13
R04	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	OFC OF CERCLA LEGAL SUPPORT	10	9
R04	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	OFC OF CERCLA/FED FAC LEGAL SUPPORT	12	11
R04	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	OFC OF GEN/CRIM LAW & CROSS-OFC SUPT	9	8
R04	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	OFC OF RCRA/CERCLA LEGAL SUPPORT	11	11
R04	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	OFC OF WATER LEGAL SUPPORT	13	12
R04	RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RESTORATION DIV	ENFORCEMENT & COMPLIANCE BR	27	28
R04	RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RESTORATION DIV	Immediate Office	9	8
R04	RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RESTORATION DIV	MATERIALS AND WASTE MANAGEMENT BR	21	20

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R04	RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RESTORATION DIV	NATL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA)	15	14
R04	RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RESTORATION DIV	RCRA CLEANUP AND BROWNFIELDS BR	31	26
R04	SCIENCE & ECOSYSTEM SUPPORT DIV	ANALYTICAL SERVICES BRANCH	24	23
R04	SCIENCE & ECOSYSTEM SUPPORT DIV	FIELD SERVICES BRANCH	40	39
R04	SCIENCE & ECOSYSTEM SUPPORT DIV	Immediate Office	3	2
R04	SCIENCE & ECOSYSTEM SUPPORT DIV	QUALITY ASSURANCE& TECHNICAL SERV BR	19	20
R04	SUPERFUND DIVISION	EMERGENCY RESP., REMVL. & PREV. BR	37	35
R04	SUPERFUND DIVISION	ENFORCEMENT & COMM ENGMT BRANCH	32	32
R04	SUPERFUND DIVISION	Immediate Office	5	5
R04	SUPERFUND DIVISION	RESOURCE & SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY BR	30	28
R04	SUPERFUND DIVISION	RESTORATION & SITE EVALUATION BR	32	30
R04	SUPERFUND DIVISION	RESTORATION & SUSTAINABILITY BR	29	28
R04	WATER PROTECTION DIV	GRANTS & DRINKING WATER PROT. BRANCH	40	37
R04	WATER PROTECTION DIV	Immediate Office	9	9
R04	WATER PROTECTION DIV	NPDES PERMITTING & ENFORCEMENT BRANCH	37	31
R04	WATER PROTECTION DIV	OWS PROTECTION BRANCH	22	24

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R04	WATER PROTECTION DIV	SUSTAINABLE COMM. & WATERSHEDS BRANCH	26	23
R04	WATER PROTECTION DIV	WATER QUALITY PLANNING BR	38	33
R04 Total			925	858
R05	AIR & RADIATION DIVISION	AIR ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE BR	46	40
R05	AIR & RADIATION DIVISION	AIR PROGRAMS BRANCH	50	46
R05	AIR & RADIATION DIVISION	AIR TOXICS & ASSESSMENT BR	32	27
R05	AIR & RADIATION DIVISION	Immediate Office	5	4
R05	LAND & CHEMICALS DIVISION	CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT BRANCH	33	29
R05	LAND & CHEMICALS DIVISION	Immediate Office	5	5
R05	LAND & CHEMICALS DIVISION	MATERIALS MANAGEMENT BRANCH	13	11
R05	LAND & CHEMICALS DIVISION	PROGRAM SERVICES BRANCH	23	21
R05	LAND & CHEMICALS DIVISION	RCRA BRANCH	40	39
R05	LAND & CHEMICALS DIVISION	REMEDICATION AND REUSE BR	29	30
R05	OFC OF ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE	CLEVELAND SECTION	8	8
R05	OFC OF ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE	Immediate Office	12	12
R05	OFC OF ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE	NEPA IMPLEMENTATION SECTION	7	7
R05	OFC OF GREAT LAKES NATIONAL PROGRAM	FINANCIAL ASSIST, OVERSIGHT & MGMT BR	20	19
R05	OFC OF GREAT LAKES NATIONAL PROGRAM	GREAT LAKES REMED & RESTORATION BR	26	24
R05	OFC OF GREAT LAKES NATIONAL PROGRAM	Immediate Office	12	11

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R05	OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS		3	2
R05	OFFICE OF EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS	Immediate Office	1	1
R05	OFFICE OF EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS	MULTIMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS SECTION	8	8
R05	OFFICE OF EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS	NEWS MEDIA & INTERGVTMNTL RELATNS SCTN	9	9
R05	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	Immediate Office	10	8
R05	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	MULTI-MEDIA BRANCH I	51	46
R05	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	MULTI-MEDIA BRANCH II	54	47
R05	Office of the Regional Administrator		5	6
R05	PLANNING & QUALITY ASSURANCE GROUP		5	4
R05	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV	ACQUISITION & ASSISTANCE BR	35	34
R05	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV	COMPTROLLER BRANCH	27	24
R05	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV	EMPLOYEE SERVICES BRANCH	19	19
R05	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV	HUMAN CAPITAL BRANCH	15	13
R05	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV	Immediate Office	4	4
R05	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT BRANCH	30	32
R05	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIV	LAB QA CORE	23	21
R05	SUPERFUND DIVISION	EMERGENCY RESPONSE BR #1	41	36
R05	SUPERFUND DIVISION	EMERGENCY RESPONSE BR #2	37	31
R05	SUPERFUND DIVISION	Immediate Office	6	5

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R05	SUPERFUND DIVISION	LAND REVITALIZATION BR	28	28
R05	SUPERFUND DIVISION	OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT BRANCH	44	41
R05	SUPERFUND DIVISION	REMEDIAL RESPONSE BRANCH #1	44	42
R05	SUPERFUND DIVISION	REMEDIAL RESPONSE BRANCH #2	45	41
R05	TRIBAL AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS OFC		7	8
R05	WATER DIVISION	GROUND WATER AND DRINKING WATER BR	28	26
R05	WATER DIVISION	Immediate Office	7	5
R05	WATER DIVISION	NPDES PROGRAMS BRANCH	22	21
R05	WATER DIVISION	STATE AND TRIBAL PROGRAMS BRANCH	19	18
R05	WATER DIVISION	UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL BRANCH	18	15
R05	WATER DIVISION	WATER ENF & COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE BR	31	30
R05	WATER DIVISION	WATER QUALITY BRANCH	24	20
R05	WATER DIVISION	WATERSHEDS AND WETLANDS BRANCH	28	25
R05 Total			1,089	1,003
R06	COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE & ENFRC DIV	AIR ENFORCEMENT BRANCH	35	34
R06	COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE & ENFRC DIV	Immediate Office	6	6
R06	COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE & ENFRC DIV	WASTE ENFORCEMENT BRANCH	32	28
R06	COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE & ENFRC DIV	WATER ENFORCEMENT BRANCH	59	52

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R06	MANAGEMENT DIVISION	ENTERPRISE OPERATIONS & SUPPORT BR	21	24
R06	MANAGEMENT DIVISION	ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES BR	32	29
R06	MANAGEMENT DIVISION	HUMAN RESOURCES BRANCH	8	7
R06	MANAGEMENT DIVISION	Immediate Office	10	7
R06	MANAGEMENT DIVISION	OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL COMPTROLLER	32	33
R06	MULTIMEDIA DIVISION	AIR BRANCH	53	49
R06	MULTIMEDIA DIVISION	HAZARDOUS WASTE BRANCH	39	33
R06	MULTIMEDIA DIVISION	Immediate Office	6	6
R06	MULTIMEDIA DIVISION	PEST/TOXICS/UNDER STORAGE TANKS BR	38	34
R06	OFC ENVIRO JUSTICE,TRIBAL&INTL AFFAIR		21	20
R06	OFFICE OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS	COMMUNICATION AND EDUCATION SECTION	13	11
R06	OFFICE OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS	Immediate Office	5	3
R06	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	DEP RGNL CNSL/GEN LAW CNSLING BR	11	12
R06	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	DEPUTY REGIONAL COUNSEL FOR ENF	33	29
R06	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	Immediate Office	2	3
R06	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	MULTIMEDIA COUNSELING BRANCH	13	11
R06	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	SUPERFUND BRANCH	13	13
R06	Office of the Regional Administrator		4	6
R06	SUPERFUND DIVISION	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT BRANCH	31	29

