If available, anticipated or realized savings in costs and/or burden

Revision to the Near-road NO₂

Using the OGI instrument where permissible, may reduce

This action is anticipated to remove requirements for

EPA seeks ways to more efficiently assess the health and

Burden reduction associated with the OGI will be dependent

Modernizing science and technology

Equipment and leak detection and repair: reducing burdens

This rule would apply to equipment such as pumps, valves, and

injectors used to convey fluids at a variety of stationary sources,

including petroleum refineries and chemical manufacturing plants.

EPA intends to reduce burdens on industry and enhance leak
detection and repair (LDR) by using an optical gas imaging

instrument to find leaks.

EPA is developing a protocol for using the optical gas imaging (OGI)

technology for the Alternative Work Practices for Leak

Detection and Repair, but EPA expects full reviews for the AWP

will occur after the draft protocol is finalized. See progress update

for the following item in this chart (Item #9). A draft AWP is not

expected until at least late 2017.

This action is a relief of burden to state and local air monitoring

agencies.

Summary of Initiative

Status of Initiative

Does the Initiative Include Regulatory Flexibilities?

What methods will you engage in to identify improvements?

EPA proposed the Uniform Standards for Equipment Leaks and

near-road NO₂ rule on May 16, 2016 (81 FR 30224). The

comment period ended June 30, 2016. EPA expects to finalize the

rule by December 2016.

The proposed rule was open for public comment for over 90 days.

The proposed rule was open for public comment for over 90 days.

This action is a relief of burden to state and local air monitoring

agencies.
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review of proposed and final rules, policy guidance and

regulatory flexibilities.

EPA is developing a protocol for using the optical gas imaging (OGI)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ICR</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 flexibilities?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to identify improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) under the CAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>National primary drinking water regulations - Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>National primary drinking water regulations - Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for grain elevator operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If available, anticipated or realized savings in costs and/or burden

EPA intends to take a number of actions to reduce SIP backlog and improve regulatory flexibilities.

Hazardous waste export/import

Certification of pesticide applicators:

State Implementation Plan (SIP)

Management Standards for Hazardous waste export-import

EPA intends to review the data and information in our possession and regulate more cost-effectively by addressing contaminants as a group. The plan is to group contaminants into one regulation, which will utilize the same analytical methods for measurement (LICP-MS) can be removed by the same treatments or control processes.

Regulatory flexibilities will be considered once options are established (during 2016-17) and are agency-approved.

The agency is currently awaiting input on potential revisions to the LCR from the SRA committee and recommendations from the NSRA and the TPRD, which will be incorporated into the rulemaking process. The agency will consider potential flexibilities or other measures described in the summary table and achieve a final rule in FY16.

EPA intends to coordinate drinking water regulations by revising the standards for the 8 regulated VOCs, promulgated in the 1987 National Primary Drinking Water Regulations for Lead and Copper (62 FR 58014). EPA expects to publish a final rule in FY16.

The 1991 National Primary Drinking Water Regulations for Lead and Copper (62 FR 21493, 2221, and 2007 NR 698-00680). The agency is currently awaiting EPA's review of progress and implementation of the 1991 standards, which were promulgated in 1991 and revised in 2007.

No benefits of this project would include reduced SIP backlog, making it easier and less time-consuming to process SIPs, and moving efforts to electronically submit SIP submittals. EPA regions 3 and 5 estimate that such changes will result in approximately $165,000 to $180,000 per year in cost savings to their states.

The project will result in significant state flexibility and burden reduction for states. EPA has been and plans to continue conducting outreach related to import/export regulations, to ensure that future SIPs are processed in a timely manner. All 10 EPA regions are involved. EPA tracks the SIP backlog associated with moving from paper to electronic submission of associated with moving from paper to electronic submission of regulatory notice published Feb. 2015. The “eSIP” system was activated in March 2015 and is accepting electronic SIP submittals from states.

Savings may result from streamlining activities which could increase clarity and stakeholder compliance. The rule is the consolidation of import/export regulations which should lead to increased clarity and stakeholder compliance.

EPA expects to publish a final rule in FY16.

