US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

United States Environmental Protection Agency

550-R-09-005
September 2009
www.epa.gov/emergencies

Strategic Direction for Emergency Management Programs

Fiscal Years 2010 – 2014

Developed by:
Office of Emergency Management in coordination with Regional Office Counterparts

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Emergency Management Timeline

Section 3: Emergency Response and Removal

Section 4: Oil Prevention, Preparedness and Response

Section 5: Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention

Section 6: Homeland Security related to Emergency Preparedness and Response

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Section 1: Introduction to Strategic Direction for Emergency Management Programs at EPA (FY 2010 – 2014)

As EPA prepares its Strategic Plan for FY2010-2014, it is a good time to reflect on the status and future direction of the emergency prevention, preparedness and response programs for which the Office of Emergency Management and our counterpart offices in the Regions are responsible.

Background:

In 2003, the OSWER Assistant Administrator decided to integrate the Emergency Response and Removal, Chemical Emergency Prevention and Preparedness, and Oil programs in an effort to achieve efficiencies and effectiveness in implementation. This merger recognized some similarities among the implementation of emergency management activities related to oil and chemical agents and also the vast array of scenarios for which the government, under the leadership of the Department of Homeland Security, was beginning to address. Additionally, the reorganization recognized the strong relationship among prevention, preparedness and response activities. For example, lessons learned from response to oil spills can influence and improve preparedness activities. Activities aimed at preventing chemical accidents can influence measures that we take to plan for responses. Simply stated, the Agency's mission in emergency management is to prevent releases of hazardous substance and oil spills to the extent possible, prepare for responses to releases and spills that we can't prevent and be on the cutting edge of response technology so that we can support our local, State and federal partners when their capacity and capabilities are exhausted.

For purposes of strategic planning, four key areas have been addressed: chemical, oil, emergency response and removal activities, and homeland security (i.e., preparing for nationally significant events). While there are synergies that can be achieved through integration of these elements, there are also separate laws, funding streams and program nuances that need to be considered. A timeline of events presented in Section 2 details key incidents and legislation that was developed over time to address similar incidents. For each of the four key areas, a brief description of the program background, current status and strategic priorities has been identified and presented in Sections 3-6.

Future Direction:

There are some common themes in the strategic priorities for the four key areas of emergency management:

- Given limited resources, it is clear that our activities must focus on getting high risk facilities into compliance as well as addressing our preparedness to respond to high risk/high consequence scenarios as identified by the Department of Homeland Security.

- There is also a common need for collection and analysis of quality data so that we can learn more about the results associated with prevention and preparedness activities and their effect on the prevention of releases and mitigation of the consequences. These data activities involve coordinated use of technology to ensure the data can be shared and analyzed across the key emergency management activities and the various agent scenarios.

- Each of the areas can benefit from "all hazards" planning.
- Finally, a common theme is to continue to work with our partners at the local, State and federal levels to ensure that we are focusing on the areas where the Agency support is most required.

FY2008 Enacted Budget

BAS 2008 Op Plan v7.0 - 05/15/2008

			Salary, Travel, WCF		
Program Project		FTE	Total Intramural Resources	Total Extramural Resources	Total Enacted Budget
Overall	HQ	78.8	$14,020.00	$39,654.00	$53,674.00
OEM Budget	RT	467.1	$60,110.00	$144,384.00	$204,494.00
			$0.00		
	OEM Total	**545.9**	**$74,130.00**	**$184,038.00**	**$258,168.00**

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Section 2: Emergency Management Timeline

1967: Torrey Canyon oil spill

1968: National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP)

1972: Clean Water Act

1978: Love Canal hazardous substance contamination

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

1982: Times Beach dioxin contamination

1984: Bhopal India Chemical Release

1986: Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA), aka SARA Title III

1988: Ashland oil spill and Shell Oil Refinery tank release

1989: Exxon Valdez oil tanker spill

1989: Texas Phillips facility explosion

1990: Clear Air Act Amendments (Section 112(r) accidental release prevention)