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R06	SUPERFUND DIVISION	Immediate Office	5	5
R06	SUPERFUND DIVISION	REMEDIAL BRANCH	29	26
R06	SUPERFUND DIVISION	REVITALIZATION & RESOURCES BRANCH	36	28
R06	SUPERFUND DIVISION	TECHNICAL & ENFORCEMENT BR	25	25
R06	WATER DIVISION	ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS BRANCH	31	29
R06	WATER DIVISION	ECOSYSTEMS PROTECTION BR	35	31
R06	WATER DIVISION	Immediate Office	13	10
R06	WATER DIVISION	NPDES PERMITS & TMDLS BR	34	32
R06	WATER DIVISION	SAFE DRINKING WATER BRANCH	29	26
R06 Total			754	691
R07	AIR & WASTE MANAGEMENT DIV	AIR PERMITTING & COMPLIANCE BR	22	18
R07	AIR & WASTE MANAGEMENT DIV	AIR PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT BR	19	19
R07	AIR & WASTE MANAGEMENT DIV	CHEMICAL & OIL RELEASE PREVENTION BR	17	15
R07	AIR & WASTE MANAGEMENT DIV	Immediate Office	5	6
R07	AIR & WASTE MANAGEMENT DIV	WASTE ENF & MATERIALS MGMT BR	23	16
R07	AIR & WASTE MANAGEMENT DIV	WASTE REMEDIATION AND PERMITTING BR	15	13
R07	ENFORCEMENT COORDINATION OFFICE		14	12
R07	ENVIRO SCIENCES & TECHNOLOGY DIV	ENVIRO DATA & ASSESSMENT BRANCH	13	11
R07	ENVIRO SCIENCES & TECHNOLOGY DIV	ENVIRONMENTAL FIELD COMPLIANCE BRANCH	15	14

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R07	ENVIRO SCIENCES & TECHNOLOGY DIV	Immediate Office	14	12
R07	ENVIRO SCIENCES & TECHNOLOGY DIV	LABORATORY TECHNOLOGY & ANALYSIS BR	21	21
R07	ENVIRO SCIENCES & TECHNOLOGY DIV	MONITORING & ENVIRO SAMPLING BRANCH	16	13
R07	OFFICE OF POLICY & MANAGEMENT	ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT BR	13	11
R07	OFFICE OF POLICY & MANAGEMENT	HUMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT BR	6	5
R07	OFFICE OF POLICY & MANAGEMENT	Immediate Office	7	5
R07	OFFICE OF POLICY & MANAGEMENT	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY BR	6	7
R07	OFFICE OF POLICY & MANAGEMENT	PROGRAM OPERATIONS & INTEGRATION BR	12	9
R07	OFFICE OF POLICY & MANAGEMENT	RESOURCES & FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT BR	20	20
R07	OFFICE OF POLICY & MANAGEMENT	SECURITY, SAFETY, & FACILITIES MGMT BR	11	11
R07	OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS		18	14
R07	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	AIR BRANCH	7	7
R07	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	CHEMICAL MANAGEMENT BRANCH	8	6
R07	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	Immediate Office	9	9
R07	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	SUPERFUND BRANCH	14	9
R07	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	WATER BRANCH	10	8
R07	Office of the Regional Administrator		4	3

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R07	OFFICE OF TRIBAL AFFAIRS		4	3
R07	SUPERFUND DIVISION	ASSESSMENT, EMERGENCY RESP & REMOVAL	28	27
R07	SUPERFUND DIVISION	BROWNFIELDS & LAND REVITALIZATION BR	10	8
R07	SUPERFUND DIVISION	Immediate Office	9	9
R07	SUPERFUND DIVISION	LEAD, MINING AND SPECIAL EMPHASIS BR	13	13
R07	SUPERFUND DIVISION	PROGRAM SUPPORT AND MANAGEMENT SCTN	7	6
R07	SUPERFUND DIVISION	SITE REMEDIATION BRANCH	19	20
R07	WATER, WETLANDS & PESTICIDES DIV	DRINKING WATER MANAGEMENT BRANCH	15	14
R07	WATER, WETLANDS & PESTICIDES DIV	Immediate Office	9	7
R07	WATER, WETLANDS & PESTICIDES DIV	TOXICS AND PESTICIDES BR	15	13
R07	WATER, WETLANDS & PESTICIDES DIV	WASTE WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE MGMT BR	15	14
R07	WATER, WETLANDS & PESTICIDES DIV	WATER ENFORCEMENT BRANCH	15	13
R07	WATER, WETLANDS & PESTICIDES DIV	WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT BRANCH	8	5
R07	WATER, WETLANDS & PESTICIDES DIV	WATERSHED PLANNING&IMPLEMENTATION BR	20	11
R07 Total			526	457
R08	OFC OF COMMS&PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	Immediate Office	10	8
R08	OFC OF COMMS&PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND INVOLVEMENT	8	8

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R08	OFC OF ECO PROTECTION&REMEDATION	ASSESSMENT AND REVITALIZATION PROGRAM	15	13
R08	OFC OF ECO PROTECTION&REMEDATION	EMER RESPONSE & PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM	26	27
R08	OFC OF ECO PROTECTION&REMEDATION	Immediate Office	6	5
R08	OFC OF ECO PROTECTION&REMEDATION	NEPA COMPLIANCE AND REVIEW PROGRAM	12	11
R08	OFC OF ECO PROTECTION&REMEDATION	SUPERFUND REM&FED FACILITIES PROG	43	41
R08	OFC OF ECO PROTECTION&REMEDATION	SUPPORT PROGRAM	20	20
R08	OFC OF ENF,COMPLIANCE&ENVIRO JUSTICE	AIR & TOXICS TECHNICAL ENF PROGRAM	17	16
R08	OFC OF ENF,COMPLIANCE&ENVIRO JUSTICE	Immediate Office	4	4
R08	OFC OF ENF,COMPLIANCE&ENVIRO JUSTICE	LEGAL ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM	29	25
R08	OFC OF ENF,COMPLIANCE&ENVIRO JUSTICE	POLICY,INFO MGMT&ENVIRO JUSTICE PROG	10	9
R08	OFC OF ENF,COMPLIANCE&ENVIRO JUSTICE	RCRA/CERCLA TECHNICAL ENF PROGRAM	11	10
R08	OFC OF ENF,COMPLIANCE&ENVIRO JUSTICE	WATER TECHNICAL PROGRAM	23	22
R08	OFC OF PARTNERSHIPS®ULATORY ASTNC	AIR PROGRAM	36	33

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R08	OFC OF PARTNERSHIPS®ULATORY ASTNC	Immediate Office	4	4
R08	OFC OF PARTNERSHIPS®ULATORY ASTNC	PARTNERSHIPS & ENVIRO STEWARD PROG	13	13
R08	OFC OF PARTNERSHIPS®ULATORY ASTNC	RESOURCE CONSERVATION&RECOVERY PROG	16	16
R08	OFC OF PARTNERSHIPS®ULATORY ASTNC	TRIBAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	8	6
R08	OFC OF TECHNICAL & MGMT SERVICES	FISCAL MANAGEMENT & PLANNING PROGRAM	21	22
R08	OFC OF TECHNICAL & MGMT SERVICES	GRANTS, AUDITS, PROCUREMENT PROGRAM	15	7
R08	OFC OF TECHNICAL & MGMT SERVICES	HUMAN RESOURCES PROGRAM	3	4
R08	OFC OF TECHNICAL & MGMT SERVICES	Immediate Office	8	7
R08	OFC OF TECHNICAL & MGMT SERVICES	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	20	17
R08	OFC OF TECHNICAL & MGMT SERVICES	INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM	8	8
R08	OFC OF TECHNICAL & MGMT SERVICES	LABORATORY SERVICES PROGRAM	15	14
R08	OFC OF TECHNICAL & MGMT SERVICES	MONTANA OPERATIONS UNIT	4	3
R08	OFC OF TECHNICAL & MGMT SERVICES	QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM	7	6
R08	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL		19	19

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R08	Office of the Regional Administrator		8	7
R08	OFFICE OF WATER PROTECTION	AQUIFER & AQUATIC RESOURCES PROT UNIT	11	10
R08	OFFICE OF WATER PROTECTION	CLEAN WATER PROGRAM	29	30
R08	OFFICE OF WATER PROTECTION	Immediate Office	2	4
R08	OFFICE OF WATER PROTECTION	SAFE DRINKING WATER PROGRAM	27	30
R08	OFFICE OF WATER PROTECTION	TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL SERVICES UNIT	11	11
R08 Total			519	490
R09	AIR DIVISION	AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS OFFICE	12	12
R09	AIR DIVISION	AIR TOXICS,RADIATION&COMPL ASSUR OFC	7	7
R09	AIR DIVISION	CLEAN ENERGY & CLIMATE CHANGE OFFICE	7	8
R09	AIR DIVISION	GRANTS & PROGRAM INTEGRATION OFFICE	9	7
R09	AIR DIVISION	Immediate Office	13	11
R09	AIR DIVISION	PERMITS OFFICE	10	10
R09	AIR DIVISION	PLANNING OFFICE	16	12
R09	AIR DIVISION	RULES OFFICE	8	9
R09	ENFORCEMENT DIVISION	AIR, WASTE, AND TOXICS BR	25	24
R09	ENFORCEMENT DIVISION	ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW SECTION	18	16
R09	ENFORCEMENT DIVISION	Immediate Office	8	8
R09	ENFORCEMENT DIVISION	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SECTION	9	9