EPA published a proposed rulemaking on October 22, 2015 (80 FR 66286). The final rule is expected to be published in October 2016.

The retrospective review is part of the Retrospective Review Plan because, in addition to improving public health protection, this work is expected to simplify and clarify requirements imposed on drinking water systems to minimize use of lead and copper in drinking water systems prior to export.

The proposed amendments are based on evidence obtained in the last 15 years. In addition, EPA actively engaged a Small Business Advocacy Review Panel to obtain advice and recommendations on the potential effects of the rule on small entities and attainment of the recommendations from the Small Business Advocacy Review Panel to obtain advice and recommendations on the potential effects of the rule on small entities and attainment of the recommendations from the Small Business Advocacy Review Panel to obtain advice and recommendations on the potential effects of the rule on small entities.

No benefits of this project would include reduced SIP backlog, making it easier and less time-consuming to process SIPs, and moving efforts to electronically submit SIP submittals. EPA regions 3 and 5 estimate that such changes will result in approximately $165,000 to $180,000 per year in cost savings to their states.

The benefits of this project would include reduced SIP backlog, making it easier and less time-consuming to process SIPs, and moving efforts to electronically submit SIP submittals. EPA regions 3 and 5 estimate that such changes will result in approximately $165,000 to $180,000 per year in cost savings to their states.

The retrospective review is part of the Retrospective Review Plan because, in addition to improving public health protection, this work is expected to simplify and clarify requirements imposed on drinking water systems to minimize use of lead and copper in drinking water systems prior to export.

The proposed amendments are based on evidence obtained in the last 15 years. In addition, EPA actively engaged a Small Business Advocacy Review Panel to obtain advice and recommendations on the potential effects of the rule on small entities and attainment of the recommendations from the Small Business Advocacy Review Panel to obtain advice and recommendations on the potential effects of the rule on small entities.

