1. EPA/OAR equipment and data detection and repair: reducing burdens

- Project Name: The project will continue work on image and/or optical gas imaging (IGI) instrument for the Alternative Work Practice for leaks of endocrine disruptors. This project builds upon the IGI program 111-2015, which was funded in FY2013. The IGI instrument will be completed and installed at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Office of Air and Radiation’s Target Initiative Project. The project will continue to develop a new IGI instrument and improve the existing IGI instrument to allow for enhanced detection and repair of leaks.

- Status: Ongoing

- Target Completion Date: 2021

- Regulatory Flexibility: The project will continue to develop the IGI instrument and improve the existing IGI instrument to allow for enhanced detection and repair of leaks.

- Method of Evaluating: The project will continue to develop the IGI instrument and improve the existing IGI instrument to allow for enhanced detection and repair of leaks.

2. EPA/OAR equipment and data detection and repair: reducing burdens

- Project Name: The project will continue the work on image and/or optical gas imaging (IGI) instrument for the Alternative Work Practice for leaks of endocrine disruptors. This project builds upon the IGI program 111-2015, which was funded in FY2013. The IGI instrument will be completed and installed at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Office of Air and Radiation’s Target Initiative Project. The project will continue to develop a new IGI instrument and improve the existing IGI instrument to allow for enhanced detection and repair of leaks.

- Status: Ongoing

- Target Completion Date: 2021

- Regulatory Flexibility: The project will continue to develop the IGI instrument and improve the existing IGI instrument to allow for enhanced detection and repair of leaks.

- Method of Evaluating: The project will continue to develop the IGI instrument and improve the existing IGI instrument to allow for enhanced detection and repair of leaks.

3. EPA/NSC reaching science and technology methods in the chemical regulation arena: reducing whole animal testing, reducing costs and burdens and improving efficiencies

- Project Name: The project will continue to develop science-based approaches to prioritize chemicals for testing. This project builds upon the work of the Toxicology and Risk Assessment and Risk Management Workgroup (TARAW G) to improve the process of prioritizing chemicals for testing. The project will continue to develop science-based approaches to prioritize chemicals for testing.

- Status: Ongoing

- Target Completion Date: 2021

- Regulatory Flexibility: The project will continue to develop science-based approaches to prioritize chemicals for testing.

- Method of Evaluating: The project will continue to develop science-based approaches to prioritize chemicals for testing.

4. EPA/OAR reaching science and technology methods in the chemical regulation arena: reducing whole animal testing, reducing costs and burdens and improving efficiencies

- Project Name: The project will continue to develop science-based approaches to prioritize chemicals for testing. This project builds upon the work of the Toxicology and Risk Assessment and Risk Management Workgroup (TARAW G) to improve the process of prioritizing chemicals for testing. The project will continue to develop science-based approaches to prioritize chemicals for testing.

- Status: Ongoing

- Target Completion Date: 2021

- Regulatory Flexibility: The project will continue to develop science-based approaches to prioritize chemicals for testing.