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R09	ENFORCEMENT DIVISION	STRATEGIC PLANNING BRANCH	4	3
R09	ENFORCEMENT DIVISION	WATER AND PESTICIDES BRANCH	32	30
R09	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT BRANCH	12	12
R09	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION	GRANTS & CONTRACTS BRANCH	25	24
R09	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION	HUMAN CAPITAL & PLANNING OFFICE	5	7
R09	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION	Immediate Office	8	5
R09	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION	INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES BRANCH	29	28
R09	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION	SCIENCE SERVICES BRANCH	22	21
R09	LAND DIVISION	COMMUNITIES BRANCH	31	27
R09	LAND DIVISION	Immediate Office	5	5
R09	LAND DIVISION	PLANNING & STATE DEVELOPMENT SECTION	9	8
R09	LAND DIVISION	POLLUTION PREVENTION BRANCH	27	26
R09	LAND DIVISION	RCRA BRANCH	26	23
R09	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	AIR, TOXICS, WATER & GENERAL LAW BR	33	33
R09	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	HAZARDOUS WASTE BRANCH	30	26
R09	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	Immediate Office	15	11
R09	Office of the Regional Administrator		5	5
R09	PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE	Immediate Office	1	1

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R09	PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE	PRESS & CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS OFFICE	7	7
R09	PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE	WEB & INTERNAL COMMUNICATION OFFICE	9	8
R09	SUPERFUND DIVISION	CA SITE CLEANUP & ENFORCEMENT BRANCH	42	37
R09	SUPERFUND DIVISION	EMER RESP, PREPAREDNESS & PREVENTION BR	38	34
R09	SUPERFUND DIVISION	FED FACILITIES & SITE CLEANUP BR	25	24
R09	SUPERFUND DIVISION	Immediate Office	4	4
R09	SUPERFUND DIVISION	PARTNERSHIPS, LAND REV & CLEANUP BR	40	36
R09	SUPERFUND DIVISION	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE	8	9
R09	WATER DIVISION	ECOSYSTEMS BRANCH	57	50
R09	WATER DIVISION	Immediate Office	10	8
R09	WATER DIVISION	TRIBAL & STATE ASSISTANCE BRANCH	48	46
R09 Total			749	691
R10	ALASKA OPERATIONS OFFICE		9	7
R10	IDAHO OPERATIONS OFFICE		5	4
R10	OFC OF ECO PROTECTION & REMEDIATION	D ECOSYSTEMS PROTECTION PROGRAM	1	1
R10	OFC OF TECHNICAL & MGMT SERVICES	GRANTS, AUDITS, PROCUREMENT PROGRAM		6
R10	OFFICE OF AIR & WASTE	AIR PLANNING UNIT	14	14
R10	OFFICE OF AIR & WASTE	Immediate Office	7	6
R10	OFFICE OF AIR & WASTE	RCRA CORRECTIVE ACTN, PERM & PCB UNIT	11	10

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R10	OFFICE OF AIR & WASTE	RCRA PRGM, MATERIALS & POLL PREV UNIT	14	11
R10	OFFICE OF AIR & WASTE	STATIONARY SOURCE UNIT	10	9
R10	OFFICE OF AIR & WASTE	TRIBAL PRGMS, DIESEL & INDOOR AIR UNIT	9	8
R10	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT	AIR ENFORCEMENT & DATA MGMT UNIT	9	7
R10	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT	GROUND WATER UNIT	14	11
R10	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT	Immediate Office	8	7
R10	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT	MULTIMEDIA INSPEC & RCRA ENFORC UNIT	14	13
R10	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT	PESTICIDES & TOXICS UNIT	15	12
R10	OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT	WATER & WETLANDS ENFORCEMENT UNIT	17	16
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRON REVIEW & ASSESSMENT	AQUATIC RESOURCES UNIT	11	8
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRON REVIEW & ASSESSMENT	ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERIZATION UNIT	12	11
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRON REVIEW & ASSESSMENT	ENVIRONMENTAL REV & SEDIMENT MGMT UNIT	11	9
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRON REVIEW & ASSESSMENT	ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES UNIT	10	8
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRON REVIEW & ASSESSMENT	Immediate Office	8	8
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRON REVIEW & ASSESSMENT	MANCHESTER ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY	18	18
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRON REVIEW & ASSESSMENT	RISK EVALUATION UNIT	14	15

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	ASSESSMENT & BROWNFIELDS UNIT	10	6
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	HANFORD PROJECT OFFICE	11	10
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	Immediate Office	6	6
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	OFC OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	25	25
R10	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	REMEDIAL CLEANUP PROGRAM	35	33
R10	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS	FISCAL MANAGEMENT & PLANNING UNIT	10	8
R10	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS	GRANTS UNIT	9	9
R10	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS	HUMAN RESOURCES & FACILITIES UNIT	10	9
R10	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS	Immediate Office	5	5
R10	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS	INFORMATION SERVICES UNIT	17	17
R10	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS	INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT UNIT	6	7
R10	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	Immediate Office	8	7
R10	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	MULTI-MEDIA UNIT 1	10	10
R10	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	MULTI-MEDIA UNIT 2	10	10
R10	OFFICE OF REGIONAL COUNSEL	MULTI-MEDIA UNIT 3	11	9
R10	Office of the Regional Administrator		5	4

EPA onboards by office and division				
RPIO	Office	Division	Jan. 15, 2017	June 18, 2018
R10	OFFICE OF WATER & WATERSHEDS	DRINKING WATER UNIT	14	13
R10	OFFICE OF WATER & WATERSHEDS	Immediate Office	9	8
R10	OFFICE OF WATER & WATERSHEDS	NPDES PERMITS UNIT	19	18
R10	OFFICE OF WATER & WATERSHEDS	PUGET SOUND PROGRAM	11	7
R10	OFFICE OF WATER & WATERSHEDS	WATER QUALITY STANDARDS UNIT	7	8
R10	OFFICE OF WATER & WATERSHEDS	WATERSHED UNIT	12	10
R10	OREGON OPERATIONS OFFICE		4	4
R10	REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR'S DIVISION	Immediate Office	8	6
R10	REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR'S DIVISION	PUBLIC AFFAIRS & COMM ENGAGEMENT UNIT	15	14
R10	REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR'S DIVISION	TRIBAL TRUST & ASSISTANCE UNIT	18	17
R10	WASHINGTON OPERATIONS OFFICE		3	4
R10 Total			549	503
Grand Total			15,946	14,702

The Honorable Bobby L. Rush

During the question period I spoke to you about the widespread levels of lead that have been detected throughout homes in Chicago and I referenced a recent Tribune article entitled “Brain-damaging lead found in tap water in hundreds of homes tested across Chicago, results show” (April 12, 2018).

You agreed with me that this was a severe problem, nationally, and it would cost approximately \$45 billion to resolve. You mentioned that there was a program at the agency consisting of \$4 billion in grants, annually, for ten years that states could apply for to address this issue.

1. Can you provide more information regarding this program, including eligibility requirements, deadlines, and the dollar amounts available?

ANSWER - The program is the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act. The WIFIA program is authorized to provide and service direct federal loans to cover 49 percent of eligible costs for drinking water and wastewater infrastructure projects. Eligible assistance recipients include corporations and partnerships, municipal entities, and State Revolving Fund (SRF) programs. The WIFIA program received \$63 million in funding in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, that could potentially provide as much as \$5.5 billion in loans, leveraging over \$11 billion in water infrastructure projects when combined with other funding sources.

On May 5, 2018, EPA announced that the deadline for prospective borrowers to submit letters of interest for WIFIA loans has been extended to July 31, 2018. Administrator Pruitt also sent a letter highlighting the deadline extension to the governors of 56 states and territories as well as tribal leadership. This year's WIFIA Notice of Funding Availability highlights the importance of protecting public health, including reducing exposure to lead and other contaminants in drinking water systems and updating the nation's aging infrastructure.

For more information about the WIFIA program and the application process please visit www.epa.gov/wifia

2. Will you commit to work with my office to have staff from EPA Region 5 come into my district to discuss this program with state and local leaders, as well as other stakeholders concerned with this issue?

ANSWER - EPA's WIFIA team is available to meet with your staff and leaders and constituents in your district to discuss the program and to answer any questions.

The Honorable Diana DeGette

1. I questioned you about your legally dubious real estate transactions, but further information is needed in light of your incomplete answers and troubling new developments.²

In your testimony before the Subcommittee, you failed to disclose significant details concerning your 2003 purchase of a luxury home in Oklahoma City. According to a recent report in the *New York Times*, you purchased the home with Justin Whitefield, a registered lobbyist who, at the time, was pursuing business-friendly changes to Oklahoma's workers' compensation rules,

² House Committee on Energy and Commerce, *Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2019 Environmental Protection Agency Budget*, 115th Cong. (Apr. 26, 2017).

which you allegedly helped negotiate.³ Mr. Whitefield, yourself, and four other owners reportedly used a limited liability company, Capitol House L.L.C. (Capitol House), to purchase the home.⁴ The seller, Marsha Lindsey, was a telecommunications lobbyist for SBC Oklahoma, and sold the property at a significant discount of approximately \$100,000.⁵ SBC Oklahoma reportedly offset this amount in Ms. Lindsey's retirement package.⁶

Your incomplete testimony leaves key questions unanswered concerning this transaction. You allegedly paid for one-sixth of the purchase price, and according to reports, you purchased the home with Kenneth Wagner, who now serves as a political appointee at EPA and previously served as treasurer of your political action committee,⁷ as well as health care executive Jon Jiles.⁸ However, the identity of two additional owners remains unknown.