No benefits of this project would include reduced SIP backlog, making it easier and less time-consuming to process SIPs, and moving efforts to electronically submit SIP submittals. EPA regions 3 and 5 estimate that such changes will result in approximately $165,000 to $180,000 per year in cost savings to their states.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ICR</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 flexibilities?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to identify improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPAGARP</td>
<td>Electronic Statement of Product Specifications</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>If available, anticipated or realized savings in costs and/or burdens.</td>
<td>Proposing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Yes. The proposed rule provides regulatory flexibility by allowing importers to file electronically in TSCA, thereby streamlining their process and reducing the time and costs associated with the current paper notification process.</td>
<td>Paper-on-paper will be cut if this is successful. EPA expects to publish a final rule in November 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPAPRAA</td>
<td>Waste Generator Regulatory Program</td>
<td>EPA OAR</td>
<td>The Hazardous Waste Generator Improvements Proposed Rule will provide a much-needed face lift to the regulations in order to keep pace with the needs of today’s regulated community. The proposed rule seeks to update the regulations by removing unnecessary and outdated requirements, improving the transparency of the regulations, and ensuring that the regulations are consistent with current enforcement procedures.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Yes. The proposed rule provides regulatory flexibility by allowing importers to file electronically in TSCA, thereby streamlining their process and reducing the time and costs associated with the current paper notification process.</td>
<td>Paper-on-paper will be cut if this is successful. EPA expects to publish a final rule in November 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPAPRAA</td>
<td>Pesticide Database</td>
<td>EPA OLEM</td>
<td>The Harmonized Pesticide Information System (HARP) is a comprehensive database of pesticide information that provides a single point of access to pesticide registrants. The proposed rule seeks to improve the transparency and accessibility of the regulations, and to reduce the burden of data collection and reporting.</td>
<td>Proposing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Yes. The proposed rule provides regulatory flexibility by allowing importers to file electronically in TSCA, thereby streamlining their process and reducing the time and costs associated with the current paper notification process.</td>
<td>Paper-on-paper will be cut if this is successful. EPA expects to publish a final rule in November 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EPA/OAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ICR RIN</th>
<th>Summary of Initiative</th>
<th>Status of Initiative</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Does the Initiative include regulatory flexibilities?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to Identify Improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPAP18</td>
<td>Regional Haze Regulations -- Revision of SIP Substitution Data and Reporting Requirements for Progress Reports (AP 65)</td>
<td>The action would revise existing process requirements of the existing Regional Haze Regulations -- Revision of SIP Substitution Data and Reporting Requirements for Progress Reports to allow states to submit their plans for additional emission reductions to improve visibility, to remove the requirement that progress reports be submitted as formal plan revisions that reducing required administrative steps at the state level, to reduce the schedule for progress reports (e.g., 700 days to 330 days), to reorient the requirement for obtaining approval for electronic submittal of progress reports, to revise the requirement in the Exceptional Events Rule, under which states may request that EPA exclude event-affected data from regulatory determinations set aside air quality data that have been affected by an exceptional event, to provide a statutory option in certain cases of relying on emission controls that were adopted for a reason other than regional haze, and to extend reporting time frames for states requesting a waiver of requirements of the existing rule.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
<td>EPA proposed the action on May 4, 2016 (81 FR 18687), with final rulemaking planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>This action would remove certain existing requirements entirely. The associated costs and benefits are not available at this time. EPA would provide the associated costs and benefits if and when available.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPAP18</td>
<td>Exceptional Events</td>
<td>The proposed rule was published on November 20, 2015 (80 FR 7280), with final rulemaking and guidance planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
<td>EPA proposed the action on May 4, 2016 (81 FR 18687), with final rulemaking planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>The measure would remove some of the basic deadlines for EPA exclusion by states. The associated costs and benefits are not available at this time.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EPA/OAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ICR RIN</th>
<th>Summary of Initiative</th>
<th>Status of Initiative</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Does the Initiative include regulatory flexibilities?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to Identify Improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPAP18</td>
<td>Exceptional Events</td>
<td>The proposed rule was published on November 20, 2015 (80 FR 7280), with final rulemaking and guidance planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
<td>EPA proposed the action on May 4, 2016 (81 FR 18687), with final rulemaking planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>The rule and guidance development effort has been informed by input from key stakeholders through public comments. The savings to states from the proposed rule changes is not stable.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EPA/OAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ICR RIN</th>
<th>Summary of Initiative</th>
<th>Status of Initiative</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Does the Initiative include regulatory flexibilities?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to Identify Improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPAP18</td>
<td>Exceptional Events</td>
<td>The proposed rule was published on November 20, 2015 (80 FR 7280), with final rulemaking and guidance planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
<td>EPA proposed the action on May 4, 2016 (81 FR 18687), with final rulemaking planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>The proposed rule was open for public comment for 60 days.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
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<th>Summary of Initiative</th>
<th>Status of Initiative</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Does the Initiative include regulatory flexibilities?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to Identify Improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPAP18</td>
<td>Exceptional Events</td>
<td>The proposed rule was published on November 20, 2015 (80 FR 7280), with final rulemaking and guidance planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
<td>EPA proposed the action on May 4, 2016 (81 FR 18687), with final rulemaking planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>The proposed rule was open for public comment for 60 days.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EPA/OAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ICR RIN</th>
<th>Summary of Initiative</th>
<th>Status of Initiative</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Does the Initiative include regulatory flexibilities?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to Identify Improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPAP18</td>
<td>Exceptional Events</td>
<td>The proposed rule was published on November 20, 2015 (80 FR 7280), with final rulemaking and guidance planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
<td>EPA proposed the action on May 4, 2016 (81 FR 18687), with final rulemaking planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>The proposed rule was open for public comment for 60 days.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EPA/OAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ICR RIN</th>
<th>Summary of Initiative</th>
<th>Status of Initiative</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Does the Initiative include regulatory flexibilities?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to Identify Improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPAP18</td>
<td>Exceptional Events</td>
<td>The proposed rule was published on November 20, 2015 (80 FR 7280), with final rulemaking and guidance planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
<td>EPA proposed the action on May 4, 2016 (81 FR 18687), with final rulemaking planned for Fall 2016.</td>
<td>The proposed rule was open for public comment for 60 days.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If available, anticipated or realized savings in costs and/or RCRA Corrective Action (CA) involves the cleanup of facilities.