1990: Oil Pollution Act

2001: Terrorist Attacks at the World Trade Center/Pentagon/Pennsylvania and Anthrax incidents

2003: HSPD-5, Management of Domestic Incidents

Section 3: Strategic Direction for EPA's mission in the Emergency Response and Removal Program (FY 2010 – 2014)

Background:

EPA's Emergency Response and Removal Program is founded on the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, commonly called the National Contingency Plan (NCP). The NCP was first published in 1968 in response to the environmental disaster caused by a 37 million gallon oil spill from the tanker Torrey Canyon in 1967 off the coast of England. To avoid the problems faced by response officials involved in this incident, U.S. officials developed a federal blueprint for a coordinated approach to cope with potential oil spills in U.S. waters. The NCP promotes overall coordination among responsible parties and local, State, and federal responders.

The NCP provides a comprehensive system of accident reporting, spill containment, and cleanup. It also establishes the positions of federal On-Scene Coordinators (OSCs) with authority to monitor or direct response actions, and to deploy federal resources if needed. Over the years, revisions have been made to the NCP to keep pace with the enactment of legislation.

Several events such as the hazardous substance contamination of the Love Canal community in Niagara Falls, New York and dioxin contamination of soil and water in Times Beach, Missouri led to the passage of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), in 1980. CERCLA, also commonly called Superfund, provided EPA and other federal agencies increased authority and funds to respond to a release or substantial threat of a release of a hazardous substance, pollutant or contaminant into the environment, not just to the waters of the U.S. Following the passage of Superfund in 1980, the NCP was broadened to cover emergency response and removal actions to releases at hazardous waste sites.

In 1986, Congress improved the Superfund Program with the passage of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA). These changes supported use of removal authority for expedited cleanups at National Priorities List sites.

Under CERCLA and SARA, a response to an actual or potential release can be taken either as a remedial or removal action. Remedial actions generally involve long-term cleanup efforts at sites on the National Priorities List and are intended as a permanent remedy. Removal actions are of 3 types: (1) emergency, where action is required within hours or days; (2) time-critical, where timely action must begin to protect human health or the environment and the lead agency has up to six months to plan the response action; and (3) non-time-critical, where the lead action has at least six months to plan the response action.

The passage of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 led to some additional revisions to the NCP, and provided some additional preparedness and response authorities to EPA. It also created the national Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund which funds EPA's oil spill response activities and is available to provide up to one billion dollars per spill incident for cleanup and remediation. The focus of this section is oil and hazardous substances removal activities.

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

EPA's mission is to respond to immediate threats from releases of hazardous substances and oil. The first priority is to eliminate any danger to the public. By the end of 2007, EPA had conducted over 9,400 removal actions[1] at more than 6,900 sites. Over the last 40 years, the nature of the contaminants, number of responses by potentially responsible parties and the capacity and capability of States has varied. Each of EPA's 10 Regional Offices has developed a strong emergency response and removal program, tailored to work with and complement the varying capabilities of local and State agencies for responding to the types of oil and hazardous substances releases that occur in their Region. Each EPA Region deals with a unique mix of industries, geography, and State and local response agencies. Still, the program acts as a federal safety net to allow for response to immediate threats when such response is necessary (e.g., when the nature, size or complexity of a spill is beyond the capacity or capabilities of the State or local responders).

Future Direction:

Despite the geographic and other differences among the 10 Regional Offices, EPA Headquarters and Regions work together to assure consistency and effectiveness in implementation. The following priorities address the national program direction for the next five years:

- In order to maintain a high state of effective response readiness and improve our capabilities to protect human health and the environment, over the next five years, using the NCP criteria, Regions will continue to respond to high priority hazardous substance releases and oil discharges. Maintaining the health and safety as well as the specialized expertise and capabilities of our emergency responders is key.

- By looking at trends over the past five years, considering emerging trends (depending on the economy, new technologies, etc.), typical contaminants, Regional differences, State and local capabilities, and removal site evaluations (RSEs), Regions will:

  - Focus OSC training on identified trends to build capacity;
  - Coordinate/collaborate with counterparts in other EPA Offices and Programs (e.g., the Site Assessment Program) ;
  - Accordingly, conduct assessments of identified sites; and
  - Ensure consistent and complete data collection, documentation, and reporting of oil and hazardous substance responses and site assessments, recognizing that "good and complete data in" results in "good data out."