You also apparently failed to disclose your interest in Capitol House in your financial disclosure filings, and in your testimony could not confirm whether you paid taxes on rental income received for a room on the property rented to another Republican lawmaker.⁹

Given your history of real estate transactions with lobbyists both in Oklahoma during your tenure as a state legislator and in Washington, D.C. while serving as EPA Administrator, and in light of these troubling developments, I ask that you respond to the following requests:

- a. Please provide the names and corresponding ownership share of all owners of Capitol House.

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

³ *Pruitt's Coziness with Lobbyists Includes Secretly Buying a House with One*, New York Times (May 3, 2018).

⁴ *Pruitt's Coziness with Lobbyists Includes Secretly Buying a House with One*, New York Times (May 3, 2018).

⁵ *Pruitt's Coziness with Lobbyists Includes Secretly Buying a House with One*, New York Times (May 3, 2018).

⁶ *Pruitt's Coziness with Lobbyists Includes Secretly Buying a House with One*, New York Times (May 3, 2018).

⁷ *Pruitt's Friend Joins Agency as Senior Adviser*, E&E News (Apr. 13, 2017).

⁸ *Pruitt's Coziness with Lobbyists Includes Secretly Buying a House with One*, New York Times (May 3, 2018).

⁹ *Scott Pruitt Before the EPA: Fancy Homes, a Shell Company and Friends with Money*, New York Times (Apr. 21, 2018).

- b. Please provide documentation of your payment for and purchase of an ownership share in Capitol House, including the terms of the payment and the individual or entity who received the payment.

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

- c. Please provide copies of your financial disclosures disclosing your ownership interest in Capitol House.

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

- d. Please provide the name of the individual(s) who arranged for cash purchase of the Oklahoma City property and subsequent transfer of ownership to Capitol House.

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

- e. Please provide the name of the individual(s) who requested or arranged for Spirit Bank, where former EPA appointee Albert Kelly was chief executive, to approve a mortgage in the name of Capitol House.

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

- f. Please provide documentation demonstrating you paid taxes on all rental income received from Jim Dunlap or any other tenant who rented space on the property, including, but not limited to, Schedule K-1 tax forms.

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

- g. Please provide documentation of any proceeds you received for the 2005 sale of the property, including the amount and date received.

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

The Honorable Janice D. Schakowsky

1. **Speeches:** Please provide the date, location, name of event, and text for all speeches you have given to industry associations (e.g. Louisiana Chemical Association) in your capacity as EPA Administrator.

ANSWER –The agency believes that QFRs are not the appropriate venue in which to respond to broad document requests of this nature and will seek to work with your staff on this request.

2. **Official vehicle:** During the hearing, you stated that EPA staff “just asked for consultation” on the selection of your official vehicle. During this consultation, did you or people responding on your behalf express a preference for a larger vehicle, leather interior, bucket seats, Wifi, GPS navigation, or any other luxury features that were ultimately included in the vehicle selected?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

3. **Samantha Dravis:**

- a. At any time during Samantha Dravis’s employment at EPA, was she employed or compensated using authority under the Safe Drinking Water Act?

ANSWER - No

- b. How much was Samantha Dravis compensated during the three months from November 2017 to January 2018?

ANSWER - Effective April 20, 2018, Samantha Dravis resigned from her position at the EPA and is no longer employed by the Agency. Due to an ongoing review by EPA OIG, it would be inappropriate to provide this information in QFR responses. EPA will seek to work with committee staff on this information request.

- c. According to the EPA’s own spokesperson, Ms. Dravis was a “senior leader at the EPA.” Do you have record of meetings attended in person or substantial projects completed by Samantha Dravis during the three months from November 2017 to January 2018? If so, please summarize. Please provide all records of meetings attended in person or substantial projects completed, as well as any emails between

Administrator Pruitt and Ms. Dravis concerning her attendance or departure from the EPA.

ANSWER - Effective April 20, 2018, Samantha Dravis resigned from her position at the EPA and is no longer employed by the Agency. The agency believes that QFRs are not the appropriate venue in which to respond to broad document requests of this nature and will seek to work with your staff on this request.

- d. Was Samantha Dravis approved for first class travel to or from Morocco in December 2017? If so, who at EPA approved first class travel and on what date?

ANSWER - No

The Honorable Paul Tonko

1. Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science Proposed Rule

- a. Please cite specific provisions in statute that require EPA to make the changes proposed in the Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science rule?

ANSWER – EPA’s authority for this rulemaking can be found in Section I.C. of the proposed rule, including its ability to promulgate rules under the Administrative Procedure Act.

- b. Do any of the statutory authorities identified by the proposed rule include the ability to grant exemptions to the treatment of science at the Administrator’s discretion to address issues on a case-by-case basis?

ANSWER – In developing the proposed rule, EPA drew from various authorities that generally speak to the need for transparency in scientific rulemaking. EPA specifically cited these sources in the proposed rulemaking to allow the public to review and better understand the basis for the proposed rule.

- c. What science organizations or stakeholder groups were involved in the development of this proposed rule? Please provide a list of all meetings, including teleconferences, with these organizations, including the date, and the name, title, and organizational affiliation of participants.

ANSWER – EPA has received numerous comments from various groups on the development of the rule. The proposed rule was open for public comment until August 16, 2018. Comments are available for viewing at <https://www.regulations.gov/docket?D=EPA-HQ-OA-2018-0259>. EPA also held a public hearing seeking feedback on the proposed rule on July 17, 2018.

- d. Previously, EPA analyzed legislation (The HONEST Act) that would have similar goals and estimated it would cost \$250 million annually to implement. Did EPA develop any cost estimates to implement the proposed rule?

ANSWER – The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is much narrower in the scope than the HONEST Act in terms of the scope of data covered, the scope of decisions covered, and its proposed intent to take advantage of existing approaches and infrastructure being developed in conjunction with other government-wide open data initiatives. Moreover, as stated in the proposed rule, EPA believes the benefits of this proposed rule justify the costs. The benefits of EPA ensuring that dose response data and models underlying pivotal regulatory science are publicly available in a manner sufficient for independent validation are that it will improve the data and scientific quality of the Agency's actions and facilitate expanded data sharing and exploration of key data sets; this is consistent with the conclusions of the National Academies.

- e. If so, please provide any cost analysis completed regarding the proposed rule.

ANSWER – See response to (d) above.

- f. Why did EPA conclude this is not an economically significant rulemaking? Please explain EPA's analysis associated with this conclusion.

ANSWER – The proposed rule focuses on strengthening transparency of EPA's regulatory science. The rule is not expected to have an "economically significant" impact on the economy as defined by E.O. 12866 and guidance from OMB.

- g. Please provide a list of all key meetings and determinations made for this rulemaking during the Action Development Process, including the rulemakings tier, meeting dates and participants in any intra-agency work group meetings, and a list of EPA offices which participated in the development of the rulemaking. For each office, please provide the name, title, and office of each work group participant.

ANSWER – The proposed rule is being overseen by EPA's Office of Research and Development. The proposed rule continues to develop, including with the comments received, and the input from the public hearing held on July 17, 2018.

- h. Did EPA examine lost benefits or costs associated with EPA's inability to consider certain scientific studies as a result of this proposal?

ANSWER – As stated above and in the proposed rule, EPA believes the benefits of this proposed rule justify the costs. One recent analysis found that: "Improvements in reproducibility can be thought of as increasing the net benefits of regulation because they would avoid situations in which costs or benefits are wrongly estimated to occur or in which regulatory costs are

imposed without corresponding benefits....” They concluded that “an increase in existing net benefits from greater reproducibility, which, if it occurred, would cover the costs of obtaining the data and making the data available.”

<https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/Mercatus-Lutter-Public-Access-Data-v3.pdf>. With regard to concerns over lost benefits, EPA believes that concerns about access to confidential or private information can, in many cases, be addressed through the application of solutions commonly in use across some parts of the Federal government. EPA also seeks comments on potential exceptions to any requirements in the rule.

- i. If so, what analysis was done on costs or lost benefits, and what were the results?

ANSWER – See response to (h) above.

- j. Many older studies may rely on data that are no longer available. Does EPA have any estimates or analysis of how many studies would be disqualified to be used for major rulemakings under this proposal?

ANSWER – Since the rule is still under development, EPA cannot comment on the substance or effect of the rule until it is final. EPA is currently accepting public comment on the potential impact of the proposal.