- Method of Evaluating: The project will continue to develop science-based approaches to prioritize chemicals for testing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of initiative / Rule / IRN</th>
<th>Summary of initiative</th>
<th>Status of initiative</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Does the initiative include regulatory flexibility?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to identify improvements?</th>
<th>If available, anticipated or realized savings in costs and/or burdens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APA/OW</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) coordinating permit requirements and removing outdated requirements</td>
<td>NP/2000-4017</td>
<td>EPA intends to review the regulations that apply to the issuance of NPDES permits, which are the wastewater permits that facility operators must obtain before they discharge pollutants to any water of the United States. EPA intends to review or repeal outdated or ineffective regulatory requirements for wastewater facilities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EPA expects to propose small revisions to NPDES permit regulations in winter 2016 and a final rule is expected in winter 2017.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>EPA estimates that this rule will result in annual cost savings of $6 million per year. This excludes any cost savings resulting from promulgating the NPDES public notice, and the costs of other methods to provide notice (besides newspaper publications, such as direct mailing). Any savings from EPA’s planned rule, however, are likely to be less than this amount. This new rule would allow facilities to conduct this review expeditiously to protect public health while considering innovations and flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA/OW</td>
<td>National primary Drinking water regulation - Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment (evaluating approaches that may maintain, or provide greater, public health protection)</td>
<td>NP/2000-4017</td>
<td>EPA intends to evaluate effective and practical approaches that may maintain or provide greater protection from Cryptosporidium and other pathogens in the water treated by public water systems for protection and stored prior to distribution to consumers. EPA plans to conduct this review expeditiously to protect public health while considering innovations and flexibility.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The review process for T2/EO2 is completed in conjunction with the 6-year review process, no later than March 2016. The National Primary Drinking Water Regulations, Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment (Rule NP/2000-4017) was promulgated, January 5, 2006.</td>
<td>EPA expects to conduct additional outreach with stakeholder groups including state permitting authorities, environmental groups, and regulated entities. EPA will solicit public comments on the proposed rule.</td>
<td>EPA estimates that the NPDES public notice on draft permit requirements for NPDES major facilities, sewage sludge facilities, and general permits currently costs approximately $4.6 million per year (this excludes the costs of preparing the content of the NPDES public notice, and the costs of other methods to provide notice (besides newspaper publications, such as direct mailing). Any savings from EPA’s planned rule, however, are likely to be less than this amount. This new rule would allow facilities to conduct this review expeditiously to protect public health while considering innovations and flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA/OW</td>
<td>New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) reviews and revisions under CAA</td>
<td>NP/2000-4017 and NP/2010-51</td>
<td>The agency, EPA, is preparing a review of existing NSPS in future years. This will be based upon innovative technologies while upholding EPA’s mission to protect human health and the environment.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EPA issued an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking in October 2011 (76 FR 64810) seeking public comment on prioritizing, in potential NSPS reviews. Subsequently, EPA conducted review of NSPS for 5 categories of sources that receive phosphate processing and proposed amendments on November 7, 2011 (76 FR 64811). A final rule is expected in early 2012. The remaining 8 potential reviews are on hold at this time, will be addressed at a later date.</td>
<td>EPA expects to conduct additional outreach with stakeholder groups, including state permitting authorities, environmental groups, and regulated entities. EPA will solicit public comments on the proposed rule.</td>
<td>EPA estimates that the NPDES public notice on draft permit requirements for NPDES major facilities, sewage sludge facilities, and general permits currently costs approximately $4.6 million per year (this excludes the costs of preparing the content of the NPDES public notice, and the costs of other methods to provide notice (besides newspaper publications, such as direct mailing). Any savings from EPA’s planned rule, however, are likely to be less than this amount. This new rule would allow facilities to conduct this review expeditiously to protect public health while considering innovations and flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA/OW</td>
<td>OA Title V permit programs: simplifying and clarifying requirements</td>
<td>NP/2010-40</td>
<td>EPA is reviewing the Title V implementation process to determine whether changes can be made to simplify and clarify the process for industry, the public, and government agencies. The changes will include a systematic approach to the Title V program process.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EPA will propose a rule clarifying and rephrasing the permit process in 2013.</td>
<td>The agency, EPA, is preparing a review of existing NSPS in future years. This will be based upon innovative technologies while upholding EPA’s mission to protect human health and the environment.</td>
<td>An anticipated or realized savings in costs and/or burdens has been implemented by simplifying and clarifying the Title V program process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Title of initiative / Rule / Act</td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>Summary of initiative</td>
<td>Status of initiative</td>
<td>Target Completion Date</td>
<td>Does the initiative include regulatory flexibilities?</td>
<td>What methods will you engage in to identify improvements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OAR</td>
<td>New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) under the CAA for grain drying systems</td>
<td>RIN 4010-0043</td>
<td>The proposed standards were promulgated in 1990 with the final amendments made in 2004. Since that time there have been a number of changes in the technology used for storing and handling grain drying systems.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The proposed amendments were published on 10/30/2013 - 7 FR 65973.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The agency is currently working with stakeholders to address the concerns raised in comments received on the proposed rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OAR</td>
<td>Water quality standards: simplifying and clarifying requirements</td>
<td>RIN 4010-0044</td>