- Strengthen coordination with States and local jurisdictions to:

  - Increase local/State response capabilities for hazardous releases and oil discharges.
  - Increase our preparedness for and our effectiveness in responses where EPA involvement is needed.

- Strive to better communicate to the public what EPA's oil and hazardous materials response and removal program is doing:

  - Focus on results using data collected; and
  - Create messages that resonate with our stakeholders.

[1] Refers only to CERCLA removal actions; does not include oil

FY2008 Enacted Budget

BAS 2008 Op Plan

SUPERFUND REMOVAL

			Salary, Travel, WCF	Programmatic Resources	
Program Project		FTE	Total Intramural Resources	Total Extramural Resources	Total Enacted Budget
C6	HQ	11.8	$2,063.00	$6,336.00	$8,399.00
Removal	RT	265.1	$34,582.00	$137,809.00	$172,391.00
	Total	**276.9**	**$36,645.00**	**$144,145.00**	**$180,790.00**

OIL RESPONSE — WE GET FUNDING BUT NO FTE FROM USCG

REMOVAL PROGRAM		
	Proposed Strategic Plan Measure	Proposed GPRA Measure
1	By 2014, oversee and complete an additional 850 PRP removal actions which includes voluntary, administrative orders on consent (AOC), and unilateral administrative order (UAO) actions. (OEM/OECA joint measure)	Oversee and complete 170 PRP removal actions annually which includes voluntary, AOC, and UAO actions.
2	By 2014, complete an additional 850 Superfund-lead removal actions.	Complete 170 Superfund-lead removal actions annually.
Proposed PART*		
1	Human Exposure Avoided per million dollars spent on fund-lead removal actions (EPA FTE/Travel costs and extramural dollars spent).	
2	Human Exposure avoided per million dollars spent assisting PRP-lead removal actions (EPA FTE/Travel Costs).	
CPRM		
1	Acreage "protective for people" at qualified removal sites.	

* No targets for Proposed PART measures.

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Section 4: Strategic Direction for EPA's mission in Oil Spill Prevention, Preparedness and Response (FY 2010 – 2014)

Background:

Significant oil spills, including a discharge of approximately 30 million gallons from the vessel Torrey Canyon in England in 1967, and the discharge of 700 thousand gallons of oil from a well blowout off the coast of Santa Barbara, California in 1969, influenced the passage of the Clean Water Act (CWA) in 1972. The Ashland Oil storage tank collapse (750 thousand gallons) in January 1988 followed by the Shell Oil Refinery storage tank release (400 thousand gallons) in April 1988 and the Exxon Valdez tanker spill (11 million gallons) in Alaska in March 1989 led to the Oil Pollution Act (OPA) in 1990. EPA's mission, authorized by these Acts, is to prevent the harm to the environment associated with actual or threatened oil spills onto the waters of the U.S. It is carried out through regulatory and guidance development, training, outreach, compliance assistance, inspection, and enforcement. Oil spills are prohibited by legislation; they endanger public health, imperil drinking water, devastate natural resources and disrupt the economy. Once oil has been released into the environment and discharged to a surface water, it is difficult, costly, and at times, impossible to clean up the oil and return the environment to its pre-spill conditions.

The legislation, together with the National Contingency Plan (NCP) which maps out EPA's oil and hazardous materials spill response functions, provide the foundation for the Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) and Facility Response Plan (FRP) regulations, Area Contingency Plan (ACP) requirements, the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund (OSLTF) and the Product Schedule under Subpart J of the NCP.

- SPCC imposes certain regulatory requirements on over 640,000 facilities primarily to prevent but also to prepare for, and respond to, oil spills.

- FRP regulations call for the development of more robust oil spill response plans at facilities that handle large quantities of oil or that could pose a significant harm should a large spill occur. About 4,200 facilities must submit their FRP to EPA.