- k. How long did the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) take to complete its review of the proposed rule? Please provide the date OIRA accepted and began review, and the date OIRA completed review.

ANSWER – OMB received the proposed rule on April 19, 2018, and concluded its review on April 23, 2018.

- l. Did EPA or other executive officials have any communication with the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to accelerate this review? If so, please provide the name and title of these individuals.

ANSWER – OMB reviewed a draft of the proposed rule and indicated to EPA that it had completed its review of the draft on April 23, 2018. OMB and federal agencies routinely discuss the timing of interagency review.

- m. Was the Office of Information and Regulatory informed by any EPA official that Administrator Pruitt would be testifying before Congress one week after submitting this proposed rule?

ANSWER – Yes, Federal agencies routinely inform OMB of upcoming hearings and EPA did so in this case.

- n. Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs reviews of similarly complex rules often take months to complete. What specific factors allowed this review to be completed so quickly?

ANSWER – See response to (m) above.

- o. The proposed rule solicits comments in numerous areas, indicating it hopes to develop answers during the regulatory process. Proposals with so many outstanding questions are often released as Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Makings. Why did EPA propose this as a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking with so many outstanding questions included?

ANSWER – EPA solicited comments from the public on various areas to better inform the development of the rule. Extending the comment period by roughly two and a half months and also holding a public hearing will provide an opportunity to receive additional useful information for the agency to consider.

- p. Did the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs ask EPA to issue an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking instead? If so, when was this request made and who at OIRA made this request?

ANSWER – Various options for how to proceed with the rule were considered during EPA’s development of the draft NPRM.

2. Science Advisory Boards (SAB)

- a. How many current members of EPA Science Advisory Boards are expected to cycle off before the end of this year?

ANSWER – For the Science Advisory Board (SAB): Seven members are completing their second and final 3-year term, and eight members are completing their first 3-year term. For the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC): One member is completing their second and final 3-year term, and three members are completing their first 3-year term.

- b. Since joining the agency, has Administrator Pruitt requested EPA career staff in the SAB Staff Office to provide recommendations for board appointments?

ANSWER – The career staff in the SAB Staff Office provided senior management with information and various options for the Administrator to consider for both SAB and CASAC appointments

- c. If so, how many of those recommendations have been accepted of the total amount of new appointees.

ANSWER – The senior management of the Agency considered the information and options.

- d. How many EPA Science Advisory Board members have been appointed without input by the SAB Staff Office?

ANSWER – The SAB Staff Office provided information on all nominated candidates for the Administrator to consider when making appointments.

- e. How many issues went before EPA Science Advisory Boards or the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) for review in each year for the past five years?

ANSWER – Number of advisory reports per year from the SAB and CASAC:

Year	SAB	CASAC
2013	7	6
2014	7	7
2015	14	2
2016	6	3
2017	8	4

- f. Does the Administrator plan to seek SAB or CASAC review of the recently proposed Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science rule?

ANSWER –Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. In general practice, the SAB and CASAC are regularly consulted for feedback on these issues and EPA intends to continue to use them in that capacity moving forward.

- g. Does the Administrator plan to seek SAB or CASAC review on any climate change issues?

ANSWER –Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. In general practice, the SAB and CASAC are regularly consulted for feedback on these issues and EPA intends to continue to use them in that capacity moving forward.

- h. Does the Administrator plan to seek SAB or CASAC review on any aspect of the long-term economic costs and benefits of any changes that have been made or are being proposed under his tenure at EPA?

ANSWER –Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. In general practice, the SAB and CASAC are regularly consulted for feedback on these issues and EPA intends to continue to use them in that capacity moving forward.

3. The Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act Implementation

- a. What steps has EPA taken to ensure new and existing chemical reviews include explicit considerations to protect vulnerable populations, as required by statute?

ANSWER – As required under TSCA, EPA continues to identify and give explicit consideration to “potentially exposed and susceptible subpopulations” for both new and existing chemical reviews. Although the explicit requirement in TSCA is new, the Agency has long given consideration to vulnerable subpopulations. See, for example, EPA's Policy on Evaluating Health Risks to Children (1995). The Agency has evaluated the risk of chemical substances to all sectors of the population, with particular attention to workers, indigenous peoples, pregnant women, children, infants, the elderly, environmental justice communities, and fence-line communities, among others. The Agency utilizes a number of existing guidance documents to evaluate risk at various life stages, and will continue to use and refine these processes to protect the most vulnerable.

EPA confirmed its commitment to meet this statutory requirement in the final Risk Evaluation framework rule, and in the scoping and problem formulation documents for the first ten chemical risk evaluations. The problem formulation documents refine the conditions of use and exposures presented in the scope of the risk evaluation and presents refinements to the conceptual models and analysis plan that describe how EPA expects to evaluate risks. EPA welcomes information from communities to further inform our risk evaluations.

EPA has sought input from specific populations and public health experts in implementing TSCA and will continue to do so. For example, EPA has had discussions on several occasions with the National Tribal Toxics Council (NTTC) to receive input on tribal lifeways and exposures. OPPT and the NTTC continue to collaborate on ways to consider tribes in conducting potentially exposed or susceptible subpopulations analyses for Draft Risk Evaluations. OPPT has also had several meetings with AFL-CIO about workers as potentially exposed or susceptible subpopulations and ways in which worker exposure information could be identified and provided for use in the risk evaluation process. OPPT has also sought advice and input regarding children as a susceptible subpopulation from the Children’s Health Protection Advisory Committee (CHPAC) through a meeting and recommendations addressing the formal request from EPA for guidance on how risk evaluation should address children.

- b. In November, Administrator Pruitt and EPA staff attended an American Chemistry Council board meeting on South Carolina’s Kiawah Island. The Administrator’s schedule contains no details of that weekend. Please provide a list of all companies or lobbyists that met with the Administrator in South Carolina.

ANSWER –The agency believes that QFRs are not the appropriate venue in which to respond to broad document requests of this nature and will seek to work with your staff on this request.

- c. Please provide a list of all chemicals specifically discussed at meetings attended by the Administrator at this event.

ANSWER –The agency believes that QFRs are not the appropriate venue in which to respond to broad document requests of this nature and will seek to work with your staff on this request.

4. Formaldehyde Assessment

- a. Earlier this year, Administrator Pruitt was asked by Senator Ed Markey at the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works hearing on 1/30/18 about the delayed formaldehyde assessment. At that hearing, Administrator Pruitt said, “Senator, I commit to you that I will look into that and make sure your office is aware of what we have and when we can release it.” Please provide an update on the status of the formaldehyde assessment.

ANSWER – We continue to discuss this assessment with our Agency partners and have no further updates to provide at this time.

- b. Has EPA concluded its intra-agency review process?

ANSWER – We continue to discuss this assessment with our Agency partners and have no further updates to provide at this time.

- c. What additional reviews are needed before it can be finalized?

ANSWER – We continue to discuss this assessment with our Agency partners and have no further updates to provide at this time.

- d. When does EPA expect the final report to be released?

ANSWER – We continue to discuss this assessment with our Agency partners and have no further updates to provide at this time.

5. EPA Year in Review 2017-2018 Report

- a. The “EPA Year in Review 2017-2018” report states, “In year one, EPA finalized 22 deregulatory actions, saving Americans more than \$1 billion in regulatory costs.” Please provide a list of each of these actions along with EPA’s analysis of the regulatory cost estimate for each action.

ANSWER – See attached spreadsheet. Note, costs in column D are in millions of dollars.

6. Lead and Copper Rule

- a. EPA undertook efforts to revise the Lead and Copper Rule more than 13 years ago. In October 2016, the EPA published a white paper on the revisions that included a pledge to issue a proposed rule by the end of 2017. That deadline has passed. When does EPA expect to issue a proposed rule?

ANSWER - EPA expects to publish proposed revisions to the Lead and Copper Rule by February 2019.

- b. Has EPA conducted any analysis on how the proposed “Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science” rule may impact its ability to regulate lead in drinking water?

ANSWER - EPA has not conducted an analysis of how this proposed regulation might impact regulations of lead in drinking water. However, consistent with Section 1412b(3)(A), EPA is committed to using the best available peer reviewed science and data collected in accordance with accepted practices to inform decision making under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

7. PFAS

- a. EPA announced a National Leadership Summit on Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS). What options has EPA discussed internally to regulate or reduce PFAS contamination in drinking water?

ANSWER - EPA is evaluating the need for a maximum contaminant level for PFOA and PFOS as noted at the National Leadership Summit on Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS).

- b. What options have been discussed by staff of EPA and the Department of Defense?

ANSWER - EPA staff regularly interacts with Department of Defense (DOD) officials and those of other interested Agencies as part of our coordination of clean-up of contamination at Federal Facilities. EPA has briefed DOD staff on the regulatory processes under the Safe Drinking Water Act including the Contaminant Candidate List, the Regulatory Determinations process and the process for developing National Primary Drinking Water Regulations.

- c. Has EPA conducted any analysis on how the proposed “Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science” rule may impact its ability to regulate PFAS in drinking water?