<td>EPA has reviewed the water quality standard (WQS) for uranium to identify ways to improve the Agency’s effectiveness in helping states and tribes clarify standards.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EPA proposed a negated rule of revisions to the WQS regulation 6/6/2013 (78 FR 36411). The comment period for the proposed rule closed 1/2/2014. EPA expects to issue a final rule in June 2015.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The revisions will enable states and authorized tribes to address complete water quality challenges to protect existing water quality and facilitate environmental improvements; simplify the process for states and authorized tribes to develop and implement WQS to protect water quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OAR</td>
<td>Water implementation plan (WIP) process: reducing burden</td>
<td>RIN 4010-0045</td>
<td>EPA intends to take a number of actions to reduce the regulatory burden and ensure that future WIPs are processed in a timely manner. All 30 states, tribes and the public have provided input on the WIP process.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The nature of the project is one of steady progress, and does not generally proceed via milestones with projected dates. Significant progress in reducing the backlog in the areas mentioned is expected in 2015.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project will require significant state flexibilities and streamlined requirements, as outlined in the summary columns of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OAR</td>
<td>National primary drinking water regulations for lead and copper: simplifying and clarifying requirements</td>
<td>RIN 4010-0046</td>
<td>To address the need that Congress has identified, EPA is seeking ways to simplify and clarify requirements imposed on drinking water systems to maintain safe levels of lead and copper in drinking water.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EPA currently expects to issue a proposed rulemaking in early 2015. The 1986 National Primary Drinking Water Regulations for Lead and Copper (RN 2003-4483), has been previously reviewed and revised in 2000: RN 2000-4527 and, 2007 RN 2007-4401-4483.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The agency is currently working with stakeholders to address the concerns raised in comments received on the proposed rulemaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OAR</td>
<td>Notification of大事 applications: reducing uncertainties and improving efficiencies</td>
<td>RIN 4010-0047</td>
<td>To address the need that Congress has identified, EPA is seeking ways to simplify and clarify requirements imposed on drinking water systems to maintain safe levels of lead and copper in drinking water.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EPA intends to propose improvements to these regulations in a future NPRM.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The EPA is currently working with stakeholders to address the concerns raised in comments received on the proposed rulemaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Title of initiative / Rule / EIR</td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>Summary of initiative</td>
<td>Status of initiative</td>
<td>Target Completion Date</td>
<td>Does the initiative include regulatory flexibility?</td>
<td>What methods will you engage in to identify improvements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OSWER</td>
<td>Management Standards for Hazardous Waste Phenomenalists</td>
<td>51.7900-1040</td>
<td>EPA intends to review the data and information on our possession about pharmaceutical products that may become wastes to address these issues as part of a readdressing or pharmaceutical waste management.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EPA expects to publish a proposed submittal in summer 2016.</td>
<td>This rule is expected to propose two conditional exemptions that provide regulatory relief (1) for the hazardous wastes that are also OSHA controlled substances, and (2) for certain types of containers that are held pharmaceuticals.</td>
<td>EPA has been plans to continue conducting outreach on the pharmaceuticals proposed rule. This outreach includes site visits and participation in conferences, and engaging stakeholders, including states and industry, EPA will also analyze public comments on the proposed rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OSWER</td>
<td>Natural Primary Water Regulations: Group Regulation of Pesticide Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)</td>
<td>51.1900-1053</td>
<td>EPA intends to coordinate drinking water regulations and regulatory burden consideration by addressing contaminants in groups. The plans to group contaminants into one regulation which will utilize the same analytical methods for measurement and/or can be removed by the same treatments or control processes.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EPA expects to issue a proposed rulemaking in 2016.</td>
<td>This action may revise drinking water standards for up to 8 VOCs. The standards for the 8 regulated VOCs were promulgated in phases I and II in 1983 (58 FR 55, No. 72, 13030; 59 FR 43905, 43909, No. 80, 22 September 1994) (59 FR 43905, 43909, No. 80), 1984 (59 FR 19505, 19506, No. 38, 5 April 1984), 1985 (59 FR 15748, 15749, No. 16, 6 April 1984), and 1986 (59 FR 10499, 10499, No. 16, 4 March 1984).</td>
<td>Regulatory flexibility will be considered once options are established (during 2016-17) and are agency approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OSWER</td>
<td>Hazardous waste export/import revisions</td>
<td>51.7900-1046</td>
<td>EPA is finalizing the objectives of a 1994 “Streamlining Export/Import Process for America’s Businesses”, this action would propose revisions to the hazardous waste export/import requirements under RCRA to improve consistency with those for the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) member, enable electronic submission of all export and import-related documents, and enable electronic validation of export shipment data prior to export.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EPA expects to publish a proposed submittal in October 2015.</td>
<td>The publication will be available upon publication of the proposed rule.</td>
<td>EPA will conduct status outreach to those businesses involved in associated imports/exports of hazardous waste. We will also notify foreign governments of the proposed changes through our regular communication channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OSWER</td>
<td>Substantial Statement of Product Specification for Pesticides</td>
<td>51.7900-1046</td>
<td>Under the aging of the US Canadian Cooperation Exports to Canada program, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has developed an action plan to, among other things, address the joint petroleum registration. The joint petroleum registration (PPRG) will consist of the joint petroleum registration (PPRG) and the National Pesticide Information System (NPIS) will reflect the current level of information already submitted to either agency and allow applicants to submit the same form to both agencies with potentially much of the same information and reduce the number of times reviewed. EPA will also investigate whether and how product specification forms could be submitted electronically.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>EPA/PMRA is in the process of developing submittal EPA/US/Canada Request for Information (PFIR) to inform the finalization of the electronic form. The purpose of developing this form is to allow regulators to submit the chemical information electronically.</td>
