

Actual Performance for Outcome Measures
 82nd Regular Session, Performance Reporting
 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

DATE: 11/5/2012
 TIME: 2:15:23PM
 PAGE: 1 OF 4

Agency code: 582

Agency name: Commission on Environmental Quality

Type/Objective/Measure	2012 Target	2012 YTD	Percent of Annual Target	
<u>1-1 REDUCE TOXIC RELEASES</u>				
1 % POLLUTION REDUC/NONATT AREAS	3.00 %	4.90 %	163.33 % *	2.85 - 3.15
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Annual Percent of Stationary and Mobile Source Pollution Reductions in Non-Attainment areas is above projections for FY 2012. This measure compares the percent change in volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides emitted in ozone nonattainment areas from point, area, on-road mobile, and non-road mobile sources. Mobile source emissions decreased as a result of more stringent emissions standards for newer fleet vehicles and the simultaneous attrition of older, higher emitting vehicles. Emissions at major stationary sources also decreased during FY 2012. The desired performance for this measure is to be above the projected target				
2 TERP REDUCTIONS	63.70	42.90	67.35 % *	60.52 - 66.89
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Nitrogen Oxide Emissions Reduced through the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) was below projections for FY 2012. This measure reports the actual tons per day (TPD) of emissions reductions as reported by grantees for projects in effect in FY 2012. Locomotive projects are reporting less fuel usage than estimated when grants were awarded. Also, some usage reports were not received in time to count towards the FY 2012 reporting period. These and other factors have led to fewer reductions than anticipated. The agency continually works with grantees that don't meet usage commitments to bring projects into compliance or return a pro-rata share of TERP grant funds.				
4 % DISCHARGES REDUCED	0.10 %	1.23 %	1,230.00 % *	0.10 - 0.11
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Annual Percent Reduction in Pollution from Permitted Wastewater Facilities Discharging to the Waters of the State was above projections for FY 2012. This measure compares this fiscal year's ratio of organic loading and permitted total flow of wastewater discharges to the previous year. Several municipalities expanded to larger treatment plants which resulted in more stringent permit limits and less pollution being discharged to the waters of the state.				
5 % SURFACE WATER MEETING STANDARDS	59.00 %	63.00 %	106.78 % *	56.05 - 61.95
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Percent of Texas Surface Waters Meeting or Exceeding Water Quality Standards is above projections at the end of FY 2012. This is a measure of the agency's success in developing and implementing state water quality management programs. The agency uses the most recent list of impaired waters to calculate performance, and the list is updated every two years. The list used to calculate reported performance is from FY 2010. Staff expected fewer surface waters to meet or exceed water quality standards when the projections were made for FY 2012. The new list of impaired waters will not be approved for use until January 2013.				

* Varies by 5% or more from target.

Actual Performance for Outcome Measures
 82nd Regular Session, Performance Reporting
 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

DATE: **11/5/2012**
 TIME: **2:15:23PM**
 PAGE: **2 OF 4**

Agency code: **582**

Agency name: **Commission on Environmental Quality**

<u>Type/Objective/Measure</u>	2012 Target	2012 YTD	Percent of Annual Target	
7 % DECREASE/TOXIC RELEASES	2.00 %	(14.03)%	(701.50)% *	1.90 - 2.10
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Annual Percent Decrease in the Toxic Releases in Texas was below projections for FY 2012. There was an actual increase in the toxic releases for the reporting period. This measure compares the most current year reported and the previous year reported for the total on-site releases of the list of core chemicals established in 1988 and released from all industries located in Texas subject to the Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) reporting requirements. During FY 2012, two large facilities increased their underground injection releases by 13.4 million pounds. This measure is subject to a variety of factors like economic conditions and business decisions that are beyond the agency's control.				
<u>2-1 INCREASE SAFE DRINKING WATER</u>				
1 % TEXANS W/WATER MEETING STANDARDS	93.00 %	97.00 %	104.30 %	88.35 - 97.65
<u>3-1 COMPLIANCE AND RESPONSE TO CITIZENS</u>				
1 % COMPLIANT AIR SITES	98.00 %	97.30 %	99.29 %	93.10 - 102.90
2 % COMPLIANT WATER SITES	97.00 %	99.51 %	102.59 %	92.15 - 101.85
3 % COMPLIANT WASTE SITES	97.00 %	90.20 %	92.99 % *	92.15 - 101.85
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Percent of Inspected or Investigated Waste Sites in Compliance is below projections at the end of FY 2012. This measure determines the compliance rate of investigated waste sites that were not found to have significant violations. The percentage of noncompliance at Petroleum Storage Tank sites investigated under the Energy Policy Act was higher than anticipated.				
4 % NONCOMPLIANT W/ ACTION TAKEN	85.00 %	95.40 %	112.24 % *	80.75 - 89.25
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Percent of Identified Non-Complaint Sites and Facilities for which Timely and Appropriate Action is Taken is above projections for FY 2012. This measure determines the percentage of enforcement actions processed in a timely manner. The improved timeliness is a result of a focused effort to keep the number of backlogged cases low throughout the year. The desired performance for this measure is to be above projections.				
7 % ADMIN PENALTIES COLLECTED	88.00 %	78.11 %	88.76 % *	83.60 - 92.40
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Percent of Administrative Penalties Collected is below performance at the end of FY 2012. Lower performance is due to the increased number of PST violations. These violations are generally against smaller companies and individuals with less means to pay and a higher propensity to be issued default orders which result in lower collection rates as compared to collection rates for larger entities.				