ANSWER - EPA has not conducted an analysis of how this proposed regulation might impact regulations of PFAS in drinking water. However, consistent with Section 1412.b.(3)(A), EPA is committed to using the best available peer

reviewed science and data collected in accordance with accepted practices to inform decision making under the Safe Drinking Water Act.

8. Funding for the Office of Inspector General

- a. The Fiscal Year 2019 budget request includes a significant proposed cut to the EPA Office of Inspector General (OIG). In November 2017, in OIG’s Semiannual Report to Congress, it was reported that “OIG submitted an FY 2019 request for \$62 million to the agency for inclusion in the President’s budget. Without seeking input from the OIG, the agency provided us with a request of \$42 million.” In February, the White House requested only \$37.5 million for the OIG. What was the justification for reducing appropriations and FTEs in the FY 2019 budget request for EPA OIG?

ANSWER - The FY 2019 budget request for EPA OIG is \$46.2 million (\$37.5 million within the Inspector General appropriation and \$8.7 million with the Superfund transfer to the Office of Inspector General appropriation). The FY 2019 President’s Budget meets the Budget Control Act’s overall federal budget level and with few exceptions, EPA and Chemical Safety Board programs that the OIG reviews also saw reductions. The overall funding change for OIG was a result of an increase in base workforce costs for existing FTE and a corresponding non-pay reduction.

- b. Did the EPA defend its \$42 million request to the Office of Management and Budget?

ANSWER - Per Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-11, the President's Budget deliberation process is confidential.

9. Freedom of Information Act

- a. It has been reported that political appointees’ role in reviewing documents requested under the Freedom of Information Act has increased significantly during Administrator Pruitt’s tenure. Please describe the process for “awareness reviews” or “senior management reviews” conducted by political appointees before EPA releases documents involving Administrator Pruitt, including the names and titles of all EPA political appointees who participate.

ANSWER - In a July 15, 2018 letter to House Oversight and Government Reform Committee Ranking Member Elijah E Cummings, which has been shared with the staff of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Principal Deputy General Counsel & Designated Agency Ethics Official Kevin Minoli explains in great detail EPA’s Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) response policy.

In his letter, Minoli explains that... “In addition to work on specific FOIA requests, the (FOIA Expert Assistance Team) also helped keep senior leaders informed of new requests that the agency received each week, coordinated

inter-agency review with the Executive Office of the President (EOP) where the EOP had equities in the responsive documents, and made senior leaders aware of impending FOIA productions. There are multiple benefits to making senior leaders – political and career – aware of productions before they are actually produced: the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs can determine if the documents are also responsive to a Congressional request for information and, if so, ensure Congress receives the documents at the same time or slightly before the requestor; the Office of Public Affairs can prepare any communications materials deemed necessary based on the documents to be produced; when the documents are from or about a particular employee, keeping that employee informed throughout the process when appropriate, including at the response stage, can significantly increase their confidence in and respect for the FOIA Program into the future; and, while not meant as a quality control tool, to the extent a mistake is identified, it can be corrected. This ‘awareness review’ process does not itself violate FOIA and can be completed without causing undue delay.”

Please find the letter attached for additional information regarding the FOIA response process, and the FOIA Expert Assistance Team’s role within the agency.

- b. Please explain EPA Chief of Staff Ryan Jackson’s role in conducting awareness reviews. How many FOIA awareness reviews has Mr. Jackson completed, and in how many instances did Mr. Jackson instruct that information be withheld, redacted, or altered prior to public release?

ANSWER – See response to 9(a)

- c. Have any other political appointees ever sought to alter, redact, or withhold portions of a FOIA disclosure following an awareness review?

ANSWER – See response to 9(a)

- d. Please provide the start date, end date, and length of review for all awareness reviews conducted during Administrator Pruitt’s tenure at EPA.

ANSWER – See response to 9(a)

- e. Have any of these reviews resulted in a missed FOIA deadline to release documents? If so, please provide details for each instance.

ANSWER – See response to 9(a)

- f. Please explain the rationale for moving the National FOIA office into the Office of General Counsel.

ANSWER – See response to 9(a)

- g. Please explain the role of EPA political appointees Matthew Leopold, Eric Baptist, Marcella Burke, David Fatouhi, and Justin Schwab in the FOIA review process, including any instance where any of these individuals withheld, delayed, redacted, or altered prior to public release?

ANSWER – See response to 9(a)

10. International Travel

- a. According to EPA emails released under a Freedom of Information Act request, on July 10, 2017, Mr. Matthew Freedman was involved in the planning of the Administrator’s potential trip to Australia. Mr. Freedman wrote to EPA staff, “[Richard Smotkin] and I will attend and will be present but will not be listed as members of the delegation.” It has been reported that Mr. Richard Smotkin was also involved in the planning of the Administrator's December trip to Morocco. Did Mr. Smotkin meet with Administrator Pruitt or any EPA staff, in official meetings or otherwise, during the Administrator’s trip to Morocco?

ANSWER - Former Administrator Pruitt traveled to Morocco on December 11-13, 2017 to promote U.S. energy and environmental technology exports. During that trip, he discussed U.S. priorities for updating the environmental cooperation workplan under the U.S.-Morocco Free Trade Agreement and promoted U.S. exports and business solutions, particularly for liquefied natural gas (LNG), biofuels, and waste management in meetings with Moroccan ministers and senior officials.

The Agency has received multiple Freedom of Information Act and Congressional oversight requests that relate to your specific questions. The Agency is in the process of responding to those requests and will provide this information to you once available.

- b. If so, please provide a full list of meetings between Mr. Smotkin and any EPA officials in Morocco, including any meetings with EPA officials and Moroccan government officials, during official business or otherwise.

ANSWER - See response to 10a.

- c. Please provide a list of all attendees for any meeting identified in (b).

ANSWER - See response to 10a.

- d. Recent press accounts indicated Administrator Pruitt and EPA staff missed their connecting flight to Morocco because his security detail’s equipment and other gear could not be transferred to the connecting flight in time. This differs from earlier explanations from EPA that the connecting flight was missed due to weather. Please explain why Administrator Pruitt and EPA staff missed their connecting flight.

ANSWER - See response to 10a.

11. Security

- a. In March, Administrator Pruitt told CBS News, "The quantity and the type of threats I've faced are unprecedented." These threats have been used to justify costly security measures, including first-class travel and full-time protection by a 20-member security detail. How does EPA catalogue threats against officials, including the Administrator?

ANSWER - EPA collects information on potential threats against employees, including the Administrator, in several ways. EPA's Office of Inspector General (OIG) investigates instances of threats against EPA employees, including the Administrator. The Protective Service Detail (PSD) uses information from multiple sources, including open-source information and potential security threats from our federal/state/local law enforcement partners.

- b. What office is primarily responsible for identifying these threats?

ANSWER - EPA's Office of Criminal Enforcement and Forensics Training (OCEFT) in the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance collects threat information from multiple sources as described below.

- c. What office is primarily responsible for investigating these threats and determining their legitimacy?

ANSWER - The OIG's Office of Investigations has authority to investigate threats against EPA employees. As you know, the OIG is an independent organization. We defer to the OIG to address any questions about their roles and responsibilities.

- d. Please describe the role in EPA security assessment, investigation, and response of each of the following offices: the Protective Security Detail, the Office of Homeland Security Intelligence Team, the Office of Inspector General, and any other EPA entity that has responsibilities related to the Administrator's security?

ANSWER - EPA's Office of Homeland Security (OHS) provides information on any potential national security threats – domestic or international – and shares this information with PSD. The OIG tracks instances of threats against EPA employees, reviews and investigates. The PSD uses information from multiple sources, including open-source information and potential security threats from our federal/state/local law enforcement partners to assesses the current security climate. OCEFT develops the operational security plan to provide protection for the Administrator.

- e. If threats are deemed to be serious, are they referred to the FBI or another law enforcement agency outside of EPA?

ANSWER - EPA's OIG investigates threats made against EPA employees. As you know, the OIG is an independent organization. We defer to the OIG to address any questions about their roles and responsibilities.

- f. Which EPA office determines whether or not to refer threats?

ANSWER - EPA's OIG makes these determinations. As you know, the OIG is an independent organization. We defer to the OIG to address any questions about their roles and responsibilities.

- g. On how many occasions did such a referral occur in 2017 and 2018?

ANSWER – We defer to the OIG to address questions about their roles and responsibilities.

- h. What spending decisions related to security require sign-off by the head of the Administrator's security detail?

ANSWER - The Special Agent in Charge (SAC) of the PSD manages the resources associated with the PSD's operational mission of protecting the Administrator. The SAC/PSD would be responsible for approving travel authorizations for PSD agents and routine expenses associated with managing the PSD including purchases of equipment, training and other associated expenses in accordance with Agency and OCEFT Delegations.

- i. When did Mr. Nino Perrotta take over the role referenced in (h)?

ANSWER - Mr. Perrotta became the Acting SAC/PSD in March 2017.