SNAP Submittal Review Process


Revision to the research, training for staff on relevant technical topics, improving effectiveness of communications with submitters, clarifying step-by-step processes, creating and using checklists, and effectively communicating with submitters, and working more closely with OCSPP's Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OSPP) on SNAP submittals to enhance the operation of the SNAP review process.

EPA increased the minimum permit term for municipal solid waste landfills operating under MSW permits to allow for the addition back lands to the disposal and the addition of landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. RD&D permits in order to streamline the phases.

Additionally, SNAP improvements will continue to reduce EPA's review time for landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. NW 2050-75

EPA increased the allowable permit terms for municipal solid waste landfills that add lands (barnstorming) operating under Research, Development, and Demonstration (RD&D) permits in order to streamline the phases. The comment period closed on December 14, 2015. The outline published the final rule on May 18, 2016 (80 FR 26326).

EPA increased the minimum permit term for municipal solid waste landfills operating under MSW permits to allow for the addition back lands to the disposal and the addition of landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. RD&D permits in order to streamline the phases.

EPA increased the minimum permit term for municipal solid waste landfills operating under MSW permits to allow for the addition back lands to the disposal and the addition of landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. RD&D permits in order to streamline the phases.

Improvements were identified through the application of Lean Six-Sigma techniques. The Agency is reaching out to submitters and potential submitters to solicit additional flexibilities in existing CA regulations so that the program can continue well past this date in order to disseminate the tool to encourage and enable its use.

EPA intends to do that in an ongoing basis for years to come. At this time, aside from having meetings of the SNAP LEAN team and involving stakeholders, we are confident the improvements will continue to reduce EPA's review time for landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. RD&D permits in order to streamline the phases.

Improvements were identified through the application of Lean Six-Sigma techniques. The Agency is reaching out to submitters and potential submitters to solicit additional flexibilities in existing CA regulations so that the program can continue well past this date in order to disseminate the tool to encourage and enable its use.
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Improvements were identified through the application of Lean Six-Sigma techniques. The Agency is reaching out to submitters and potential submitters to solicit additional flexibilities in existing CA regulations so that the program can continue well past this date in order to disseminate the tool to encourage and enable its use.

EPA intends to do that in an ongoing basis for years to come. At this time, aside from having meetings of the SNAP LEAN team and involving stakeholders, we are confident the improvements will continue to reduce EPA's review time for landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. RD&D permits in order to streamline the phases.

Improvements were identified through the application of Lean Six-Sigma techniques. The Agency is reaching out to submitters and potential submitters to solicit additional flexibilities in existing CA regulations so that the program can continue well past this date in order to disseminate the tool to encourage and enable its use.

EPA intends to do that in an ongoing basis for years to come. At this time, aside from having meetings of the SNAP LEAN team and involving stakeholders, we are confident the improvements will continue to reduce EPA's review time for landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. RD&D permits in order to streamline the phases.

Improvements were identified through the application of Lean Six-Sigma techniques. The Agency is reaching out to submitters and potential submitters to solicit additional flexibilities in existing CA regulations so that the program can continue well past this date in order to disseminate the tool to encourage and enable its use.

EPA intends to do that in an ongoing basis for years to come. At this time, aside from having meetings of the SNAP LEAN team and involving stakeholders, we are confident the improvements will continue to reduce EPA's review time for landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. RD&D permits in order to streamline the phases.

Improvements were identified through the application of Lean Six-Sigma techniques. The Agency is reaching out to submitters and potential submitters to solicit additional flexibilities in existing CA regulations so that the program can continue well past this date in order to disseminate the tool to encourage and enable its use.

EPA intends to do that in an ongoing basis for years to come. At this time, aside from having meetings of the SNAP LEAN team and involving stakeholders, we are confident the improvements will continue to reduce EPA's review time for landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. RD&D permits in order to streamline the phases.

Improvements were identified through the application of Lean Six-Sigma techniques. The Agency is reaching out to submitters and potential submitters to solicit additional flexibilities in existing CA regulations so that the program can continue well past this date in order to disseminate the tool to encourage and enable its use.