- EPA Regions work with 14 areas and 62 subareas to convene Area Committees comprised of federal, State, and local government agencies to prepare Area Contingency Plans (ACPs). The ACP provides detailed information on the roles, responsibilities and resources available from each responding agency in the area that may be called upon to assure that an oil spill is controlled and cleaned up in a timely and safe manner.

Nearly 20,000 oil spills are reported to the National Response Center every year. EPA evaluates about 13,000 of these reports and manages or oversees a response to about 300 spills affecting the inland waters of the United States. Additionally, oil spills or the threat of oil spills occur at abandoned facilities. EPA conducts clean ups to mitigate these incidents. Although responses to oil spills are generally funded from the emergency response portion of the OSLTF, in coordination with the USCG, EPA must use some of its oil appropriation to maintain the infrastructure necessary to support those responses (personnel, training, equipment, research); using funding that otherwise would be supporting prevention, preparedness and planning activities.

Oil Program Priorities

Over the next five years, the Oil Program will focus on identifying high-risk SPCC and FRP facilities and ensuring compliance with regulations. This focus will include prevention, preparedness, and response. This compliance is viewed as the most promising way to prevent and prepare for spills. New SPCC regulations finalized in FY09 will require a major outreach effort to facilitate compliance. Additionally, we will place a major focus on non-compliant facilities, especially those that have had oil spills. This effort will require the collection of sufficient data to allow targeting of sectors and facilities where spills are the most prevalent. Specifically, EPA will:

- Bring inspected facilities into compliance:
  - » Develop/revise guidance on inspections and methods for bringing facilities into compliance when they are found to be deficient at the time of inspection.
- Finalize and implement SPCC/FRP requirements:
  - » Conduct comprehensive outreach regarding final rules to ensure industry awareness of regulatory responsibilities; and
  - » Facilitate compliance through development of, and outreach on, compliance assistance and enforcement tools.
- Develop the instruments for, and collect comprehensive data on:
  - » The regulated universe (e.g. industry sector, location, amount of oil handled); and
  - » Spills (industry sector, discharge point, causes).

In addition:

  - » Investigate major spills to identify and understand causes and potential mechanisms to prevent a recurrence; and
  - » Analyze collected data to:
    - Determine whether program changes are needed to prevent discharges; and
    - Identify problem sectors and target compliance assistance, enforcement and program priorities.
- Participate with sister agencies and regulated community through Area Committee meetings, training, RRT, NRT, and exercises.
  - » Develop area planning strategy to address high-risk areas.
- Ensure response readiness to mitigate threats and discharges of oil.
  - » Enhance coordination process with NPFC (maintaining oil fund and supporting cost recovery);
  - » Maintain national training (funding and resources);
  - » Maintain Special Teams capabilities.

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Note that while EPA pursues these strategic goals, we must continue to maintain a sufficient level of programmatic effort and support for our regulations, guidance, inspector training, inspections, enforcement, exercises, area planning, and response support. For reference, below are the FY08 resources allocated to the Oil Program and the proposed new Strategic Plan measures:

FY2008 Enacted Budget for OEM Oil Program

Program Project		FTE BOC 17	Intramural (Salary and Travel)	Total Extramural Resources	Total Enacted Budget
91	HQ	14.2	$2,017.0	$1,119.0	$3,136.0
Oil	RT	69.8	$8,337.0	$1,877.0	$10,214.0
	Total	**84.0**	**$10,354.0**	**$2,996.0**	**$13,350.0**