<td>EPA is working with 9 standards that test the electronic submission module and to develop implementation test release, based on same content and test results. Once the IG is approved (2015), the new electronic form will be valued and the electronic form will be readily available to interested partners. The current paper forms will remain available for registrants to complete while the new optional electronic form is being made available.</td>
<td>EPA's work in solicitation comments form 8 submission on the electronic form. The finalization of the electronic form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EPA may conduct what it decides to what EPA referral in this rule is anticipated by December 2015. Promulgation of EPA's final rule is anticipated by December 2016, consistent with EO 13620, entitled Strengthening the Federalism Principles of Executive Order 13132, which requires the Federal government to create, make available, and publish a single system for the sharing of import and export data from industry and Federal agencies.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ER</th>
<th>RIN</th>
<th>Summary of Initiative</th>
<th>Status of Initiative</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Does the Initiative Include Regulatory Flexibility?</th>
<th>What Methods Will You Use to Identify Improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Subpart B Revision Process Improvements</td>
<td>T/U</td>
<td>Through a significant new Alternatives Program (SNAP), EPA will require industry to replace certain hazardous chemicals that manufacturers use in consumer products such as aerosol cans, refrigerants, and air conditioning systems. The potential chemical alternatives are submitted by the producing manufacturers, and EPA reviews and approves those that have lower environmental impacts on the ozone while reducing the risk to human health and the environment. It is in the interest of both the environment and the industries that this review and approval process proceed expeditiously. In this project, EPA will undertake a number of process improvements to reduce the time it takes to get potential chemical alternatives approved. Examples include use of cost estimators responsible for specific submissions, training staff on relevant technical topics, improving effectiveness of meetings with submitters, clarifying steps for reviews, creating and using templates for correspondence and meeting decisions, updating submission forms and instructions to reduce requests for further information and clarifications, improving tracking of submittals related to ensure prompt processing and communication with submitters, and working together more closely and more systematically with EPA’s Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP) on SNAP submittals that are also submitted to OCSPP through pre-manufacture notices for new chemicals.</td>
<td>Filing</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>The project limitations and details of SNAP process are a number of ways, as discussed in the summary column of this report.</td>
<td>EPA will track the stakeholders and potential submitters to consider proposed alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Improvements to the Hazardous Waste Generator Regulatory Program (Parts 265, 266)</td>
<td>RIN 14</td>
<td>The Hazardous Waste Generator Improvements Proposed Rule will provide a much needed sector wide approach to the regulations in order to keep pace with the needs of today’s regulated community. For example, EPA expects to update the ISRA emergency preparedness and response regulations to fit in with current emergency response infrastructure and request comment on how next generation compliance can be better assist with compliance. Through this rule, we seek to improve understanding of the regulations, for example, by updating the identical reporting and hazardous waste determination provisions to reflect current EPA guidance and instructions. Additionally, we expect to recognize the regulations to make it easier for the regulated community to find applicable regulations and to reduce erroneous cross referencing.</td>
<td>Filing</td>
<td>Proposed 2016</td>
<td>For the Hazardous Waste Generator Improvements Proposed Rule will propose a number of regulatory changes and improvements to the generator program, including regulatory relief and burden reduction associated with changing how generator categories are defined.</td>
<td>EPA will publish a proposed submission in summer 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Interim Enforcement Guidance for Local Treatment Plants Under the Clean Water Act Regulatory Programs</td>
<td>RIN 27</td>
<td>The purpose of this action is to request comments on a proposed implementation of the final authority provision of the Clean Water Act. This section authorizes EPA to treat eligible tribes as a further manner to a state for administrative purposes under the Clean Water Act program. The implementation would reflect changes since the initial compliance and EPA’s experience. The implementation would remove the current requirement for applicable tribes to show relevant regulatory authority; however, we would retain the requirement for tribes to identify water bodies for which jurisdiction is being assessed.</td>
<td>Filing</td>
<td>Proposed 2016</td>
<td>EPA proposes to provide tribes to apply for TMA for the water quality standards program and other Clean Water Act regulatory programs.</td>
<td>EPA conducted consultation and coordination with newly recognized tribes and with states (including intergovernmental associations) during April-September 2016. The input received helped EPA shape the proposal to answer common questions and concerns. EPA will accept comments on the proposal for 60 days following publication in the Federal Register and will offer an informational webinar within the first month to assist the comment process. At the same time, EPA will offer further consultation and coordination opportunities to tribes and states. The proposal would reduce the administrative costs for an applicable tribe by an estimated 3% and advance cooperative federalism by facilitating tribal involvement in the protection and preservation of water quality as intended by Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Public Notice Provisions Under CAA Permitting Programs (SAN/SSIM 1)</td>
<td>RIN 14</td>
<td>This action proposes to make the public notification process for CAA permitting programs to proceed electronically rather than via print medium.</td>
<td>Filing</td>
<td>Proposed August 2016</td>
<td>EPA plans to propose this in August 2016.</td>
<td>EPA is consulting with stakeholders in an ad hoc task force to finalize these changes, and the public will be able to comment on the draft rule since it has been proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some more will result associated with certain provisions of the Hazardous Waste Generator Improvements rule that provide additional flexibility for generators managing hazardous waste. The proposed rule would reduce the administrative costs for an applicable tribe by an estimated 3% and advance cooperative federalism by facilitating tribal involvement in the protection and preservation of water quality as intended by Congress.
The EPA plans to propose this action in January, 2016, with final \textit{meaninging and guidance} planned for Summer 2016. This action would remove certain existing requirements relating to 50 affected states. It would allow a state to choose whether, by July 31, 2016, to submit its next report to improve visibility in Class I areas, under the CAA and existing regulations, states already have considerable discretion to determine what emission reductions are necessary to make reasonable progress toward the goal of natural conditions of visibility.