* Varies by 5% or more from target.

Actual Performance for Outcome Measures
 82nd Regular Session, Performance Reporting
 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

DATE: 11/5/2012
 TIME: 2:15:23PM
 PAGE: 3 OF 4

Agency code: 582

Agency name: Commission on Environmental Quality

Type/Objective/Measure	2012 Target	2012 YTD	Percent of Annual Target	
4-1 CONTAMINATED SITE CLEANUP				
1 % LEAKING PETR TANK CLEANUPS	88.00 %	93.51 %	106.26 % *	83.60 - 92.40
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Percent of Leaking Petroleum Storage Tank Sites Cleaned Up was above projections for FY 2012. This measure provides an indication of the agency's efforts to clean up leaking petroleum storage tank sites relative to the total population of known leaking petroleum storage tank sites. Most cleanups are finalized after responsible parties complete all field work and formally request closure review. The agency has limited control over the number of requests for closure submitted within a fiscal year.				
2 # SUPERFUND REMEDIAL ACTIONS COMP.	111.00	113.00	101.80 %	105.45 - 116.55
3 % BROWNFIELDS FOR REUSE	68.00 %	76.00 %	111.76 % *	64.60 - 71.40
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Percent of Voluntary and Brownfield Cleanup Properties Made Available for Commercial/Industrial Redevelopment, Community or Other Economic Reuse was above projections for FY 2012. This outcome measure indicates the total number of sites that have been accepted into the program divided by the total number of certificates of completion issued since the inception of the program. Performance is above projected levels due to applicants submitting technical documents and other program related documents in a timely manner.				
5-1 RIVER COMPACT COMMISSIONS				
1 % OF CANADIAN WATER RECEIVED	100.00 %	16.00 %	16.00 % *	95.00 - 105.00
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Percentage Received of Texas' Equitable Share of Quality Water Annually as Apportioned by the Canadian River Compact was below projections for FY 2012. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the Canadian River compact with New Mexico. The acre-feet of quality water received by Texas from the Canadian River were less than average due to drought conditions in the Canadian River watershed. New Mexico is in compliance with the Compact.				
2 % OF PECOS WATER RECEIVED	100.00 %	314.00 %	314.00 % *	95.00 - 105.00
<u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Percentage Received of Texas' Equitable Share of Quality Water Annually as Apportioned by the Pecos River Compact was above projections for FY 2012. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the Compact. The acre-feet of quality water received by Texas from the Pecos River were higher than projected due to New Mexico's credits accumulated under the Compact. New Mexico was in compliance with the Compact.				
3 % OF RED RIVER WATER RECEIVED	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	95.00 - 105.00

* Varies by 5% or more from target.

Actual Performance for Outcome Measures
 82nd Regular Session, Performance Reporting
 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

DATE: 11/5/2012
 TIME: 2:15:23PM
 PAGE: 4 OF 4

Agency code: 582

Agency name: Commission on Environmental Quality

Type/Objective/Measure	2012 Target	2012 YTD	Percent of Annual Target	
4 % OF RIO GRANDE WATER RECEIVED	100.00 %	0.00 %	0.00 % *	95.00 - 105.00
<p><u>Explanation of Variance:</u> Performance for the Percentage Received of Texas' Equitable Share of Quality Water Annually as Apportioned by the Rio Grande River Compact was below projections for FY 2012. This measure reports the extent to which Texas receives its share of water as apportioned by the Compact. The Rio Grande Compact Commission was unable to agree on the calculation methodologies that determine the share of water for members of the Compact. Specifically, New Mexico could not agree with other members and has filed litigation in federal court to attempt to verify their positions on the calculations that determine water credits and water deliveries. New Mexico's position could reduce the amount of water available to Texas.</p>				
5 % OF SABINE WATER RECEIVED	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	95.00 - 105.00

* Varies by 5% or more from target.