OIL PROGRAM		
	Proposed Strategic Plan Measure	Proposed GPRA Annual Measure
1	By 2014, 60 percent of all SPCC inspected facilities found to be non-compliant between Fiscal Years 2010-2014 will be brought into compliance.	The annual measure would require progressive annual targets to reach the programmatic goal of bringing 60 percent of facilities found to be non-compliant into compliance. Example: For FY 2010, 15 percent of all inspected SPCC facilities found to be non-compliant will be brought into compliance.
2	By 2014, 60 percent of all FRP inspected facilities found to be non-compliant between Fiscal Years 2010-2014 will be brought into compliance.	The annual measure would require progressive annual targets to reach the programmatic goal of bringing 60 percent of facilities found to be non-compliant into compliance. Example: For FY 2010, 15 percent of all inspected FRP facilities found to be non-compliant will be brought into compliance.
Proposed PART*		
1	Gallons of oil verified as safely stored at the time of inspection at FRP and SPCC facilities during the fiscal year. (Please note this is one measure combining FRP and SPCC because some facilities are subject to both regulations.)	
2	Total gallons of oil capacity verified as safely stored at inspected FRP and SPCC facilities during the reporting period per one million program dollars spent annually on prevention and preparedness. (Please note this is one measure combining FRP and SPCC because some facilities are subject to both regulations.)	

Section 5: Strategic Direction for EPA's mission in Chemical Emergency Prevention and Preparedness (FY 2010 – 2014)

Background:

Significant chemical accidents, such as the 1984 chemical release in Bhopal, India along with other less severe incidents in the United States around the same time, influenced the passage of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA) in 1986. EPCRA requires information about industrial risk for over 600,000 facilities be provided to State and local agencies and the public for effective emergency planning and response. Prior to the enactment of EPCRA, EPA worked with industry and State and local governments to conduct emergency preparedness activities. After EPCRA was passed, EPA continued that partnership with industry, States, and local communities in the development of regulations for the various sections within the law, including emergency planning for local communities (Section 302), reporting of chemical inventories (Section 311 and 312), and toxic release reporting (Section 313). The philosophy of the law and regulations is that the risk is at the local level and therefore prevention and preparedness for chemical emergencies can best be addressed there. While EPCRA assigned much responsibility for emergency planning and providing chemical hazard information to communities, local and State governments, and industry, EPA had the role of providing national direction to the program and developing guidance and tools to assist stakeholders in implementing the regulations.

In October 1989, an explosion occurred at the Phillips facility in Pasadena, Texas, killing 23 workers and injuring 314. As a result of this and other similar accidents, in November 1990, Congress amended the Clean Air Act to include Section 112(r). Section 112(r) of the CAA calls for certain facilities to develop risk management programs to prevent serious accidents and minimize the consequences of accidents that do occur. EPA worked closely with industry to develop regulations governing the Risk Management Program, including the development and submittal of Risk Management Plans (RMPs) by industry and a list of regulated substances. RMPs are to be submitted by covered facilities every 5 years to EPA. Section 112(r) continues the philosophy that EPA embraced in implementing EPCRA, by providing additional facility hazard information to the public and government officials in order to promote a dialogue about risk reduction. EPA maintains that State and local-level participation in the implementation of the Risk Management Program will help to prevent serious chemical accidents and improve emergency preparedness.

Driven by this legislation, EPA's mission is to reduce chemical risks to communities and the environment. The concept is to prevent accidents before they happen and be prepared for those that do occur.

Since the enactment of these laws, much progress has been made toward preventing chemical accidents, improving chemical safety, and reducing chemical risk to local communities. Analysis of facility data from the Risk Management Program shows that during the decade spanning 1995 to 2005 – a period of increasing economic activity in the U.S. – the frequency of accidents at facilities covered under the program has declined by over 20%. More recently, in hurricanes Katrina and Rita, none of the hundreds of hazardous chemical facilities in the path of the storms suffered any catastrophic chemical releases, either during the hurricanes or in their aftermath. In addition, a

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

recent survey of Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs) shows that since the events of September 11, nearly half of the responding LEPCs have increased their overall activity level and over 75% have exercised their contingency plan.

However, despite a vast amount of work by Local Emergency Planning Committees, State Emergency Response Commissions (SERCs), industry, EPA Regional Offices, and other RMP implementing agencies, chemical accidents still occur. The BP America, Texas City accident in March 2005 was the largest U.S. industrial disaster in over 15 years. This single accident caused 15 deaths, 180 injuries, over $1.5 billion in economic losses, and other significant impacts in the local community. Additionally, some LEPCs have been challenged by the rapid changes in the chemical industry and have had difficulty maintaining effective local emergency plans. These facts show that there are continuing challenges for both government (at the local, State, and federal level) and industry in their efforts toward preventing chemical accidents and reducing risks to the community.