- j. Before Mr. Perrotta took over this role, who was responsible for those duties?

ANSWER - Eric Weese was the SAC/PSD prior to SAC Perrotta.

- k. Why and when was the previous head of the Administrator's security detail removed from that position?

ANSWER - SAC Weese was reassigned to a new position as the Senior Law Enforcement Intelligence Advisor within the Criminal Investigation Division in March 2017.

- l. If that employee continued to work at EPA, to where was he reassigned and what is his current employment status?

ANSWER - SAC Weese was reassigned to a new position as the Senior Law Enforcement Intelligence Advisor within the Criminal Investigation Division in March 2017 and continues in that role today.

- m. How many EPA security officials hit the \$160,000 annual salary cap due to overtime last year?

ANSWER – In FY 2017, ten EPA security officials earned more than the \$161,900 cap. The average (mean) of that overtime pay for all of FY 2017 was \$3,166.

- n. How does that compare to each of the previous 5 years?

ANSWER – In FY 2017, ten EPA security officials earned more than the \$161,900 cap. The average (mean) of that overtime pay for all of FY 2017 was \$3,166. In FY 2016, three EPA security officials earned more than the annual limit of \$161,300. In FY 2015, three EPA security officials earned more than the annual limit of \$158,700. In FY 2014, five EPA security officials earned more than the annual limit of \$157,100. In FY 2013, no one exceeded the annual pay limit. In FY 2012, two EPA security officials earned more than the annual limit of \$155,500.

- o. On May 1, 2017, Mr. Perrotta sent a memorandum requesting Administrator Pruitt be seated in first or business class on official travel. On how many instances before this memorandum did the Administrator travel in first or business class on official travel?

ANSWER – The Federal Travel Regulation states that “[w]hen exception security circumstances require other than coach-class airline accommodations,” an agency “may authorize/approve first class accommodations.” 41 C.F.R. section 301-10.123(a)(3). Due to security concerns, EPA approved former Administrator Pruitt’s use of other than coach-travel accommodations. For all trips prior to May 1, 2017, former Administrator Pruitt’s official travel authorizations were ticketed in the economy class.

- p. On how many instances after this memorandum did the Administrator travel in first or business class on official travel?

ANSWER – Between May 1, 2017 and February 14, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt conducted official business travel on thirty instances in which he was ticketed in other than coach-class accommodations.

- q. How many times and on what dates did EPA security officials travel with the Administrator for nonofficial business, where the Administrator paid for his own travel expenses?

ANSWER – Due to security protocol sensitivities, the agency believes that QFRs are not the appropriate venue in which to respond to information requests of this nature and will seek to work with your staff on this request.

- r. What was the total cost for security officials’ airfare, hotel, and per diem for each of these instances?

ANSWER – The agency believes that QFRs are not the appropriate venue in which to respond to information requests of this nature and will seek to work with your staff on this request.

- s. Which EPA employee(s) approved the EPA payment to Mrs. Vicki Hart to compensate for a broken door at her condo?

ANSWER – The payment to reimburse Mrs. Hart for damages to her property was done in compliance with all applicable federal and agency policies and laws.

- t. Was Administrator Pruitt involved with or notified about that payment?

ANSWER – Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

- u. It has been reported that EPA entered into a new vehicle lease for a Chevrolet Suburban at \$10,200 annually. This lease was reportedly for a more upscale LT model, instead of the LS model typically leased and included monthly charges of \$300 for luxury upgrades. What were the terms and rate of the previous vehicle used by the Administrator, and what was the rationale for these upgrades?

ANSWER – The contract for the 2018 Chevrolet Suburban was terminated and the Agency does not currently lease the vehicle referenced.

12. The Administrator’s Housing Arrangement

- a. It has been reported that the Administrator’s original lease with Mrs. Vicki Hart ended at the end of April 2017, but he did not move out of that condo until later in the year. What were the terms of extending the lease?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

- b. On what date did Administrator Pruitt move out of the condo owned by Mrs. Hart?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

The Honorable David Loeb sack

Administrator Pruitt, as I indicated to you at the hearing, I have a lot of concerns about the way in which the small refinery exemptions within the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) program have been handled by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). There needs to be much more transparency and public accountability in the with respect to the small refinery waiver exemptions. Please provide responses to the following questions regarding small refinery exemptions within the RFS.

1. What is the total number of refinery waiver applications that EPA received in each year from 2013 through 2017?

ANSWER - For the 2013 compliance year, EPA received 17 petitions for the RFS small refinery hardship exemption. For the 2014 compliance year, EPA received 15 petitions; 2015 compliance year, 15 petitions; 2016 compliance year, 20 petitions; 2017 compliance year, 33 petitions.

2. For each year from 2013 through 2017, how many waivers did the EPA grant?

ANSWER - For the 2013 compliance year, EPA granted RFS exemptions to 8 small refineries. For the 2014 compliance year, EPA granted 8 exemptions; 2015 compliance year, 7 exemptions; 2016 compliance year, 19 exemptions; 2017 compliance year, 29 exemptions. EPA is still evaluating 4 petitions for the 2017 compliance year.

3. What companies have received waivers for each year from 2013 through 2017?

ANSWER - Small refineries have claimed confidential business information protection for their hardship exemption petitions to EPA. For that reason, EPA does not disclose the names of the refineries or their parent companies.

4. What is the total volume of biofuel obligation represented by the waivers granted for each year 2013 through 2017?

ANSWER - In 2013, the total Renewable Volume Obligation (RVO) exempted through the small refinery hardship exemptions was approximately 190 million RINs. In 2014, approximately 210 million RINs; 2015, approximately 290 million RINs; 2016, approximately 790 million RINs; 2017, approximately 1.46 billion RINs.

5. What is the EPA process for confirming that each applicant falls beneath the 75,000-barrell throughput capacity?

ANSWER - EPA verifies that each applicant processed less than 75,000 barrels per day of crude oil by using annual refinery data from EIA.

6. Please confirm how the gallons waived under the small refinery exemption process are handled. Are the gallons reassigned to remaining obligated parties for blending? Are they reassigned within the same compliance year? If they are not reassigned to the remaining obligated parties, what is the disposition of those gallons relative to the overall renewable volume obligation set in the annual rule?

ANSWER - Small refinery exemptions that are granted before EPA establishes the RFS standards for a given compliance year are redistributed to the remaining obligated parties in that compliance year, consistent with EPA's formulas for calculating the percentage standards that apply to all obligated parties. Small refinery exemptions that are issued after the annual standards are established do not affect the standards for that particular year.

7. Did you inform President Trump or White House staff of the unusually large number of small refinery exemptions EPA was granting and of the potential effects on the renewable fuel market of exempting additional gallons and facilities and the fact that these actions would not be well received by the agricultural community?

ANSWER - Meetings with the White House regarding the RFS have included a range of stakeholders impacted by the program including representatives from USDA, EPA, Members of Congress, the agricultural community, and the refining community. A number of topics have been discussed, including the small refinery exemption program established by Congress under the Clean Air Act 211(o)(9)(B) and 40 CFR 80. 1441 (e)(2) . We strive to make decisions based on the full breadth and scope of impacted stakeholders and will continue to do so under the RFS.

8. EPA claimed recently that the Agency did not change the criteria for granting exemptions from those used in past years. Yet, numerous press reports indicate the Agency has granted almost double the amount of waivers than have been granted in past years. What is your explanation for the Agency's granting of an unusually high number of waivers under this program as compared to past years? If the Agency is applying different criteria, please provide an explanation of the changes and the justification for initiating the new criteria.

ANSWER - This question is the subject of ongoing litigation filed in the Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. See Petition for Review, Advanced Biofuels Association v. EPA, filed in Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit on May 1, 2018. EPA does not comment on topics that are the subject of ongoing litigation.

9. Did EPA consult with the Department of Energy on each of the applications for a small refinery exemption for 2016 and 2017? For how many of the applications reviewed by DOE for these two compliance years did EPA disagree with DOE's recommendation to grant or deny the exemption?

ANSWER - Consistent with Clean Air Act requirements, EPA consulted with, and received a recommendation from DOE on every small refinery hardship petition that was submitted for 2016 and 2017. EPA's decision differed from DOE's recommendation in one case. In addition, EPA granted 100% exemptions in cases where DOE recommended 50% relief.

The Honorable Joseph Kennedy, III

1. What precipitated the need for a secure phone booth inside of your office? You repeatedly have placed blame at the feet of your staff for the exorbitant \$43,000 cost of the phone booth, but it was you yourself who instructed your staff to find a way to create a secure communications line in your office in the first place. Why do you need that secure line? What is the nature of the phone calls you are making that require an additional "secure" phone line while already in the privacy of your own office? If your office does not provide sufficient privacy, why is one of the two Secure Compartmented Information Facilities (SCIFs) inside the EPA headquarters not sufficient?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Therefore, EPA is not able to discuss your question with Mr. Pruitt to provide you with an answer.