The EPA has already held several meetings and conference calls with states on the topics to be addressed in the rulemaking. EPA managers discussed rule revision and guidance concepts with members of the Western States Air Resource Council at several of its semi-annual meetings over the two years. EPA hosted a 2-day meeting of states, multi-state organizations, Federal land managers and State and regional office EPA staff and managers on March 18 and 19, 2015, to discuss issues and options, and these extended conference calls in July 2015. The proposed rule and guidance will be published and open for public comment.

EPA is also working to finalize its rulemaking in the area of visibility in Class II areas. This rule and guidance development effort has been advisory for several years of close engagement with state and other air agencies. Although they have encountered some implementation issues, the EPA has already had a number of conference calls with states to discuss issues and options, and the EPA will issue technical guidance to assist states in preparing documentation for reports to withdraw affected source data.

Additional efforts to remove existing data requirements in support of regulatory relief in other areas, including air toxics, hazardous waste and superfund, have been ongoing. The Agency has recently established a focal point to coordinate these efforts, and has been meeting regularly with the various stakeholders involved.

In summary, the Agency believes that it has made considerable progress over the last several years in reducing regulatory burden, and has made significant efforts to streamline reporting requirements and reduce unnecessary regulatory burden for states and tribes. The Agency also has a robust effort underway to continue to reduce regulatory burden in the future.
If available, anticipated Initiative/Summary of improvements include what you engage in and how improvements were identified through the application of lean (or) waste minimization tools and techniques to two EPA Region projects led by two EPA Regions, with participation by states and other stakeholders. Additional potential improvements will be identified through workshops, training, and other means of encouraging implementation of the options listed in the tables and other developed through in-use of the tools and application of approaches, include partnerships, joint training, and further communications between headquarters, regions, and states.

Participants in the initiative's project plan to, if appropriate, make ideas available in the toolboxes and cut the time for two years from 3 yrs. (or by roughly 33%). Such improvements enhance cleanup, reusing contaminated site remediation and streamlining facility issues, providing significant economic and societal benefits.

RCRA Corrective Action: First Joint Initiative (RCRA FIRST) involves cleanup; the time for a two-year project is two years. In 2015, EPA will continue workshops will continue this year in order to disseminate the tool and encourage its use.

Improvements were identified through the application of lean approaches to two major projects jointly led by two EPA Regions, with participation by states and other stakeholders. Additional potential improvements will be identified through workshops, training, and other means of encouraging implementation of the options listed in the tables and other developed through in-use of the tools and application of new approaches, include partnerships, and further communications between headquarters, regions, and states.

Participants in the initiative's project plan to, if appropriate, make ideas available in the toolboxes and cut the time for two years from 3 yrs. (or by roughly 33%). Such improvements enhance cleanup, reusing contaminated site remediation and streamlining facility issues, providing significant economic and societal benefits.

RCRA Corrective Action: First Joint Initiative (RCRA FIRST) involves cleanup; the time for a two-year project is two years. In 2015, EPA will continue workshops will continue this year in order to disseminate the tool and encourage its use.

Improvements were identified through the application of lean approaches to two major projects jointly led by two EPA Regions, with participation by states and other stakeholders. Additional potential improvements will be identified through workshops, training, and other means of encouraging implementation of the options listed in the tables and other developed through in-use of the tools and application of new approaches, include partnerships, and further communications between headquarters, regions, and states.

Participants in the initiative's project plan to, if appropriate, make ideas available in the toolboxes and cut the time for two years from 3 yrs. (or by roughly 33%). Such improvements enhance cleanup, reusing contaminated site remediation and streamlining facility issues, providing significant economic and societal benefits.

RCRA Corrective Action: First Joint Initiative (RCRA FIRST) involves cleanup; the time for a two-year project is two years. In 2015, EPA will continue workshops will continue this year in order to disseminate the tool and encourage its use.

Improvements were identified through the application of lean approaches to two major projects jointly led by two EPA Regions, with participation by states and other stakeholders. Additional potential improvements will be identified through workshops, training, and other means of encouraging implementation of the options listed in the tables and other developed through in-use of the tools and application of new approaches, include partnerships, and further communications between headquarters, regions, and states.

Participants in the initiative's project plan to, if appropriate, make ideas available in the toolboxes and cut the time for two years from 3 yrs. (or by roughly 33%). Such improvements enhance cleanup, reusing contaminated site remediation and streamlining facility issues, providing significant economic and societal benefits.

RCRA Corrective Action: First Joint Initiative (RCRA FIRST) involves cleanup; the time for a two-year project is two years. In 2015, EPA will continue workshops will continue this year in order to disseminate the tool and encourage its use.

Improvements were identified through the application of lean approaches to two major projects jointly led by two EPA Regions, with participation by states and other stakeholders. Additional potential improvements will be identified through workshops, training, and other means of encouraging implementation of the options listed in the tables and other developed through in-use of the tools and application of new approaches, include partnerships, and further communications between headquarters, regions, and states.

Participants in the initiative's project plan to, if appropriate, make ideas available in the toolboxes and cut the time for two years from 3 yrs. (or by roughly 33%). Such improvements enhance cleanup, reusing contaminated site remediation and streamlining facility issues, providing significant economic and societal benefits.

RCRA Corrective Action: First Joint Initiative (RCRA FIRST) involves cleanup; the time for a two-year project is two years. In 2015, EPA will continue workshops will continue this year in order to disseminate the tool and encourage its use.