EPA intends to do that in an ongoing basis for years to come. At this time, aside from having meetings of the SNAP LEAN team and involving stakeholders, we are confident the improvements will continue to reduce EPA's review time for landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. RD&D permits in order to streamline the phases.

Improvements were identified through the application of Lean Six-Sigma techniques. The Agency is reaching out to submitters and potential submitters to solicit additional flexibilities in existing CA regulations so that the program can continue well past this date in order to disseminate the tool to encourage and enable its use.

EPA intends to do that in an ongoing basis for years to come. At this time, aside from having meetings of the SNAP LEAN team and involving stakeholders, we are confident the improvements will continue to reduce EPA's review time for landfill gas as a source of fuel and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. RD&D permits in order to streamline the phases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ICR</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 flexibilities?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to Identify Improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sightline and EPA/FAO</td>
<td>Regulatory certainty for farmers working with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and states</td>
<td>AQ32</td>
<td>EPA worked with USDA and state governments to require farmers to adopt water quality improvements.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>January 2013.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/STJ and EPA/SDWA</td>
<td>Electronic online reporting of health and safety data under TSCA, FIFRA, and FFDCA: reducing burden and improving efficiencies. target: USDA</td>
<td>AQ37</td>
<td>EPA is transitioning from paper-based reporting to electronic reporting for industries regulated under TSCA, FIFRA, and FFDCA. Online electronic reporting is reducing burden.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OAR and EPA/OCSPP</td>
<td>National Priorities List rules: Public Involvement and transparency.</td>
<td>AQ54</td>
<td>EPA revised FIFRA and FFDCA reporting requirements.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Electronic online reporting of health and safety data under TSCA, FIFRA, and FFDCA: reducing burden and improving efficiencies.</td>
<td>AJ75</td>
<td>EPA is required to provide electronic reporting under TSCA, FIFRA, and FFDCA on December 4, 2013. (78 FR 72818)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OECA and EPA/OAR</td>
<td>Vehicle Regulations: harmonizing CA and Federal regulations</td>
<td>AQ101</td>
<td>EPA is required to harmonize vehicle regulations for CA and federal regulations.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/STJ</td>
<td>Agronomic Plan for integrated nutrient management and chloradimuron sources</td>
<td>AQ54</td>
<td>EPA is required to harmonize nutrient management practices for chloradimuron sources.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/STJ and EPA/SDWA</td>
<td>Vehicle Regulations: Emission and fuel economy standards</td>
<td>AQ106</td>
<td>Vehicle regulations: Emission standards.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>August 2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electronic online reporting**

- **Deregulation of reporting burden:**
  - **TSCA, FIFRA, and FFDCA:**
    - **EPA:**
      - *Online reporting can reduce burden and costs for industries.*
    - **Federal:**
      - *Electronic reporting reduces burden for industries.*

- **Increased transparency:**
  - **EPA:**
    - *Electronic reporting provides transparency.*
  - **Federal:**
    - *Increased transparency is available.*

- **Increased efficiency:**
  - **EPA:**
    - *Electronic reporting improves efficiency.*
  - **Federal:**
    - *Improved efficiency for industries.*

**Regulatory Flexibility:**

- **EPA:**
  - *Assessment and identification of regulatory flexibilities.*
  - *Engaging key stakeholders.*

- **Federal:**
  - *Assessment and identification of regulatory flexibilities.*
  - *Engaging key stakeholders.*

**Identify Improvements:**

- **EPA:**
  - *Assessment and identification of regulatory flexibilities.*
  - *Engaging key stakeholders.*