Attachment 2—Member Requests for the Record

During the hearing, Members asked you to provide additional information for the record, and you indicated that you would provide that information. For your convenience, descriptions of the requested information are provided below.

The Honorable Bill Johnson

1. I know that the EPA has expressed interest in finding a resolution to some of the concerns regarding EPA's current brick MACT rule which was issued in 2015. Would you commit to working with me and this committee in providing further information on this work and any potential possibilities?

ANSWER - We are currently working on a plan to assist facilities that are covered by the brick rule and need more time to comply to obtain a one-year extension of the rule's compliance deadline. Under the Clean Air Act, state permitting authorities can grant an additional year for compliance with a section 112 standard (providing a total of four years to comply with the rule). We continue to review the issues raised by the brick industry and anticipate reaching out to the industry for further discussions soon. We will be glad to provide further information as this process moves forward.

The Honorable Bill Flores

As the American people are well aware, the EPA under the Obama administration abused environmental regulatory process by ignoring congressional statutes any by circumventing the U.S. Constitution. Fortunately, the federal court system stepped in to protect American families from this abuse of the law. In this regard I have the following questions:

1. Can you provide this committee with a list of those overreaching and overturned regulations that were overturned by the court systems?

ANSWER – In response to this question, EPA provides the following four examples of EPA actions that were reversed or stayed by the courts:

- **The 2015 Waters of the United States (WOTUS) rule has been preliminarily enjoined by two district courts in a total of 24 states. The rule was also stayed nationwide by the 6th Circuit (now dissolved because the Supreme Court thereafter held that the court lacked jurisdiction).**
- **In 2016, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a stay of the 2015 “Clean Power Plan” (CPP).**
- **The 2012 RFS cellulosic mandate was overturned by the DC Circuit in API v. EPA (D.C. Cir. 2013).**
- **The Tailoring Rule (one of the “four Ts” that followed the 2009 endangerment finding), which would have phased new and modified sources of GHGs into the Prevention of Significant Deterioration permitting regime under Clean Air Act Title I, Part C, was reversed in part by the Supreme Court in UARG v. EPA**

(June 2014). The Court held that GHG emissions alone do not trigger application of PSD permitting requirements, and overturned EPA’s revisions to statutory emissions thresholds.

2. Can you provide this committee with the economic cost of those overturned regulations?

ANSWER – Please see the response to question 1 regarding the status of each of the following rules. In the Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) for the 2015 WOTUS rule, EPA estimated that the cost of the rule could have been as high as \$306.6 million. The RIA for the 2015 Clean Power Plan estimated the rules’ cost as falling between \$5.1 and \$8.4 billion by 2030. For the 2012 RFS cellulosic mandate, the DC Circuit found that EPA had set the mandate for cellulosic fuel at an excessively high level. If EPA had waived the cellulosic requirement and offered waiver credits as required by the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) of 2007, the compliance costs of that regulation could have amounted to approximately \$22.15 million. EPA did not quantify the costs of the Tailoring Rule.

3. Can you also inform the committee about EPA’s actions, if any, to modify those regulations so those overreaching regulations to conform with the rule of law?

ANSWER - EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are taking a multi-step approach to reconsider the jurisdictional scope of the Clean Water Act. The agencies issued a final rule in January 2018 to change the applicability date of the 2015 rule to February 2020. The agencies proposed to rescind the 2015 rule and re-codify the status quo. The agencies issued this proposal in June 2017 and issued a supplemental notice seeking additional public comment in July 2018. Lastly, the agencies are developing a revised definition of WOTUS. On June 15, the agencies sent a proposed rule to the Office of Management and Budget for interagency review.

In October 2017, EPA issued a proposed rule to repeal the CPP. On December 18, 2017, EPA issued an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) on a potential rule that would establish emission guidelines for states to establish performance standards for GHG emissions from existing Electric Generating Units (EGUs). EPA has recently sent a proposed new rule to OMB for interagency review.

In response to the DC Circuit’s decision, EPA rescinded the 2012 cellulosic mandate as well as the 2011 standard based on the same methodology. Additionally, EPA refunded money to obligated parties that had purchased cellulosic waiver credits from the Agency.

As noted in the Spring 2018 Unified Agenda of Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions, EPA intends to take additional action regarding revisions to the Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V greenhouse gas permitting regulations, including related to the establishment of a greenhouse gas “Significant Emissions Rate,” in order to address the court rulings on the tailoring rule.

The Honorable Richard Hudson

1. Was GenX used in a manner that was incompatible with the consent agreement under the Toxic Substances Control Act?

ANSWER - EPA is investigating the facility to determine whether terms of the 2009 Consent Order were complied with. EPA has not made any final determinations as to whether the use of GenX at the plant was incompatible with the TSCA consent order. EPA is continuing to assess the use of GenX at the plant under the consent order.

The Honorable Doris O. Matsui

1. You said the EPA has data supporting your decision to revise emission standards for light duty vehicles. Will you commit to providing that data to both side of the committee?

ANSWER - On April 2, 2018, I announced my determination that the standards for greenhouse gas emissions for model year 2022-2025 light-duty vehicles are not appropriate and therefore should be revised. The data and information supporting this determination is included in the docket at <https://www.regulations.gov/docket?D=EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0827>. EPA is working in partnership with the Department of Transportation to initiate a notice and comment rulemaking to revise the standards, as appropriate. The data and information supporting this forthcoming proposal will be made available in docket EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0283 upon publication of the proposed rule.

The Honorable John P. Sarbanes

1. Did Carl Ichan's company apply for a waiver from ethanol blending requirements for any of its refining facilities?

ANSWER - Small refineries have claimed confidential business information protection for their hardship exemption petitions to EPA. For that reason, EPA does not disclose the names of the refineries or their parent companies.

2. Did Carl Ichan's company receive a waiver for any of its refining facilities?

ANSWER - Small refineries have claimed confidential business information protection for their hardship exemption petitions to EPA. For that reason, EPA does not disclose the names of the refineries or their parent companies.

The Honorable Tony Cardenas

1. In regard to your lease, can you provide the written statement from the attorneys after reviewing it?

ANSWER - Effective July 6, 2018, former Administrator Pruitt resigned from his position as Administrator of the EPA and is no longer an employee of the Agency. Please forward your question to his personal counsel.

The Honorable Debbie Dingell

1. In regard to the January 25, 2018 guidance to reverse the longstanding once in, always in policy for major sources of hazardous air pollutants, did EPA determine the location of these sources?

ANSWER - The January 25, 2018 guidance memorandum discusses the definitions of “major source” in CAA section 112 (a)(1) and of “area source” in CAA section 112 (a)(2) and explains how those definitions provide that a major source becomes an area source at such time that the source takes an enforceable limit on its potential to emit (PTE) HAP below the major source thresholds (10 tpy of a single hazardous air pollutant or 25 tpy of any combination of HAP). Pursuant to those definitions, sources of HAP previously classified as “major sources” may be reclassified as “area” sources when the facility limits its PTE below major source thresholds using an enforceable mechanism.

2. Yes or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of the health effects including the potential increased risk of cancer of this decision before releasing the January 25th guidance memo?

ANSWER - As discussed in the 2018 Wehrum guidance memorandum, EPA will follow the January 25th issuance of the memorandum with a proposal to take comment on adding regulatory text to implement EPA’s plain language reading of the statute. We anticipate issuing a proposal for public review and comment in early 2019. As we proceed through the rulemaking process, we will prepare appropriate analyses and provide ample opportunity for interested parties to provide comment.

3. Yes or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of the potential health effects of this policy on children, babies, or pregnant women before releasing the January 25th?

ANSWER - As discussed in the 2018 Wehrum guidance memorandum, EPA will follow the January 25th issuance of the memorandum with a proposal to take comment on adding regulatory text to implement EPA’s plain language reading of the statute. We anticipate issuing a proposal for public review and comment in early 2019. As we proceed through the rulemaking process, we will prepare appropriate analyses and provide ample opportunity for interested parties to provide comment.

4. Yes or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of the potential health effects of this policy on older Americans or those with chronic health problems before releasing the January 25th guidance?

ANSWER - As discussed in the 2018 Wehrum guidance memorandum, EPA will follow the January 25th issuance of the memorandum with a proposal to take comment on adding regulatory text to implement EPA’s plain language reading of the statute. We anticipate issuing a proposal for public review and comment in early 2019. As we proceed through the rulemaking process, we will prepare appropriate analyses and provide ample opportunity for interested parties to provide comment.

5. Yes or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of the potential health effects of this policy on minority and low-income communities before releasing the January 25th?

ANSWER - As discussed in the 2018 Wehrum guidance memorandum, EPA will follow the January 25th issuance of the memorandum with a proposal to take comment on adding regulatory text to implement EPA's plain language reading of the statute. We anticipate issuing a proposal for public review and comment in early 2019. As we proceed through the rulemaking process, we will prepare appropriate analyses and provide ample opportunity for interested parties to provide comment.