Improvements were identified through the application of lean approaches to two major projects jointly led by two EPA Regions, with participation by states and other stakeholders. Additional potential improvements will be identified through workshops, training, and other means of encouraging implementation of the options listed in the tables and other developed through in-use of the tools and application of new approaches, include partnerships, and further communications between headquarters, regions, and states.

Participants in the initiative's project plan to, if appropriate, make ideas available in the toolboxes and cut the time for two years from 3 yrs. (or by roughly 33%). Such improvements enhance cleanup, reusing contaminated site remediation and streamlining facility issues, providing significant economic and societal benefits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ER</th>
<th>RIN</th>
<th>Summary of Initiative</th>
<th>Status of Initiative</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Does the initiative include regulatory flexibility?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to identify improvements?</th>
<th>Available, anticipated, or realized savings in costs and/or burden?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCSPP</td>
<td>Alternative waste reporting of health and safety data under TSCA, EPCRA, and FLDCA, reducing burden and improving efficiency.</td>
<td>RIN: 2070-0047</td>
<td>EPA replaced traditional paper-based reporting for industries regulated under TSCA, EPCRA, and FLDCA. Online electronic reporting can reduce burdens and costs for regulated entities. The changes to TSCA reporting requirements are intended to reduce reporting burdens and to clarify reporting requirements. Consideration include the submission of an electronic copy in the place of 8–10 paper copies, the additional requirement including “lookback summaries” of test results with test data; and the use of the inventory update meaning form to format submission of preliminary assessment information.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>EPA issued a final rule related to electronic reporting under TSCA on December 4, 2013. (78 FR 73641).</td>
<td>Yes, with regard to electronic reporting under EPCRA &amp; FLDCA, on October 31, 2012, EPA implemented an electronic submission option via EDGAR that covers many aspects of the particular registration provisions. EPA provided a detailed webinar and a brown-bag tool to facilitate electronic submission via EDGAR of registration and endocrine disrupting chemical program orders.</td>
<td>Online electronic reporting is expected to reduce burden and costs for the regulated entities by eliminating the costs associated with printing and mailing reports to EPA, many of which are received in multiple copies, completing the forms through look-up features and error checks, and maintaining paper records. It also provides the opportunity for increased efficiencies in terms of record retrieval and information sharing within the company. At the same time, it will improve EPA’s efficiency in reviewing the submissions, in particular for lengthy scientific studies. The regulated community has indicated that these savings would be substantial, but there may be an offset from burdens related to initial registration into the system that will be used for the online reporting portal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCSPP</td>
<td>National Priorities List reviews: improving transparency</td>
<td>RIN: 2013-0004</td>
<td>EPA improved transparency in the NPL listing process by considering ways for states, local governments, and tribes to have meaningful input to listing decisions.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>January 2013. See: <a href="http://www.epa.gov">http://www.epa.gov</a> superfund/sites/query/queryhtm/nplstcor.htm</td>
<td>EPA is initiating a more structured approach for the process by which state and tribal input on NPL listing decisions is solicited. A model letter has been developed for use when requesting state and tribal support for NPL Listing. The model letter describes the process and the EPA’s rationale for proceeding. It requests an explanation of how the state intends to address the site if placement on the NPL is not feasible, and it emphasizes the transparent nature of the process by informing states that information on their responses will be publicly available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCM</td>
<td>Integrated planning for a municipal wastewater and stormwater system.</td>
<td>RIN: 2060-8046</td>
<td>Final RIR required public comments in how we should move forward under the executive Order 13614, several comments raised concerns that EPA, states and municipalities often focus on GLO Water Act requirements applicable to municipalities, including requirements for CSOs, SSIs, and other wet weather discharges, individually, limiting and implementing the best available treatment in order to solve one problem at a time without a complete consideration of the entire water system to the challenge facing a community. EPA received e-mail comments on the Plan to help EPA gather additional information on how to better promote green infrastructure to promote non-green cost-effective treatment to CSO, SSI and other wet weather discharges. EPA seeks additional guidance on how to improve this planning process, including developing a comprehensive plan that addresses CSO’s, SSI, stormwater and other municipal GWPT requirements in a way that focuses their resources on the most pressing public health and environmental protection issues first.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>EPA issued the Integrated Municipal Wastewater and Stormwater Planning Approach framework document on June 4, 2012 that more fully covers the integrated planning concept. See: <a href="http://www.epa.gov/water/p4%E9%82%A3%E4%BD%8D/infrastructure/upload/integrated_planning_framework.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/water/p4那位/infrastructure/upload/integrated_planning_framework.pdf</a></td>
<td>This effort gives municipalities the opportunity to develop and implement plans that will help them meet their water quality obligations in the most cost-effective way. It allows municipalities to take advantage of some innovative practices, such as green infrastructure, that can be used to address CSOs, SSIs and overflows discharges. Green infrastructure offers municipalities other benefits as well, such as making their communities more attractive, improving the urban heat island effect, and saving energy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCM</td>
<td>Air Quality: harmonizing requirements for GHG and Fuel Economy Standards</td>
<td>RIN: 2060-0154</td>
<td>The National Program for greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) and fuel economy standards was developed jointly by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and applies to light-duty and truck compliance model years 2012-2016 (first phase) and 2017-2025 (second phase).</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>Final phase rule publishing published 01/27/2012 - 77 FR 4262.</td>
<td>The rulemaking is a direct response to requests from the auto industry to harmonize CAFE and fuel economy standards, EPA’s greenhouse gas standards and CAFE’s greenhouse gas standards. Standards: These will allow the auto manufacturers to more efficiently produce one vehicle to meet the requirements of both “National Programs.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCM</td>
<td>Multiple air pollutants: coordinating existing emission reduction regulations and using innovative technologies</td>
<td>RIN: 2060-0148</td>
<td>EPA intends to explore ways to reduce emissions of multiple air pollutants through the use of technologies and practices that offer multiple benefits, such as controlling hazardous air pollutants while still controlling particular matter and sulfur dioxide. An early example of this approach is an emerging pollution control requirement for the pulp and paper industry.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>Final rule issued 01/25/2012 - 77 FR 4846.</td>
<td>Market analysts found that the proposal’s likely to reduce emissions to the average national price of paper and paperboard products. The control costs for the proposed rule amendments are estimated to be approximately $0.4 per year with associated emission reductions of approximately 0.02 tons per year of PM10. Total industry costs (repair, monitoring and incremental reporting increment requirements in addition to controls) are estimated to be approximately $0.14 per year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Title of Initiative / Rule / RIN</td>
<td>Summary of Initiative</td>
<td>Status of Initiative</td>
<td>Target Completion Date</td>
<td>Does the Initiative Include Regulatory Flexibility?</td>
<td>What Methods Will You Engage in to Identify Improvements?</td>
<td>If available, anticipated or realized savings in costs and/or burdens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Transition Methodology: seeking to open new markets and utilize technology</td>
<td>EPA introduced technology during retrospective reviews and new methodologies to help encourage development of innovative technologies that reduce costs. EPA also plans to update existing and testing protocols to allow the use of new methods and technologies, where feasible. Support for the newly formed regional water technology innovation cluster will continue.</td>
<td>Completed. EPA completed the plan in 2012. The US market analysis plan was completed in 2012 and was focused on understanding the needs, wants, barriers, and selection criteria used by companies when an alternative finance mechanism is considered or employed. A second pilot study was completed in December 2012 with OW focusing on mountain top mining water pollution technologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The action was not designed to reduce costs or eliminate burdens. Its desired outcome is to stimulate the incorporation of the most up to date technology in regulatory programs. EPA began to explore the potential for providing alternative technologies and processes in the market that will offer new possibilities for reducing environmental and health impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>The costs of regulations: improving cost estimates</td>
<td>The goal of the retrospective cost study is to evaluate whether proposed and rejected cost estimates of regulations differ substantially and, if so, to explore the reasons causing the divergence. If systematic differences between estimated and cost estimates are detected, we hope to identify the source of the differences and determine if there are defensible reasons for correcting them in our future cost estimation methodology.</td>
<td>EPA: incorporating information received from an OMB/EA review of OMB's internal report, EPA released &quot;Retrospective Study of the Costs of EPA Regulations: A Report of Four Case Studies&quot; in August 2014. The final report is available at: <a href="http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/compliance/estimates/7517.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/compliance/estimates/7517.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ultimate goal of this effort is to improve our cost modeling and to inform future revisions to EPA's Guidelines for Preparing Economic Analyses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Anhydrous urea vapor recovery systems: addressing redundancy</td>
<td>EPA intends to seek burdens for gas stations by incorporating regulatory requirements that call for the use of redundant technology.</td>
<td>Completed. Final rule published 7/26/2012 - 77 FR 42772 The EPA projects that during 2013, gasoline dispensing stations (GDS) up to 30 stations and the District of Columbia could seek to decommission and remove Stage II systems. From that standpoint, there are about 2,800 GDS with Stage II in the 16 states, 100 GDS that approach 5 stages, and 20 GDS that approach 3 stages. If the five states cabinet and EPA approves SIP revisions to remove Stage II systems from these GDS, the EPA projects savings of about $60.5 million in the first year. $60.5 million is the second year; and $91 million in the third year. Long-term savings are projected to be about $100 million per year, compared to the current use of Stage II systems in these states.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA estimates the long-term cost savings associated with the two to be approximately 0.0015 cents per gallon (2010$).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>May 2013 - April 2014: Reducing Burden</td>
<td>Under this rule, EPA is providing information to stakeholders and other interested parties to assist them in better understanding and ensuring compliance with CCR requirements. The rule is intended to clarify or reduce complex CCR requirements and make the rule easier to understand.</td>
<td>Completed. The final rule was published on February 7, 2014 (79 FR 74211).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of a March 2012 rule could result in annual cost savings exceeding $10 million, and annual burden reductions of between 370,000 and 700,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Electronic tracking waste list (E TL) form: reducing burden</td>
<td>EPA required ways to reduce burden for hazardous waste generators, transporters, and haulers of waste permits.</td>
<td>Completed. Shortly after the final rule was released and before final EPA review, EPA released a draft for compliance assistance guidance on the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA initially publishing the form would: (1) lessen in number of requests for similar forms to be completed, signed and mailed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Electronic tracking waste list (E TL) form: reducing burden</td>
<td>EPA requires ways to reduce burden for hazardous waste generators, transporters, and haulers of waste permits.</td>
<td>Completed. Shortly after the final rule was released and before final EPA review, EPA released a draft for compliance assistance guidance on the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA initially publishing the form would: (1) lessen in number of requests for similar forms to be completed, signed and mailed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Electronic tracking waste list (E TL) form: reducing burden</td>
<td>EPA requirements to provide greater transparency and public participation in protecting the nation's drinking water, while at the same time looking for opportunities to reduce utility burden.</td>
<td>Completed. On January 3, 2014, EPA released an interpretative memo allowing for electronic delivery of CCR and a document summarizing CCR issues and recommended next steps for utilities to enhance public access to information on drinking water quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPA estimated a cost savings of approximately $12,000,000 (2010$) per year, based on the anticipated reduction in postage and paper costs for systems serving 250,000 customers. EPA developed estimated cost savings to utilities for several different electronic delivery scenarios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Title of Initiative / Rule / ICR</td>
<td>RIN</td>
<td>Summary of Initiative</td>
<td>Status of Initiative</td>
<td>Target Completion Date</td>
<td>Does the Initiative Include Regulatory Reforms?</td>
<td>What Methods Will You Engage in to Identify Improvements?</td>
<td>If available, anticipated or realized savings in cost and/or burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Revising requirements on water (NAAQs) for the Clean Water Act (CWA)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA explored ways to reduce the burden on state governments when reporting on the quality of the nation’s water bodies.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not available for this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Improving efficiency and reducing burden and improving efficiency</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA evaluated options to reduce regulatory burden on industry and foreign countries minimizing export requirements, as industry suggests that these requirements do not appear to provide comparable benefits to public health or the environment.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not available for this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Revising published procedures for use of the TMDL program (2003), reducing burden and relying on scientific objectivity</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>EPA is reevaluating the approach by which the regulated community would apply the threshold planning quantities (TPQs) for those extremely hazardous substances (EHSs) that are non-reactive solids in solution. This would allow facilities reporting for the first time to have larger quantities on-site and not be subject to the reporting requirements.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not available for this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Revising the pesticide registration review process, as well as other FIFRA requirements.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA is reviewing the pesticide registration review process, as well as other FIFRA requirements.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not available for this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Revising the policy regarding the regulation of PCBs, reducing burden and relying on efficiency</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA is reviewing existing PCB guidance and regulations to formulate regulatory requirements related to hazardous PCB uses under the FIFRA. The disposal and cleanup requirements for PCB contaminated building materials depend on whether the material is classified as PCB bulk product waste or PCB-contaminated waste. The Agency intends to issue a Federal Register notice that solicits comments on guidance that contemplating the definition of PCB bulk product waste. EPA believes that this proposed reimplementation would allow for accelerated cleanup of PCB-contaminated building material by providing a more straightforward path for disposal pursuant to the regulations. Speeding up removal and disposal of the PCB-contaminated material is critical for reducing exposure potential, such as in schools or other locations where such PCB-contaminated building materials are currently in place.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not available for this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Title of initiative / Rule / RIN</td>
<td>Status of initiation</td>
<td>Target Completion Date</td>
<td>Does the initiative include regulatory flexibility?</td>
<td>What methods will you engage in to identify improvements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OSWER</td>
<td>Hazardous waste requirements for retail products: clarifying and ensuring the program remains effective</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The guidance on how to manage containers that contain hazardous waste from pharmacies that were pre-listed hazardous waste is not clear. EPA will provide training to states and other stakeholders on best practices for managing these containers. The guidance will be updated to reflect new regulations. EPA will also consider changes to the RIN rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OSWER</td>
<td>Hazardous waste requirements for retail Products</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The guidance on how to manage containers that contain hazardous waste from pharmacies that were pre-listed hazardous waste is not clear. EPA will provide training to states and other stakeholders on best practices for managing these containers. The guidance will be updated to reflect new regulations. EPA will also consider changes to the RIN rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OSWER</td>
<td>Selective list revisions, coordinating requirements (RIN 3037‐0033)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The list of items, for which operating instructions are required, will be reviewed and updated periodically. EPA is committed to maintaining the public list and coordinating revisions as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above provides an overview of the initiatives and their respective status, target completion dates, and methods for identifying improvements. The initiatives are aimed at clarifying hazardous waste requirements and ensuring the effective management of waste. The table includes the agency responsible, the title of the initiative, the status of the initiative, the target completion date, whether regulatory flexibility is involved, and the methods used to identify improvements. The initiatives cover various aspects of hazardous waste management, including clarifying program effectiveness and coordinating revisions to the hazardous waste regulations. The table also highlights the importance of training and public involvement in the regulatory process.