Future Direction

The identification of a strategic direction for the CEPP Program ensures that all stakeholders focus on those key areas of the program that are most effective in improving chemical safety. In order to accomplish these priorities, EPA Headquarters and the Regions will work together, with Headquarters providing a national direction for the program as well as guidance and support and the Regions implementing the program and working with States to build the State and local infrastructure and reducing chemical risks.

CEPP Priorities

Over the next five years, the CEPP Program will focus on the identification and inspection of high risk facilities and improving the State and local infrastructure for chemical accident prevention and preparedness. This effort will move forward in partnership with SERCs, LEPCs, and industry. Resubmission of RMPs in 2009 provides an opportunity to renew our focus on data quality and analysis. Communication of the results of the analyses will also enhance State capabilities in chemical accident prevention and preparedness. Specifically, EPA will:

- Bring high-risk chemical facilities into compliance.
  - » Establish criteria to identify high risk chemical facilities and develop methods for bringing these facilities into compliance following inspections.
  - » Perform RMP, EPCRA, and CAA General Duty Clause (GDC) facility inspections (Regions).
  - » Develop enforcement cases following established Combined Enforcement Policies.
- Work with each State to define the current status of their CEPP programs and develop strategies for chemical risk-reduction.
  - » Assist SERCs, LEPCs, fire departments and other local agencies in emergency plan development, facility risk identification, communication of chemical hazards information, and regulatory inspections/enforcement via guidance, training, and technical assistance.
  - » Provide program information and support via the OEM Web site, e-mail notices, and conferences/training to assist State and local emergency preparedness and planning efforts.

- Improve data collection, quality, and analysis.
  - » Ensure high-quality facility hazard and risk data is collected, analyzed, and disseminated to stakeholders.
  - » Develop and maintain software to assist with regulatory compliance.
  - » Develop and deploy software for Internet-based submission and distribution of RMPs.

FY2008 Enacted Budget

BAS 2008 Op Plan v7.0 - 05/15/2008

			Salary, Travel, WCF	Programmatic Resources	
Program Project		FTE	Total Intramural Resources	Total Extramural Resources	Total Enacted Budget
C3	HQ	19.3	$2,847.00	$5,012.00	$7,859.00
EPM	RT	38.6	$4,820.00	$11.00	$4,831.00
RMP	*Total*	**57.9**	$7,667.00	$5,023.00	$12,690.00
C8	HQ	14.5	$2,188.00	$2,990.00	$5,178.00
Federal	RT	29.6	$3,923.00	$0.00	$7,846.00
Prep	*Total*	**44.1**	$6,111.00	$0.00	$13,024.00
Overall	HQ	78.8	$14,020.00	$39,654.00	$53,674.00
OEM Budget	RT	467.1	$60,110.00	$144,384.00	$204,494.00
			$0.0		
	OEM Total	**545.9**	**$74,130.00**	**$184,038.00**	**$258,168.00**

RPM PROGRAM	
Proposed Strategic Plan Measure	Proposed GPRA Annual Measure
By 2014, conduct 2,000 inspections and audits at RMP facilities.	Conduct 400 RMP inspections and audits at RMP facilities.

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Section 6: Strategic Direction for EPA's Homeland Security Activities Related to Emergency Preparedness and Response (FY2010-2014)

Background:

In recent years, the United States has faced unprecedented challenges in responding to nationally significant incidents related to homeland security, including the World Trade Center and Pentagon terrorist attacks and anthrax contamination. Additionally, the Columbia Space Shuttle recovery, and most recently hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustav and Ike have presented significant challenges.