- **Federal:**
  - *Assessment and identification of regulatory flexibilities.*
  - *Engaging key stakeholders.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / ICR</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 flexibilities?</th>
<th>What methods will you engage in to identify improvements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Multiple air pollutants: coordinating emission reduction regulations and using innovative technologies</td>
<td>RIN 2060-0575</td>
<td>EPA intends to remove redundant requirements for the pulp and paper industry.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Final rule issued 5/16/2012 - 77 FR 28772</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Method anchor found that the proposal is likely to reduce national costs and emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OLEM</td>
<td>Innovative technology: seeking to spur new markets and utilize redundant technology</td>
<td>RIN 2060-0575</td>
<td>EPA intends to develop pollution technologies, where feasible. Support for the newly formed regional water technology innovation cluster will continue.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Final rule published 9/11/2012 - 77 FR 55698</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Method anchor found that the proposal is likely to reduce national costs and emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OP</td>
<td>The costs of regulations: streamlining cost estimates</td>
<td>RIN 2060-0575</td>
<td>EPA intends to use flexible reductions in gas stations by eliminating regulatory requirements that add for the use of redundant technology.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Final rule published 1/11/2012 - 77 FR 13780</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Method anchor found that the proposal is likely to reduce national costs and emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OP</td>
<td>Electronic hazardous waste Site ID forms: reducing burdens</td>
<td>RIN 2060-0575</td>
<td>EPA explored ways to improve the electronic hazardous waste Site ID forms system that requires it copy forms to be completed, printed and signed manually.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Final rule published 6/3/2011 - 77 FR 36176</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Method anchor found that the proposal is likely to reduce national costs and emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OP</td>
<td>Electronic hazardous waste Site ID forms: reducing burdens</td>
<td>RIN 2060-0575</td>
<td>EPA explored ways to reduce burdens for hazardous waste generators, transporters, and handlers of hazardous waste.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Final rule published 6/3/2011 - 77 FR 36176</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Method anchor found that the proposal is likely to reduce national costs and emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OP</td>
<td>Electronic delivery considerations for states and utilities: revising regulatory program requirements</td>
<td>RIN 2060-0575</td>
<td>EPA explored ways to improve the electronic hazardous waste Site ID forms system that requires it copy forms to be completed, printed and signed manually.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Final rule published 6/3/2011 - 77 FR 36176</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Method anchor found that the proposal is likely to reduce national costs and emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OP</td>
<td>Increased sunlight exposure for primary drinking water reservoirs: enhancing regulatory program requirements for the open exchange of information</td>
<td>RIN 2060-0575</td>
<td>EPA explored ways to improve the electronic hazardous waste Site ID forms system that requires it copy forms to be completed, printed and signed manually.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Final rule published 6/3/2011 - 77 FR 36176</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Method anchor found that the proposal is likely to reduce national costs and emissions.</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 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/OW</td>
<td>Revisions to the WQS regulation: simplifying and clarifying approaches</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The reinterpretation was published in the Federal Register on May 16, 2016 (81 FR 30183). For more information see <a href="https://www.epa.gov/wqs-tech/revised-water-quality-standards-regulation">https://www.epa.gov/wqs-tech/revised-water-quality-standards-regulation</a>.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>August 21, 2015 (80 FR 51019).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Revisions to the WQS regulation: reducing burden and improving efficiencies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The revised water quality standard (WQS) regulations to identify ways to simplify (Revisions to WQS regulations to identify ways to simplify) and facilitate environmental improvements.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>August 21, 2015 (80 FR 51019).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OCSPP</td>
<td>Revisions to the WQS regulation: identifying and addressing nonmarket benefits</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA has reviewed the water quality standard (WQS) regulations to improve the clarity of modern regulatory tools to identify ways to simplify and facilitate environmental improvements.</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Revisions to the WQS regulation: protecting high quality waters</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA reviewed the WQS regulations to identify ways to simplify and facilitate environmental improvements. In addition, the rule provides a clear pathway to retain the use of these tools by promoting transparent and engaged public participation. The rule also clarifies that federal agencies are not required to consider the clarification for antidegradation, strengthened use, WQS variances, and compliance schedule authorizing provisions. For example, WQS variances and compliance schedule authorizing provisions are discretionary positions of the regulation, and the rule provides a clear pathway to retain the use of these tools. With regard to the antidegradation clarification, the rule clearly defines the clarity as an approach to identify and protect high quality waters, and allows selection of any alternative from a range. Finally, the rule retains flexibility for tribes as a tool to provide a highest order use and provides several examples.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Revisions to the WQS regulation: improving transparency and public participation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The reinterpretation was published in the Federal Register on May 16, 2016 (81 FR 30183). For more information see <a href="https://www.epa.gov/wqs-tech/revised-water-quality-standards-regulation">https://www.epa.gov/wqs-tech/revised-water-quality-standards-regulation</a>.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>August 21, 2015 (80 FR 51019).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Identifying and correcting nonmarket benefits</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA reviewed the WQS regulations to improve the clarity of modern regulatory tools to identify ways to simplify and facilitate environmental improvements. In addition, the rule provides a clear pathway to retain the use of these tools by promoting transparent and engaged public participation. The rule also clarifies that federal agencies are not required to consider the clarification for antidegradation, strengthened use, WQS variances, and compliance schedule authorizing provisions. For example, WQS variances and compliance schedule authorizing provisions are discretionary positions of the regulation, and the rule provides a clear pathway to retain the use of these tools. With regard to the antidegradation clarification, the rule clearly defines the clarity as an approach to identify and protect high quality waters, and allows selection of any alternative from a range. Finally, the rule retains flexibility for tribes as a tool to provide a highest order use and provides several examples.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Revisions to the WQS regulation: protecting high quality waters</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA reviewed the WQS regulations to improve the clarity of modern regulatory tools to identify ways to simplify and facilitate environmental improvements. In addition, the rule provides a clear pathway to retain the use of these tools by promoting transparent and engaged public participation. The rule also clarifies that federal agencies are not required to consider the clarification for antidegradation, strengthened use, WQS variances, and compliance schedule authorizing provisions. For example, WQS variances and compliance schedule authorizing provisions are discretionary positions of the regulation, and the rule provides a clear pathway to retain the use of these tools. With regard to the antidegradation clarification, the rule clearly defines the clarity as an approach to identify and protect high quality waters, and allows selection of any alternative from a range. Finally, the rule retains flexibility for tribes as a tool to provide a highest order use and provides several examples.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Revisions to the WQS regulation: protecting high quality waters</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA reviewed the WQS regulations to improve the clarity of modern regulatory tools to identify ways to simplify and facilitate environmental improvements. In addition, the rule provides a clear pathway to retain the use of these tools by promoting transparent and engaged public participation. The rule also clarifies that federal agencies are not required to consider the clarification for antidegradation, strengthened use, WQS variances, and compliance schedule authorizing provisions. For example, WQS variances and compliance schedule authorizing provisions are discretionary positions of the regulation, and the rule provides a clear pathway to retain the use of these tools. With regard to the antidegradation clarification, the rule clearly defines the clarity as an approach to identify and protect high quality waters, and allows selection of any alternative from a range. Finally, the rule retains flexibility for tribes as a tool to provide a highest order use and provides several examples.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OW</td>
<td>Revisions to the WQS regulation: protecting high quality waters</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA reviewed the WQS regulations to improve the clarity of modern regulatory tools to identify ways to simplify and facilitate environmental improvements. In addition, the rule provides a clear pathway to retain the use of these tools by promoting transparent and engaged public participation. The rule also clarifies that federal agencies are not required to consider the clarification for antidegradation, strengthened use, WQS variances, and compliance schedule authorizing provisions. For example, WQS variances and compliance schedule authorizing provisions are discretionary positions of the regulation, and the rule provides a clear pathway to retain the use of these tools. With regard to the antidegradation clarification, the rule clearly defines the clarity as an approach to identify and protect high quality waters, and allows selection of any alternative from a range. Finally, the rule retains flexibility for tribes as a tool to provide a highest order use and provides several examples.</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If available, anticipated or realized savings in costs and/or benefits

The proposed rule published on January 14, 2015 (80 FR 1873).

EPA made several minor amendments to the EPA lead-based paint requirements.

Final rule published 3/22/2012 (77 FR 16679).

EPA has revised the manner by which the regulated community may apply the threshold planning question (TPQ) for those facilities that report extremely hazardous substances (EHSs) in solution. This allows facilities reporting large quantities on-site to apply for a reduction in reporting requirements.

Lead-based Paint Program;

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB)

The new procedure were put in place in March 2013. This is an ongoing program, so efforts and commitments described apply to future activities.

The proposed rule not published as of January 14, 2015 (80 FR 1931). The regulations of the final rule occurred on February 10, 2016 (81 FR 7987).

Yes. This rule affects regulatory requirements, added state regulations and use of citizen strategies to reduce burdens with the transparent burden.

EPA has bundled several sets of chemicals together as part of evaluation
to support pesticide re-evaluation, EPA begins holding “focus meetings.” “Focus meetings” involved EPA and stakeholders in discussions about re-evaluation criteria to support re-evaluation decisions.

Relevant and specific chemical exposures will be reviewed to determine the potential for increased environmental and human health risks. EPA will evaluate existing laboratory data and in vivo toxicity laboratory data to ensure that the use of an existing active ingredient will not pose less harm when released.

Completed.

Reinterpretation. The reinterpretation is available to the public at http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/hazard/tsd/pcbs/pubs/caulk/reinterpret.htm

Stakeholder consultations led to NPRM. Public comment period closed on February 13, 2015.

Changing the hands-on training requirement is estimated to reduce the cost for renovators (training cost can be calculated by an average of $60 per student, and also expected to reduce online information training costs for those who provide training). In addition, 1,140 relaxation that removing the SSP examination (used by EPA to assess knowledge of sprayer certification) and associated examinations (used by EPA to assess knowledge of sprayer certification) and associated modifications to the reporting requirements. In addition, the changes in reporting will allow for early identification of data needs to support re-evaluation decisions.

Completed.

Regulated PCB guidance and regulations to support the new requirements.

Completed.

EPA estimated the regulatory savings of this rule at approximately $1.8 million to $3.4 million additional jurisdictions. EPA estimated the annualized cost savings of this rule at approximately $1.8 million to $3.4 million per year.

Completed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title of Initiative / Rule / RIN</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Summary of Initiative</th>
<th>Status of Initiative</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Does the Initiative include regulatory flexibilities?</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>EPA/OLEM</td>
<td>Hazardous waste requirements for retail products: clarifying and making the program more effective</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EPA intended to review its regulations to determine what hazardous waste requirements should apply.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reviewing current regulations to identify areas for improvement; EPA committed to investigating whether guidance in this area was needed and appropriate.</td>
<td>No guidance on how to manage containers that contain pharmaceutical residues is available. EPA is working on developing guidance and has conducted outreach to stakeholders to understand their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OLEM</td>
<td>Hazardous Waste Requirements for Retail Products</td>
<td>RIN 2050-AG72</td>
<td>EPA is continuing to review its regulations to determine what hazardous waste requirements should apply to the retail sector. This NODA is part of the Agency's effort to better understand concerns from all stakeholders about RCRA's applicability to the retail sector, what materials may be affected, what the full scope of the issue is, and what options may exist for addressing the issue.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>RIN 2050-AG72</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Conducting outreach activities with stakeholders in the retail community to gather additional information regarding the hazardous waste issues they are facing and to better understand challenges faced by the retail sector in complying with the RCRA hazardous waste generator regulations. EPA plans to conduct outreach on the proposed rules and is developing a strategy to engage the regulated community on pending issues. The strategy includes site visits, meetings, participation in conferences and targeted outreach. EPA will also analyze public comments on the proposed rules.</td>
<td>Expected cost savings associated with the Hazardous Waste Generator Improvements Rule and the Pharmaceuticals Rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA/OP</td>
<td>Section 610 reviews: coordinating requirements</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The list of rules for which upcoming 610 reviews are required is posted on EPA’s Small Entity Compliance website (<a href="http://www.epa.gov/soccr/">http://www.epa.gov/soccr/</a>). In addition, EPA is coordinating with other regulatory agencies to develop standard procedures for conducting Section 610 reviews.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Conducting Section 610 reviews in coordination with other regulatory agencies to develop standard procedures for conducting Section 610 reviews.</td>
<td>Cost savings associated with the Hazardous Waste Generator Improvements Rule and the Pharmaceuticals Rule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>