Following the terrorist attacks of September 2001, in February 2003, the President issued Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD)-5, Management of Domestic Incidents, which directs the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security (DHS), to develop and administer a National Incident Management System (NIMS) to provide a consistent nationwide approach for federal, tribal, State, and local governments. It also calls for a National Response Plan (now known as the National Response Framework) that integrates the federal government domestic prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery plans into one all-discipline, all-hazards plan. Under the National Response Framework (NRF), EPA is the lead for Emergency Support Function (ESF) #10, hazardous materials. EPA also plays a role in many of the other Emergency Support Functions. These responsibilities build to a great extent on the expertise of EPA's emergency responders that are inherent in our ongoing implementation of the Emergency Response and Removal Program.

HSPDs 9 (Defense of U.S. Agriculture and Food), 10 (Biodefense for the 21st Century), and 22 (Domestic Chemical Defense) assign EPA critical sector and agent responsibilities including decontamination and provision of analytical services to support a response in the aftermath of a terrorist event.

In June 2003, the EPA Administrator introduced a new Agency-wide EPA National Approach to Response (NAR) to increase preparedness for the possibility of multiple, simultaneous nationally significant incidents across several Regions. In November 2008, the NAR was updated and issued as an EPA Order. EPA has already completed a significant amount of work to address the preparedness necessary for response to these nationally significant events. For example, EPA is at the forefront in implementation of the National Incident Management System. Additionally, over 2,000 employees have joined the Response Support Corps (RSC) which is the mechanism through which all EPA offices prepare to effectively fulfill their roles and maximize EPA's response capabilities within our current resource base. RSC members may be required to support operations in the field as well as at the headquarters Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and the Regional Emergency Operations Centers (REOCs).

Future Direction:

The possibility of future events makes it clear that EPA must continue to focus on preparedness and response planning for simultaneous significant incidents that could occur across several Regions. The Office of Emergency Management (OEM) in OSWER and Regional counterparts are responsible for coordination with offices across the Agency to complete the priority work that must be done in order to be prepared. OEM is working with Regions and other AAships to complete the development of a comprehensive NAR Preparedness Plan. Additionally, OEM has included key activities related to

emergency response preparedness and decontamination in the Agency's Homeland Security Priority Work plan. Consistent with these documents and the government-wide NRF, EPA will work to fully implement the priorities under its internal NAR so that the Agency is prepared to respond to multiple nationally significant incidents. Specifically, EPA will:

- Maintain the Agency's premier status as a federal response organization by applying the best science and practices to respond, mitigate, and recover from chemical, biological and radiological incidents.
- Continue to expand its cadre of trained emergency responders through the RSC and increase Agency–wide employee awareness of EPA's roles and responsibilities to support homeland security and emergency response initiatives and activities.
- Build and implement a National Training and Exercise Program that will allow for the testing of internal policies, procedures, systems as well as response readiness of personnel. This program will interface with the DHS National Exercise Program and will allow for coordination with our federal, State, tribal, and local partners.
- Work to have clearly defined and understood decontamination roles and responsibilities, and provide ready access to the best available science, policy decisions, and technical information on all aspects of decontamination with a focus on radiological, biological and chemical agent scenarios.
- Work with federal, State, tribal and local partners to build environmental laboratory capacity and capabilities to address the federal planning scenarios with a focus on radiological, biological and chemical agent scenarios.

FY2008 Enacted Budget

HOMELAND SECURITY

			Salary, Travel, WCF	Programmatic Resources	
Program Project		FTE	Total Intramural Resources	Total Extramural Resources	Total Enacted Budget
72	HQ	19.0	$4,905.00	$18,724.00	$23,629.00
Homeland Security	RT	64.0	$8,448.00	$4,687.00	$13,135.00
	Total	**83.0**	**$13,353.00**	**$23,411.00**	**$36,764.00**

HOMELAND SECURITY	
Proposed Strategic Plan Measure	Proposed GPRA Annual Measure
By 2014, achieve and maintain at least 75 percent of the maximum score on the Core NAR evaluation criteria.	The annual measure would require progressive annual targets to reach the 75 percent programmatic goal score. Example: Score on annual Core NAR assessment (55 percent for FY 2010, 65 percent for FY 2011, etc.).

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT